

Empathy at Play: Embodying Posthuman Subjectivities in Gaming

Wilde, P & Evans, A

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:

Wilde, P & Evans, A 2017, 'Empathy at Play: Embodying Posthuman Subjectivities in Gaming' *Convergence*, vol (in press), pp. (in press)

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1354856517709987>

DOI 10.1177/1354856517709987

ISSN 1354-8565

ESSN 1748-7382

Publisher: Sage

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

Empathy at play: Embodying posthuman subjectivities in gaming.

Journal:	<i>Convergence</i>
Manuscript ID	CON-15-0086.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Keywords:	posthuman subjectivity, posthuman empathy, World of Warcraft, avatar-player relationships, MMORPG, embodiment, digital culture, empathy, posthuman
Abstract:	In this paper, we address the need for a posthuman account of the relationship between the avatar and player. We draw on a particular line of posthumanist theory associated closely with the work of Karen Barad, Rosi Braidotti and N. Katherine Hayles that suggests a constantly permeable, fluid and extended subjectivity, displacing the boundaries between human and other. In doing so, we propose a posthuman concept of empathy in gameplay, and we apply this concept to data from the first author's 18-month ethnographic fieldnotes of gameplay in the MMORPG World of Warcraft. Exploring this data through our analytic of posthuman empathy, we demonstrate the entanglement of avatar-player, machine-human relationship. We show how empathy allows us to understand this relationship as constantly negotiated and in process, producing visceral reactions in the intra-connected avatar-player subject, as well as moments of co-produced in-game action that require 'affective matching' between subjective and embodied experiences. We argue that this account of the avatar-player relationship extends research in game culture, providing a horizontal, non-hierarchical discussion of its most necessary interaction.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 **Empathy at play: Embodying posthuman subjectivities in gaming.**

10
11
12
13 **Abstract**

14
15 In this paper, we address the need for a posthuman account of the relationship between the avatar and player.
16
17 We draw on a particular line of posthumanist theory associated closely with the work of Karen Barad, Rosi
18 Braidotti and N. Katherine Hayles that suggests a constantly permeable, fluid and extended subjectivity,
19 displacing the boundaries between human and other. In doing so, we propose a posthuman concept of
20 empathy in gameplay, and we apply this concept to data from the first author's 18-month ethnographic
21 fieldnotes of gameplay in the MMORPG *World of Warcraft*. Exploring this data through our analytic of
22 posthuman empathy, we demonstrate the entanglement of avatar-player, machine-human relationship. We
23 show how empathy allows us to understand this relationship as constantly negotiated and in process,
24 producing visceral reactions in the intra-connected avatar-player subject, as well as moments of co-produced
25 in-game action that require 'affective matching' between subjective and embodied experiences. We argue that
26 this account of the avatar-player relationship extends research in game culture, providing a horizontal, non-
27 hierarchical discussion of its most necessary interaction.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Keywords**

42 Posthuman subjectivity, posthuman empathy, World of Warcraft, avatar-player relationships, MMORPG,
43 embodiment, digital culture, empathy, posthuman.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

'Bricka's heart would skip a beat. Or was it mine? Does it matter?' (Sundén, 2012: 168).

In this paper, we provide an account of posthuman subjectivity through gameplay. Gameplay has always been understood as having an immersive effect on the player (see Cairns et al., 2004 for review). Although the empathetic interaction in the avatar-player assemblage has been explored by some (see Tronstad, 2011; Belman and Flanagan, 2010; Smethurst, 2015 for examples) we believe a closer analysis of empathy could deepen accounts of the subjective effects of gaming, especially when applied through a posthuman lens. Our aim in providing such an account is to reveal how the avatar-human relationship is a subjectivity created through an intra-active¹ relationship between subject and screen, where 'the screen looks back at the viewer not only with ideologically specific images, but with its own eye or its own definition of visibility' (Clough, 2000: 56).

In demonstrating this posthuman empathy, we have taken insight from Sundén's (2012) research on *World of Warcraft*. In her autoethnographic study, Sundén and her avatar, Bricka, form a romantic relationship with another avatar, Slap. Sundén's (2012) analysis of this human-machine relationship explores the interconnections between herself, her avatar, and the avatar of the other player, suggesting that the relationship complicates notions of one body and one subjectivity, given the multiplicity of performers that took part in the romance. Reflecting on her desire for the other avatar-player, Sundén (2012: 169) asks: '[w]as it her, regardless of the game? Was it her through the game? Was it her through the orc woman and the ways in which she moved and talked and somehow managed to reach out to me and touch something within me

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 through the screen?”. The mediation of digital romantic attachments through the psychical bodies that control
10 their movements means that spaces between subjectivities refuse clear separation between player and avatar:
11
12 ““Hi Jenny and Bricka! I smile. Slap grins. We flex our muscles”” (Sundén, 2012: 174).
13
14

15 Sundén’s (2012: 177) own relationship to her avatar-self is described as ‘[p]art identification, part
16 desire’. Sundén explains her connection to Bricka as both an inseparable sameness and fascinated difference:
17 this incorporation being ‘an intriguing part of game experiences’ (2012: 177). Along with Sundén and others
18 (e.g. Filiciak, 2003; Gee, 2008), we also argue for a horizontal, intra-dependent avatar-gamer relationship:
19 what is new in our work is the alignment of this with posthuman theory (see for exception to this gap in the
20 scholarly literature Boulter (2015) on how gaming enacts and narrates posthuman themes). What is created
21 and hosted by the game is a particular example of posthuman subjectivity that blends the embodied
22 materiality of the gamer with the informational avatar.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Where the romantic relationship between avatar-player and another avatar-player might seem
32 remarkable, these experiences have become increasingly everyday. In the “networked society” personal lives
33 are increasingly co-constructed through technological interaction with a screen (McCarthy, 2001). Recent
34 approaches document the very embodied, emotional and connected meanings of technologically enabled
35 subjective experiences (Taylor, 2006). In game studies, for example, Filiciak (2003) notes how gameplay
36 actions shape subjectivity, and so constitutes an important part of their experience. He suggests these
37 connections bring us closer to new sets of interrelated subjectivities that are not bound in the same way by
38 traditional territories or industries (e.g. local villages or venues for consumption). Shinkle (2012) too notes
39 how interaction between player and screen creates a connection, not only of excitement and awe, but also
40 repetition, boredom, and frustration: for example, when the machine crashes or fails to load properly. Not
41 necessarily utopian or remarkable, such emotional accounts of digital culture demonstrate the capacity for
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 feelings of belonging (Ferreday, 2009), affective responses (Karatzogianni and Kuntsman, 2012) and
11 embodied, visceral ways of interacting with the screen (Hillis, 1999). However, although much research has
12 demonstrated the extensions of the body through an online, digital and networked society, few have drawn a
13 close conceptual link between gaming and posthuman subjectivity.
14
15

16
17 In this article, we contribute to recent empirical research that explores the application of posthuman
18 subjectivity to lived experiences. Using empathy as our analytical concept, we apply a posthuman reading to
19 fieldnotes produced during gameplay in *World of Warcraft*. Before doing so, we document our understanding
20 of posthuman subjectivity below, showing how this body of thought could develop understandings of the
21 relationship between gamer and avatar in gaming culture research.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **The posthuman gamer**

30 Posthuman subjectivity is a heavily contested term. Notions of posthuman subjectivity are not homogeneous,
31 nor easy to define, and a vast body of work has explored various “posthuman” accounts as a response to a
32 highly mediated twenty-first century and as evidence of a more substantial shift in the meaning of being. Of
33 these accounts, many have gained critical attention for proposing a version of disembodied, high-tech,
34 transcendental subjectivity. Borrowing heavily on codes from science-fiction, these accounts tend to lead to
35 non-human notions of “the posthuman” (see Herbrechter, 2013 for a genealogy of posthumanism and the
36 posthuman). Caricatured as either utopian, allowing us to overcome, for example, categories of age, gender,
37 class, race (e.g. Plant, 1997; Haraway, 1991), or dystopian, where the cyborg-self becomes inhuman and
38 emptied of feeling (e.g. Turkle, 2011), we suggest both exaggerations limit what the notion of ‘posthuman
39 subjectivity’ can do.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

With this caveat in mind, we draw on a notion of “the posthuman” that posits new forms of subjectivity have been emerging in technologically mediated societies, which nevertheless only serve to highlight already existing forms of subjectivity that are not necessarily high-tech, disembodied, or historically recent (Braidotti, 2013; Hayles, 2006; Herbrechter, 2013). Instead, a view of subjectivity emerges that resists subjectivity as singular, unchanging and self-contained, rejecting ideas implicit in the concept of the liberal human subject (e.g. autonomy, self-determination and individualism). Although not explicitly associated with the posthuman, Blackman’s (2012) account of ‘immaterial bodies’, for example, suggests understanding the self as constantly permeable. She provides examples of this permeability from early psychology, where suggestion, hypnosis and ‘mental touch’ trouble notions of separate, bounded bodies. In another example, crowd mentality represents a concept ripe for the interdependence of one body with another, and is clearly evident in a range of spaces, such as festivals, dance and clubbing spaces (Blackman, 2012; Thrift, 2008). The experience of these spaces is not of an individual, unified body, but is rather felt collectively and affectively.

From this viewpoint, Haraway (1991: 178) pointedly asks, ‘[w]hy should our bodies end at the skin, or include at best other beings encapsulated by skin’, when subjectivity is defined so much by experiences that happen beyond the body. This is a not a refusal of the flesh: rather than *transcending* the body we instead *extend* our embodied awareness (Braidotti, 2013; Hayles, 1999). Contra accounts of posthuman subjectivity as anti- or dehumanising, we might instead posit a subjectivity whereby ‘we are no less human than the first time an ancestor picked up a stick to extend an arm’ (Tufekci, 2012: 34). Taking into account the further studies into affect, embodiment, and permeability, not to mention the different subjectivities that we inhabit, the idea of the “rational” and autonomous being becomes outdated, and hence a posthuman model that accommodates a more fluid understanding of “being” can be usefully employed. The singular subject is

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 replaced by the view of subjectivity as a flow and a fold, where our materialities are shaped by others in our
10 environment, who may be both human and non-human.

11
12
13 As clear distinctions between self and other begin to collapse, we should also consider what Braidotti
14 terms a “posthuman ethics”. She states that the non-unitary subject includes ‘an enlarged sense of inter-
15 connection between self and others, by removing the obstacle of self-centred individualism’ (Braidotti, 2013:
16 49-50). We do not want to propose a gaming exceptionalism, neither do we see it as a particular technological
17 effect: however, gaming does provide a strong example where we see a ‘relationship between organism and
18 the machine’ (Toffoletti, 2007: 2) that challenges any clear distinction between them and where posthuman
19 subjectivity can emerge from the amalgamation of human and informational entities. As Boulter (2015: 2)
20 points out, ‘gaming enacts [...] a practical realization that the human is a fluid, dynamic, unstable,
21 discontinuous entity. The digital game thus, in its radical critique of the idea of a transparent, unified self,
22 becomes a site of interrogation and sustained philosophical analysis’. Gaming therefore might provide us with
23 a good ground on which to ask, “what does posthuman subjectivity do?”
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Game research has already recognised the effects of gameplay experiences. The concept of the
36 cyborg as a metaphor of human-machine hybridity (Haraway, 1991) has been used extensively by game
37 research to understand new subjective experiences enabled by the game. O’Riordan (2001), for example,
38 explores her relationship with Lara Croft as one cyborg-subjectivity activated by human agency, and so
39 moves us away from dystopian constructs of technological determinism. Drawing on the cyborg, research has
40 also shown interconnections between real life and game life (e.g. Taylor, 2006), and technology and culture
41 (Crogan and Kennedy, 2009). Research has paid attention to how gaming allows a heightened experience of
42 the cyborg-body, through for example rumble packs and gameplay visuals (e.g. where the avatar’s experience
43 of blindness or blurred vision is re-presented on screen) (Lahti, 2003). Such research usefully demonstrates
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 the promise of the cyborg as mythical, showing how notions of the transcendental body overlook that we are
10 still located in gender, class and race structures (Lahti, 2003).

11
12
13 The cyborg provides one way of understanding the self through gameplay. But for some, this
14 approach positions the avatar as merely a vessel waiting for the player to inhabit, and not a relationship that
15 flows both ways. O’Riordan’s (2001) emphasis on human agency, for example, focuses too much on human
16 capacity in the gaming relationship. Similarly, Farrow and Iacovides (2012: 5) state that ‘[w]e do not relate to
17 bodies in virtual world... in the same way that we relate to our own corporeality... phenomena are
18 experienced as representation, not as subjective experience’. Our understanding of gameplay is a counterpoint
19 to such perspectives. Banks (2015), for example, has suggested that gaming research has assumed a parasocial
20 relationship between player and avatar, where the avatar only exists for the psychological needs of the player.
21 By contrast she proposes a social relationship exists, whereby gaming is a fully embodied, emotional and
22 shared experience. We side with Banks’ (2015) critique of avatar-gamer research, and attempt to move away
23 from a one-directional hierarchical and wholly separate embodiment that moves from gamer to avatar. We do
24 not suggest that we live in the body of a machine, but instead consider how a posthuman subjectivity is
25 something that arises from a *mutual* reciprocation from entwined entities previously defined as distinct.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 Gee (2008: 259) suggests that the avatar allows for a ‘projection’ of the player’s own desires and
40 intentions. However, Gee (2008) also suggests this is a two-way process, where the player also conforms to
41 the desires and intentions of the game. Gaming thus becomes an exchange, allowing for negotiation between
42 avatar and player. Tronstad (2011: 254) takes this further, suggesting that ‘the capacities of the character and
43 those of the player are experienced as being in perfect balance... The character now becomes an extension of
44 the player while still being perceptible as a separate identity with which the player may identify through either
45 embodied or imaginative empathy (or both)’. Taylor (2009) too explores gameplay as an assemblage, an
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 interrelationship between various components that flattens out hierarchies between player and avatar and
10 where agency exists outside of any particular agent (see also Filiciak, 2003; Shinkle, 2012). A more seamless
11 entanglement between avatar and player is proposed here, which opens spaces for thinking of the relationship
12 between “human” and “machine”. This, to us, comes closer to the kinds of posthuman subjectivity that we
13 suggest is engendered by Sundén’s (2012) research, allowing a romantic relationship that is neither
14 completely embodied by avatar nor player.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 Thus, posthuman subjectivity can be easily used to define gameplay, as a fluid, horizontal and
22 relational experience between human and machine. But it does not explain what facilitates this subjectivity,
23 especially if we understand posthuman subjectivity existing everywhere, as a general state of ‘humanness’
24 (Braidotti, 2013). Nor does the definition of gameplay as posthuman make sense of the very visceral emotions
25 that take place, such that one avatar-player assemblage can fall in love during gameplay with another avatar-
26 player. In this paper, we propose that a posthuman concept of empathy develops such thinking by opening up
27 ways of analysing the posthuman condition and permitting a more horizontal relationship between avatar and
28 player. We argue that empathy is a useful tool in exploring the connection with the non-physical other that is
29 simultaneously imaginative, embodied and cognitive. Our understanding of empathy is intentionally fluid,
30 where the binary between the cognitive and corporeal break down and the two intertwine.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 That said, empathy is not an unproblematic concept to bring to posthuman analysis. Therefore we
41 outline our concept of posthuman empathy below, before applying it to our data. In our analysis we
42 demonstrate the usefulness of this concept through fieldnotes that reflect the embodied, emotional and
43 permeable experiences of *World of Warcraft*. We conclude by suggesting that gaming research could further
44 contemporary thinking on posthuman subjectivity by developing accounts of the constantly negotiated and
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 fluid intra-action between avatar and gamer. We believe that such a concept could have wider application in
10 game research, and for others interested in the relationship between the subject and the screen.
11
12

13 14 15 **Methods**

16
17 The data presented here is part of a broader 18-month immersion in *World of Warcraft*, with fieldnotes that
18 have been collected during the first author's gameplay. In the context of the broader project, the aim has not
19 been to explore the social aspects of the game (although social interactions, of course, do appear in the
20 fieldnotes). Instead the focus has been to explore experiences of gameplay as one instance of posthuman
21 subjectivity.
22
23
24
25
26

27 We have drawn on approaches that emphasise the researcher as both object and subject of study
28 (Ellis et al., 2010; Davies, 1999). In taking this approach we recognise the difficulties of using self-reflection
29 for research on posthuman subjectivity. If "the subject" is no longer located at the centre of experience, the
30 collection of fieldnotes, by contrast, suggests self-knowledge and self-mastery: it would mean the researcher
31 could think rationally about themselves enough to *write the self*. A similar claim could be made about theories
32 of affect: is it possible to collect fieldnotes about the pre-discursive and visceral? In addressing these claims,
33 we contend that fieldnotes are not in themselves a true reproduction of gameplay experience, nor could they
34 be: they are, like this article, constructed. They do however capture the sense of gameplay as 'a fully
35 embodied, sensuous, carnal activity' (Crick, 2011: 267) that we view as congruous with posthuman
36 subjectivity. We also maintain that the fieldnotes are not in themselves a demonstration of self-coherence and
37 bounded uniqueness, but are fragments, not least because collecting fieldnotes is messy and open to revision.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 As with traditional ethnographic research, the data analysis has been a process of cycling: applying
49 and reapplying theory, and returning to the field to explore instances and themes in more depth (Van Maanen,
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1988). Our analytic of empathy emerged when we recognised a theme concerning the connection between the first author and her avatar, Etyme. In recognising this theme, we then took it back to the field, to think through these experiences with our concept of posthuman empathy. Below we briefly explore our understanding of posthuman empathy.

Posthuman empathy

A relatively recent shift in critical theory to notions of “affect” has emphasised the importance of empathy as an emotional interaction with another. For Braidotti (2013: 78) empathy has the potential to encompass posthuman ideals, through its capacity as a selfless quality and its focus on the emotional rather than the “rational” being of humanism. However, we suggest that a *posthuman* empathy needs to be wary of the problematic humanist traits that the term “empathy” might indicate. In the Merriam-Webster dictionary, for instance, empathy is defined as ‘the imaginative projection of a subjective state into an object so that the object appears to be infused with it’. For us, this definition is insufficient, given that it proposes a one-directional and hierarchical empathy. In her account, Coplan (2011: 5) suggests that common uses of “empathy” have made definitions ambiguous, often co-existing with similar terms and states. With this in mind, she aims to provide a clarification in terminology that is, as she terms it, ‘conceptually cleaner’ (Coplan, 2011: 6). Informed by psychological and neuroscientific research, Coplan (2011: 5) defines empathy as a ‘complex imaginative process in which an observer simulates another person’s situated psychological state while maintaining clear self-other differentiation. To say that empathy is ‘complex’ is to say that it is simultaneously a cognitive and affective process’.

Coplan’s (2011) definition of empathy has been, for us, a useful starting point. We were interested in understanding gameplay as an example of posthuman subjectivity, and such definitions are suggestive of a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

notion of empathy that complicates simple mind/body dualisms by refusing the singularity of cognitive or affective processes. Equally, we were drawn to Coplan's (2011) definition of empathy given the centrality of imagination, which we recognised in our fieldnotes. And yet in another sense, Coplan (2011) states that empathy is a 'human-to-human' concept that requires 'simulating' the other's 'psychological state' but 'maintaining clear self-other differentiation'. This means that the empathic subject would remain distinct, maintaining the problematic discrepancies implicit with the concept of the unified, liberal human subject. Therefore, this use of the term "empathy" is one that we work both with and against throughout this paper.

Recognising empathy as an imperfect analytic tool, our definition of a *posthuman* empathy would include: a) recognising the empathetic capacity of others who are non-human, including the empathetic capacity of the avatar, which is in keeping with our discussion of posthuman subjectivity and b) acknowledging that such empathy only works through the network along a complex range of assemblages in multiple relationships with other actors (in this case avatar-gamer assemblages). We are not suggesting that the avatar is an empathetic subject with the capacity for imagination in and of itself. This capacity only exists intra-actively in relation to other parts of the assemblage, including the player-avatar one. A posthuman empathy would mean recognising that there is no primary subject, but that empathy is always already an interconnected network of dynamically intra-acting forces, or agencies. This aligns well with traditional concepts of empathy, where empathy can occur viscerally between subjects, while sympathy, for example, might be understood as more one-directional. It is also important to state that whilst empathy might be enhanced, we would disagree with claims that it is only "projected" – this would imply some degree of humanistic, conscious "control" over the empathy that is experienced. A posthuman empathy refutes such anthropocentric understandings, instead considering empathy as an affective, intra-active encounter.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 The notion of more than one empathetic subject engenders our first criteria of posthuman empathy.
11 Although research has explored our capacity to empathise with biological others (e.g. Rogers, 1975; Hoffman,
12 2000; Coplan and Goldie, 2011), our focus here is empathy between the material human-gamer and the
13 pixelated technological avatar. This is a very specific other to share an empathetic relationship, and it should
14 be noted that the following arguments are based on the avatar as a characterised, humanoid form – i.e. a
15 “being” with ‘human characteristics, identities, personality traits and personal history’ (Martin, 2013: 318).
16 Therefore, rather than simply viewing the avatar as only a “tool”, we also perceive the avatar as ‘capable of
17 inducing empathy’ (Martin 2013: 318).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 As suggested above, our concept of empathy is not complete, fixed or static. Nor would we argue
26 that the empathy we explore in this paper is limited to the avatar-gamer relationship. Context necessarily
27 shapes the cognitive-affective construct of empathy - which we demonstrate with the example of the remote
28 control. The television-remote-human assemblage could be easily understood as an extension of the human
29 hand (in the McLuhan sense). However, a more complicated picture is required if we think of empathy as a
30 decentred experience. The electrical current, the batteries in the remote, the sensors on the TV, and so on,
31 would all need considering alongside the human hand, so that all are acting with empathy towards each other
32 for the event (switching on the television) to take place, creating a different cognitive-affective relationship
33 than the one in gameplay. This aligns with Bennett’s (2010) analysis of the vibrant life of matter. Where
34 different materialities have historically been understood as passive in their engagement with the world,
35 Bennett (2010) proposes a vitalism where objects are able “to act”: for example, in the above the electricity
36 may blow, preventing that actant from engaging in the empathetic relationship that’s needed for the TV to
37 come on. Far from a naive, wholly intentional or conscious agent, objects nevertheless have an effect on the
38 world, with both ‘always perform an intricate dance with one another’ (Bennett, 2010: 31). Considered in this
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 light, a posthuman empathy might include, in the case of gameplay, the gameplayer-neurons assemblage,
10 where ‘the response of mirror neurons to the game’s audio-visual information activates the player’s motor
11 systems, recreating the conditions of the virtual world in the body’ (Martin, 2013: 317-318). Our argument
12 isn’t that empathy exists between the avatar and player. Rather, an empathetic relation emerges through the
13 avatar-player assemblage.
14
15
16
17
18

19 In exploring empathy as avatar-player, we take up Sundén’s (2012) position of inseparable sameness
20 and fascinated difference, but view this as a horizontal relationship, where both avatar and player coexist. On
21 occasion, empathy is experienced as complete incorporation. This is seen in our data when the self/avatar
22 become inseparable, with I/Etyme being used interchangeably. But at other times the “I” makes observations
23 about Etyme, and vice versa. For example, in an equal and opposite way, Etyme responds when the keys are
24 pressed; and yet elsewhere she separates from the player by complaining that there’s “nothing to target”, or
25 proclaiming “I’m not ready”. In total incorporation, we might not find these effects. But if we understand
26 empathy as a posthuman affect, we can read it as distributed, meaning that empathy is no longer a concept to
27 explain “putting ourselves in someone else’s shoes” only to return to the “safety” of our own bodies. Empathy
28 instead demonstrates how humans and non-humans are intertwined through their ability to affect and be
29 affected by circumstances, environments, and feelings (Bennett, 2010). Likewise, our understanding of the
30 avatar as active, agentic, and empathic recognises the vibrancy of non-human agency.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 We use this concept of posthuman empathy below. In the first section of the analysis, we explore
44 how a posthuman empathy creates moments of embodied experience, which appear to take place almost-
45 instinctively. Our second section describes how these empathetic relations are connected to others within the
46 gaming environment. Finally, we suggest that this concept of posthuman empathy can be put to use when
47 understanding the avatar-gamer relationship, where the interaction between self and machine is more than
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 incorporation of body and subjectivity. Where Sundén's (2012) work has shown how the player empathises
10 with another player through the body of the avatar, we aim to take empathy further, through the empathetic
11 relationship that is generated by the avatar-player assemblage.
12
13
14
15

16 17 *Empathy as embodied experience*

18
19 Empathy can be broadly understood as an affective response to what another is experiencing. In gaming this
20 is often an immersive act: the avatar body becomes what we navigate the world through. It is therefore felt not
21 only to be an object of perception, but also a means of perception (Martin, 2013) that involves an empathetic
22 relationship where our eyes, for example, see through the avatar, but where equally the avatar sees through us
23 (Clough, 2000). An instance of this would be how the avatar's position in gameplay highlights the potentials
24 in the gameworld landscape that are interactive (e.g. objects, avatars, NPCs) and "sees" the value and
25 prospects that engagement with the interactive elements of the game could provide. Put simply, the player
26 cannot act on or progress in the game without the avatar, but neither can the avatar do so without the player.
27 The visual field is therefore intra-dependent, opening up the complexity and heterogeneity of the perceptual
28 and agential circuits through which posthuman subjectivity is experienced.ⁱⁱ Similarly, when the gaming
29 environment or monsters (known as "mobs") affect the avatar body, our "human" bodies affected along those
30 channels of feeling: '[a]s any player knows, the rush you get from a good game is not confined to the space of
31 the screen; it is a subrational, bodily thing as well' (Shinkle, 2005: 22).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 In our data, for example, the extract below captures a sense of the interconnectedness of the gamer-
46 avatar's embodied experience. Empathy emerges at the most instinctive of "human" acts: holding your breath
47 underwater.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

I'm completing a quest underwater, diving for relics in a deep, wide lake. I'm absorbed in my task, deep beneath the water where the colours and sounds are dulled and I am lulled into that ethereal state of being. Etyme's air supply seems ample – until suddenly it doesn't and I am forced to ascend. I begin to worry when I don't break the surface – I hadn't realised I was so deep. I need to get Etyme to the surface and I find myself holding my own breath, a worried look adorning my face as I watch the air supply dwindle and watch her body rise... I make it, and breathe againⁱⁱⁱ.

In this extract, the avatar was experienced through a visceral reaction in the body of the gamer. We could make sense of this embodied empathy in two ways. One way we can analyse this form of empathy would be through Blackman's (2012: 82) description of affect as nonconscious mimicry or 'attunement', which is 'not about conscious recognition but about forms of bodily affectivity'. When one human smiles at another, the "instinct" is to smile back; likewise, in gameplay Etyme's experience of being underwater is enacted through mimicry on the body of the gamer. The avatar-gamer relationship creates the space to react in ways that are not only imitation, but happen beyond conscious recognition. More than this, the gamer's experience is one of being underwater - *I'm absorbed in my task, deep beneath the water* - while re-emerging similarly engenders a shared avatar-human reaction - *I make it, and breathe again*.

A second way we could explain the complex forms of empathy at play when the avatar-player extend into one another is Coplan's (2011) 'affective matching', which she lists as an essential feature of empathy. In Coplan's (2011: 7) definition, 'this matching must come about in a particular way, namely through other-oriented perspective-taking', where perspective-taking is more than nonconscious mimicry, so that emotional contagion alone does not constitute empathy. Instead, 'affective matching occurs only if an observer's

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 affective states are qualitatively identical to a target's [...] The observer must therefore experience the same
10 type of emotion (or affect) as the target' (Coplan, 2011: 6). She continues:
11
12

13
14
15 One of the key differences between emotional contagion and empathy is that contagion is a direct,
16 automatic, unmediated process. Empathy is never fully unmediated since it requires perspective-
17 taking. Roughly, perspective-taking is an imaginative process through which one constructs another
18 person's subjective experience by simulating the experience of being in the other's situation (Coplan,
19 2011: 9)
20
21
22
23
24

25
26
27 Gameplay empathy, by its nature, is never unmediated. And although the fieldnotes certainly demonstrate
28 instances of emotional contagion, such that there is automatic imitation of one another in the avatar-gamer
29 relationship, we argue that the extract above demonstrates more than this. Holding one's breath is instinctive;
30 but in this instance there is also concern and panic. In the empathetic intertwining of embodied, affective and
31 cognitive, such fieldnotes demonstrate a reaction to the situation, including recognition of what the
32 consequence of the immediate danger is: for instance, drowning. We expand on how this perspective-taking is
33 facilitated through the game below. In this extract, empathy emerges directly through the mechanics of the
34 game, which produces an embodied reaction in the avatar that directly affects the player.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44
45 *I am "disorientated" – this is both a spell that hits me and an actual feeling! The disorientation spell*
46 *forces the person hit with it to run off in the wrong direction, changing suddenly at a tangent, and*
47 *then again, and again. It is a brilliant "spell" for the fact that it is subjectively experienced exactly*
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *as intended - it is completely disorientating and I'm totally thrown by it, having no idea where I have*
10 *ended up when the spell is over.*
11
12

13
14
15 As we have discussed above, empathy is more than the impulse to repeat, but is a deeply felt perspective-
16 taking that produces affective reactions and extends the feeling of self. In the above, this shared perspective
17 between Poppy and Etyme is enhanced by a sudden change during gameplay.
18
19

20
21 The “disorientation spell” creates a seamless experience between player and avatar, whereby one, the
22 avatar, physically reacts to it, and the other, the player, feels it. The account given refutes traditional
23 boundaries between player and avatar and the lines between physical reaction and the feeling of disorientation
24 intermingle, shaping the holistic experience of the disorientation spell. We could take this analysis even
25 further: while we cannot ever know what Etyme *feels*, this is true of all other human and non-human objects.
26
27 At the very least, the intra-action between avatar and player demonstrates a distributed empathy, whereby the
28 body has the capacity to affect and to be affected, so that both have a vibrancy that deems the relationship
29 between the two horizontal, non-hierarchical and heterogeneous (Bennett, 2010).
30
31

32
33 Reading the concept of empathy through Coplan’s (2011) notion of ‘affective matching’ and
34 Blackman’s (2012) nonconscious mimicry, we would argue that the embodiment of gameplay represented by
35 the extracts above is a *post*-biological one: ‘both organic and inorganic, living and non-living, material and
36 immaterial’ (Blackman, 2012: 13-14). This takes gameplay beyond the view of the avatar as a tool.
37
38

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 *Empathetic connections in pride, skill and achievement*
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

I realise I feel really proud of these achievements, like me and Etyme have become a more formidable team, working together and eliminating our foes.

The empathetic relationship, however, goes beyond moments of shock or bodily affect, but is also produced through a cognitive matching. In the note above, distributed cognition experienced by the gamer becomes clear (e.g. “me and Etyme”) and the empathetic direction less so. Is the player experiencing empathy for the avatar’s achievement, or vice versa? Just as Boulter (2015: 65) asks, ‘who is playing? Who is *being* played?’, we could ask: who is achieving? Who is being achieved? The sense of achievement is distributed, and the source of either achievement or rightful “ownership” of the achievement is unclear, becoming in “human” terms an example of “good teamwork”.

Therefore, in addition to empathy facilitating the experience of an extended body, the narrative of the game also elicits emotional responses that engender imaginative empathy, especially in the shared experiences of the avatar-human as the two co-develop. Although “imaginative” might suggest these empathetic connections are fictional, we would argue that a posthuman empathy would not require a distinction between the “real” and the “imagined”. The broad field of posthumanism has already identified the problems that occur from creating or enforcing binary positions such as machine/human, real/virtual, man/woman to name but a few, and to consider gaming as an experience outside of “real life” ignores it as a situated, embodied practice.^{iv} In gaming, the emotional reactions that empathy provokes are experientially *real*, although admittedly with less longevity or consequence than some out-of-game scenarios.

As with our above analysis of shared embodiment, this imaginative empathy between avatar-player can at first occur as affective embodied reactions to events in ways that demonstrate the interconnections

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 between mind, body and cognition. The extract below retells a moment where Poppy and Etyme experienced
10 something unexpected, which challenges their concept of skill and provokes a desire for retribution.
11
12

13
14
15 *I round a corner at one point, climbing a tower, and suddenly encounter a mob which, for one*
16 *reason or another, I wasn't expecting. "Whoa, fuck!" I involuntarily gasp, my heart lurches and I*
17 *quickly scramble to regain equilibrium and kill off the offending mob. It is unlikely that it would*
18 *actually succeed in killing me but there is a particular kind of vengeance I feel towards it for having*
19 *taken me by surprise and I dispatch it quickly - in my mind brutally. It panicked me, disrupting my*
20 *equilibrium and shaking me from my perceived skill and feeling of prowess. I take a moment, and*
21 *vow to be more diligent as I scrutinise the remaining enemies below. I drop down on them from*
22 *above, and unleash my anger in efficient blows.*
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 In the above, we see a similar pattern emerging, where a seamless and nonconscious reaction to the game
34 produces a visceral affective response – “Whoa, fuck!”. In addition, however, there is also an imaginative,
35 emotional engagement with the game, which cannot be reduced to the body alone. Instead cognitive and
36 affective experiences expand embodied awareness through their different operations (Braidotti, 2013; Hayles,
37 1999). Here, for example, the avatar-player reaction to this moment of gameplay produces an emotive
38 reaction, retold as vengeance, pride and anger. The perception of anger being unleashed in “efficient blows”
39 seems to indicate a projected empathy from the part of the avatar, responding to the anger of the player and
40 externalising it through action. Part of these emotions are facilitated by the affordances of MMORPGs, which
41 enable both player vs. environment and player vs. player gameplay, meaning that the experiences of the game
42 are in some way mediated by the existence of other avatar or avatar-player bodies. The further denomination
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 of these “others” as either Alliance or Horde creates a social context through which various power relations
10 are shaped (Chen, 2009; Williams et al., 2006). Recognition of the avatar-player self, expressed above as
11 being skilled, having “prowess” and an ability to land “efficient blows”, means that, like all forms of
12 subjectivity, self-awareness is formed through recognition (and misrecognition) of the self as separate to
13 others (both human and non-human), thereby imagining these others to also have self-awareness.
14
15
16
17
18

19 Emotions during gameplay are therefore not asocial or individual, but are entangled with in-game
20 objects. For us, the emotional entanglement of avatar-player has been most evident in fieldnotes collected
21 during player vs. player scenarios and battlegrounds. Emerging as events that occur when Alliance and Horde
22 factions meet, battlegrounds facilitate empathetic relations to emerge between avatar-player and other avatar-
23 players, and encourages the feeling that gameplay has a real, meaningful impact on the environment.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 *I enjoy the sense of achievement which I get in battlegrounds, as it makes your proficiency public.*
32 *It's basically an opportunity to show off, highlighting how much of a performance it is as it serves as*
33 *an opportunity to display to others how skilful you are, how good you look. You are rewarded by*
34 *conquering your foes and collecting on the achievement points, ultimately winning the battle. At the*
35 *end of each battleground the achievements for each player are displayed, further accentuating this*
36 *public moment of glory - or failure.*
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 ***

46
47
48 *There is such a level of pent up excitement on these battlegrounds, and even when you spend much of*
49 *your time dead (as I do) this is made more obvious through the forced procedure of waiting the*
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *allotted amount of time before you can resurrect and get back to the fight. At one point I engage in*
10 *one-on-one combat with another hunter: we both circle each other slowly, our awareness of the*
11 *space reduced to that which flows between us and ignoring all of the other players who flow around*
12 *us. Our ranged attack on each other is interrupted by the end of the battleground.*
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Above, the first author recounts the emotions of pride, excitement, glory and impatience in gameplay, which
20 are again coupled with affective embodied reactions such the temporal feeling of time passing when waiting
21 to “resurrect”, or in losing spatial awareness and getting lost in the moment. Unlike earlier extracts from the
22 fieldnotes, the narrative retelling often appears without “Etyme”, with both avatar and player becoming “I”
23 and the events within gameplay affecting this “I”. This has already been noted by Hand (2005: 215) as an
24 element of gaming-language that ‘reveals how the multiple dialects – external versus internal, objective
25 versus subjective, active versus passive and so on – are complicated in the worlds of performance and
26 gaming’. Moreover, the former extract also demonstrates the potential emotional payoffs within social
27 interaction. The empathetic connection between avatar-player are so intertwined as to create another form of
28 empathy, where the avatar-player joins into the assemblage of other avatar-players. We would suggest that in
29 this interaction there is a continuous affective flow, where the avatar-player are not only one posthuman
30 subjectivity, but are actively affective and affecting other objects (including other avatar-players) in their
31 environment, creating a vast network of posthuman subjectivities.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Human-non-human*

47
48 We have argued gameplay empathy creates a range of posthuman subjectivities by shaping cognitive and
49 affective extensions of the avatar-player assemblage and emotional perspective-taking with other players. The
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

avatar-player subject is integral: they feel together through the body, while the existence of other feeling avatar-players means that this posthuman embodiment is shared, distributed and connected, creating the space for emotions such as pride, skill and achievement. We suggest this is both a conscious and nonconscious extension in a human-machine world that has co-evolved (Hayles, 2006), and that the two “objects” - avatar and human - are inseparable subjects. In our fieldnotes, this is provoked when empathy entwines one subject with another through the very human fear of death:

Etyme falls from a great height and I gasp. It is completely involuntary, I am in that moment, her, falling, perhaps to her/my death. It is a ridiculous concept because even if Etyme were to die I would be fine, and it would take just moments to run my spirit through the graveyard to find her body and resurrect. Note the my/her complications. The boundaries are blurred. She is not me but she is not-me. Just as Daboo (2007: 264 and 271) notes as actors create characters who they ‘both are-and-are-not [...] It is both me-and-not-me at the same time’.

Although the gamer is in no danger, the perceived threat against the avatar is felt empathetically through the holding of a breath, a gasp, a “lurch” in the heart. Such instances demonstrate the displacement of boundaries, where gamer-avatar are experienced as enmeshed, because they put into practice the fundamental fear of impermanence. Such experience allows for a body-subject that operates with and through technical extensions and enables a flow of bodily being whereby:

The term ‘body’ is usually replaced by the concept of body-subject [...] which displaces a mind-body dualism but does not reduce bodies to material (physiological, neurological, biological)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 processes. The incorporations enacted by a body-subject include technical, material extensions which
10 articulate the body in new ways. (Blackman, 2012: 9)
11
12
13

14
15 We would take Blackman's (2012) suggestion of the body-subject further, and would argue that empathy
16 allows for a state that is neither wholly about distributed embodiments nor distributed emotions, but a concept
17 that allows for the dynamic interaction between the two: an 'ontological inseparability of agentially intra-
18 acting components' (Barad, 2007: 33). In Poppy's own self-reflections on gameplay, this dynamic also means
19 that to be *both me-and-not-me* involves something more than becoming Etyme, demonstrating that posthuman
20 subjectivity is not only about living in the body of the machine. Etyme herself is a necessary part of this
21 empathetic relationship. At times, Etyme dying can be experienced as the player dying (or provoking the fear
22 of death); at other times, gameplay can feel like a negotiation (or even struggle) between two separate-but-
23 connected subjects. By refusing the boundary between human and non-human and rethinking this relationship
24 as one which is in a constant state of becoming, we can conceptualise the avatar differently, capable of an
25 affective exchange with the gamer, and creating resonance between avatar and gamer.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Conclusion**

40
41 As suggested, much theoretical work has been carried out with a view to describing subjectivity as
42 "posthuman" through the relation of the human to, variously, the animal, the machine or the environment. In
43 this paper, we specifically considered one example of posthuman subjectivity engendered by the techno-
44 informational aspects in the game world. Whilst the incorporation of machinic elements are not always
45 necessary to posthuman subjectivity and other domains of experience could also be defined as posthuman, we
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

have nevertheless used this example to illuminate the ways in which an intra-dependence between traditionally separate elements can form a non-hierarchical assemblage.

Our deployment of empathy, we would argue, also moves concepts of posthuman subjectivity beyond an account of what the subject is, and allows us to provide a methodological framework from which to provide an empirical analysis of posthuman intra-active subjectivity. Our concept of a posthuman empathy is decentralized: it is not “owned” by either player or avatar/game but rather emerges out of their relation in the process of playing the game. We have explored how the empathetic relationship between avatar-player actively makes problematic any clear distinctions between human and machine. We have deployed the use of empathy in a more fluid understanding of the experience, expanding the concept to include an acknowledgement of the empathetic capacity of the avatar in an assemblage and a rhizomatic understanding of the different agencies at play. Our “posthuman empathy” blends the principles of posthumanism (e.g. in a post-anthropocentric acknowledgement of the permeability of beings) with the principles of empathy (e.g. a dynamic interaction of cognitive and affective responses).

In this respect, the idea of “the posthuman” does not need to elicit fear of the change in “the human”, but rather celebrates the prevalence of the emotional, embodied and permeable throughout different contexts. For example, in our analysis, the relationship between Poppy and Etyme is one of care, concern and connection, despite the avatar’s pixelated, technological form. Such avatar-human relationships are testament to the deep intra-connections between human and machine. Our empathetic relationship with the avatar is indicative of the very real experience of being (always already) connected with others, in ways that do not fight for dominance of human over machine but accept the equality of both player and avatar: a principle central to posthuman ethics (e.g. Braidotti, 2013; Bennett, 2010). What emerges is ‘a more relational ontology

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 that explores how entities emerge from intra-actions consisting of human and non-human agencies'
10
11 (Blackman, 2012: 174).

12
13 The shifting flows between self and other are complex yet easily apparent in the fieldnotes – for
14
15 example in the switches between “I”, “we” and “Etyme”. The relationship is a continuous negotiation
16
17 between the avatar and player, as the desires of one cannot be achieved without the actions of another, so that
18
19 each part must be receptive to the goals of the other. This empathy is further facilitated by the game
20
21 mechanics which constantly seek to bring the avatar and player together and allow a spectrum of feelings to
22
23 proliferate, demonstrated above through feelings from disorientation to pride. Connecting with the avatar
24
25 demands an emotional and embodied connection in order to succeed at the game, and using empathy we have
26
27 been able to acknowledge these particular moments in order to demonstrate the intra-dependence at the centre
28
29 of avatar-gamer relationships.

30
31 Empathy has therefore been used as one analytic for how posthuman subjectivity has arisen from/out
32
33 of the relationship between the player and avatar in *World of Warcraft*. We have demonstrated how empathy
34
35 helps to conceptualise the connection between a human and non-human other, in a way that shares
36
37 perspectives and bodies along channels of affective feeling. The experience is one that shows how human and
38
39 machine are undeniably fused, retaining emotional and embodied feelings in a permeable way. As such we
40
41 have shown how “being posthuman” is as complex as being “human” ever was.

42 43 44 **Notes**

45
46
47 ⁱ We take inspiration from Barad’s (2007: 33) concept, where ‘in contrast to the usual “interaction,” which
48
49 assumes that there are separate individual agencies that precede their interaction, the notion of intra-action
50
51 recognizes that distinct agencies do not precede, but rather emerge through, their intra-action’.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 ii We would like to thank the reviewers of this paper for their helpful comments here.

11 iii See Wilde, 2015 for more examples of the data.

12
13 iv Additionally, in the traditional sciences, empathy itself has been shown to make use of the same neuronal
14 pathways, regardless of whether the events are ‘fictional’ or ‘real life’ (Kemp, 2012: xviii), so that the
15 biological body empathetically reacts in chemically similar ways to characters in books and films as it would
16 to another material body.
17
18
19

20 21 **Acknowledgements**

22 We would like to thank Professor Gary Hall for his helpful comments on a version of this paper.
23
24
25

26 27 **References**

28
29
30 Banks J (2015) Object, Me, Symbiote, Other: A social typology of player-avatar relationships. *First Monday*,
31 20(2), available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.5210/fm.v20i2.5433>.

32
33
34 Barad K (2007) *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and*
35 *Meaning*. London: Duke University Press.

36
37
38 Belman J and Flanagan M (2010) Designing Games to Foster Empathy. *Cognitive Technology* 14(2): 5-15.

39
40 Bennett J (2010) *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. London: Duke University Press.

41
42 Blackman L (2012) *Immaterial Bodies: Affect, Embodiment, Mediation*. London: Sage.

43
44 Boulter J (2015) *Parables of the Posthuman: Digital Realities, Gaming, and the Player Experience*. Detroit:
45 Wayne State University Press.
46

47
48 Braidotti R (2013) *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Broadhurst S (2012) Digital Practices: New Writings of the Body. In: Broadhurst S and Machon J (eds)
10 *Sensualities/Textualities and Technologies*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.9-22.
11
12
13 Cairns P, Cox A and Nordin I (2004) Immersion in Digital Games: a Review of Gaming Experience
14 Research. In: Angelides MC and Agius H (eds) *Handbook of Digital Games*. New Jersey: John Wiley
15 & Sons, Inc.
16
17
18
19 Chen MG (2009) Communication, Coordination, and Camaraderie in World of Warcraft. *Games and Culture*
20 4(1): 47-73.
21
22
23 Clough P (2000) *Autoaffection: Unconscious Thought in the Age of Teletechnology*. London: University of
24 Minnesota Press.
25
26
27 Coplan A (2011) Understanding Empathy: Its Features and Effects. In Coplan A and Goldie P (eds) *Empathy:*
28 *Philosophical and Psychological Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.3-18.
29
30
31 Coplan A and Goldie P (eds) (2011) *Empathy: Philosophical and Psychological Perspectives*. Oxford:
32 Oxford University Press.
33
34
35 Crick T (2011) The Game Body: Toward a Phenomenology of Contemporary Video Gaming. *Games and*
36 *Culture* 6(3): 259-269.
37
38
39 Crogan P and Kennedy H (2009) Technologies Between Games and Culture. *Games and Culture* 4(2): 107-
40 114.
41
42
43 Daboo J (2007) Michael Chekhov and the embodied imagination: Higher self and non-self. *Studies in Theatre*
44 *and Performance* 27(3): 261-273.
45
46
47 Davies CA (1999) *Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others*. London: Routledge.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Ellis C, Adams TE and Bochner AP (2010) Autoethnography: An Overview. *Forum: Qualitative Social*
10
11 *Research* [online] 12 (1) available online at [http://www.qualitative-](http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095)
12
13 [research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095](http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095).
14
- 15 Farrow R and Iacovides I (2012) 'In the game'? Embodied subjectivity in gaming environments. In: *6th*
16
17 *International Conference on the Philosophy of Computer Games: the Nature of Player Experience*,
18
19 Madrid, Spain, 29-31 January 2012. Available online at [http://oro.open.ac.uk/33357/1/82-Farrow-](http://oro.open.ac.uk/33357/1/82-Farrow-Iacovides_FINAL.pdf)
20
21 [Iacovides_FINAL.pdf](http://oro.open.ac.uk/33357/1/82-Farrow-Iacovides_FINAL.pdf).
22
- 23 Ferreday D (2009) *Online Belongings: Fantasy, Affect and Web Communities*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
24
- 25 Filiciak M (2003) Hyperidentities. In: Wolf M and Perron B (eds) *The Video Game Theory Reader*. London:
26
27 Routledge, pp.87-102.
28
- 29 *Games and Culture* 4(2): 107-114.
30
- 31 Gee JP (2008) Video Games and Embodiment. *Games and Culture* 3(3-4): 253-263.
32
- 33 Hand R (2005) Theatre of Interactivity: Video Games in the Drama Studio. In: Garrelts N (ed) *Digital*
34
35 *Gameplay*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, pp.208-220.
36
- 37 Haraway D (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Oxon: Routledge.
38
- 39 Hayles NK (1999) *How We Became Posthuman*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
40
- 41 Hayles NK (2006) Unfinished Work: From Cyborg to Cognisphere. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23(7-8): 159-
42
43 166.
44
- 45 Herbrechter S (2013) *Posthumanism: A Critical Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury.
46
- 47 Hillis K (1999) *Digital Sensations: space, identity, and embodiment in virtual reality*. Minneapolis:
48
49 University of Minnesota Press.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Hoffman ML (2000) *Empathy and Moral Development: Implications for Caring and Justice*. Cambridge:
10 Cambridge University Press.
11
12
13 Karatzogianni A and Kuntsman A (eds) (2012) *Digital Cultures and the Politics of Emotion: Feelings, Affect*
14 *and Technological Change*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
15
16
17 Kemp R (2012) *Embodied Acting: What neuroscience tells us about performance*. London: Routledge.
18
19 Lahti M (2003) As We Become Machines Corporealized Pleasures in Video Games. In: Wolf M and Perron B
20 (eds) *The Video Game Theory Reader*. London: Routledge, pp.157-170.
21
22
23 Martin P (2013) Embodiment in skateboarding videogames. *International Journal of Performance Arts and*
24 *Digital Media* 9(2): 315–327.
25
26
27 McCarthy A. (2001) *Ambient Television: Visual Culture and Public Space*. Duke University Press.
28
29 O’Riordan K (2001) Playing with Lara in virtual space. In: Munt S (ed) *Technospaces - Inside the New*
30 *Media. Critical Research in Material Culture*. London: Continuum, pp.224-238.
31
32
33 Plant S (1997) *Zeros + Ones: Digital Women and the New Technoculture*. London: Fourth Estate.
34
35 Rogers CR (1975) Empathic: An Unappreciated Way of Being. *The Counseling Psychologist* 5(2): 2-10.
36
37 Shinkle E (2005) Corporealis ergo sum: affective response in digital games. In: Garrelts N (ed) *Digital*
38 *gameplay: essays on the nexus of game and gamer*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, pp.21-35.
39
40 Shinkle E (2012) Videogames and the Technological Sublime. In: Karatzogianni A and Kuntsman A (eds)
41 *Digital Cultures and the Politics of Emotion: Feelings, Affect and Technological Change*. Hampshire:
42 Palgrave Macmillan, pp.94-108.
43
44
45
46 Simon B (2006) Beyond Cyberspatial Flaneurie: On the Analytic Potential of Living With Digital Games.
47 *Games and Culture* 1(1): 62-67.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Smethurst T (2015) *Playing with Trauma in Video Games: Interreactivity, Empathy, Perpetration*. PhD
10 Thesis, Ghent University, Belgium.
11
12
13 Sundén J (2012) Desires at Play: On Closeness and Epistemological Uncertainty. *Games and Culture* 7(2):
14 164-184.
15
16
17 Taylor TL (2006) *Play Between Worlds: Exploring Online Game Culture*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
18
19 Taylor TL (2009) The Assemblage of Play. *Games and Culture* 4(4): 331-339.
20
21 Thrift N (2008) *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. London: Routledge.
22
23 Toffoletti K (2007) *Cyborgs and Barbie Dolls: Feminism, Popular Culture and the Posthuman Body*.
24 London: I B Tauris & Co Ltd.
25
26
27 Tronstad R (2011) Character Identification in World of Warcraft: The Relationship Between Capacity and
28 Appearance. In: Corneliussen HG and Walker Rettberg J (eds) *Digital Culture, Play, and Identity: A*
29 *World of Warcraft Reader*. London: MIT Press, pp.249-263.
30
31
32
33 Tufekci Z (2012) We Were Always Human. In: Whitehead NL and Wesch M (eds) *Human No More: Digital*
34 *Subjectivities, Unhuman Subjects, and the End of Anthropology*. Boulder: University Press of
35 Colorado, pp:33-47.
36
37
38
39 Turkle S (2011) *Alone Together: Why We Expect More From Technology and Less From Each Other*. New
40 York: Basic Books.
41
42
43 Van Maanen J (1988) *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
44
45 Wilde P (2015) The Empathic Gamer. In Wain V and Pimomo P (eds) *Encountering Empathy: Interrogating*
46 *the Past, Envisioning the Future* [ebook]. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press, pp:139-149.
47
48
49 Williams D, Ducheneaut N, Xiong L, Zhang Y, Yee N and Nickell E (2006) From Tree House to Barracks:
50 The Social Life of Guilds in World of Warcraft. *Games and Culture* 1(4): 338-361.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 | **Empathy at play: Embodying posthuman subjectivities in gaming.**

Formatted: Level 1

14
15
16 | **Abstract**

Formatted: Level 1

17
18 In this paper, we address the need for a posthuman account ~~of~~ the relationship between the avatar and
19 player. We draw on a particular line of ~~thought in~~ posthumanist theory associated closely with the work of
20 Karen Barad, Rosi Braidotti and N. Katherine Hayles that suggests a constantly permeable, fluid and extended
21 subjectivity, ~~displacing which blurs~~ the boundaries between human and ~~other~~ non-human. In doing so, we
22 propose a posthuman concept of empathy in gameplay, and we apply this concept to data from the first
23 author's 18-month ethnographic fieldnotes of gameplay in the MMORPG *World of Warcraft*. Exploring this
24 data through our analytic of posthuman empathy, we demonstrate the ~~entanglement~~ interdependence of ~~the~~
25 avatar-player, machine-human relationship. We show how empathy allows us to understand this relationship
26 as constantly negotiated and in process, producing visceral reactions in the ~~intra-connected~~ interconnected
27 avatar-player subject, as well as moments of co-produced in-game action that require 'affective matching'
28 between subjective and embodied experiences. We argue that this account of the avatar-player relationship
29 extends research in game culture, ~~by~~ providing a horizontal, non-hierarchical discussion of its most necessary
30 interaction.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 | **Keywords**

Formatted: Level 1

41 Posthuman subjectivity, posthuman empathy, World of Warcraft, avatar-player relationships, MMORPG,
42 embodiment, digital culture, empathy, posthuman.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

'Bricka's heart would skip a beat. Or was it mine? Does it matter?' (Sundén, 2012: 168).

In this paper, we provide an account of posthuman subjectivity through gameplay. Gameplay has always been understood as having ~~ana-particular~~ immersive effect on the player (see Cairns et al., 2004 for review).

Although the empathetic interaction in the avatar-player assemblage has been explored by some (see Tronstad, 2011; Belman and Flanagan, 2010; Smethurst, 2015 for examples) we believe a closer analysis of empathy could deepen accounts of the subjective effects of gaming, especially when applied through a posthuman lens. Our aim in providing such an account is to reveal how the avatar-human relationship is a subjectivity created through an ~~intra-active' relationshipinterdependene~~ between subject and screen, where 'the screen looks back at the viewer not only with ideologically specific images, but with its own eye or its own definition of visuality' (Clough, 2000: 56).

In demonstrating this posthuman empathy, we have taken insight from Sundén's (2012) research on *World of Warcraft*. In her autoethnographic study, Sundén and her avatar, Bricka, form a romantic relationship with another avatar, Slap. Sundén's (2012) analysis of this human-machine relationship explores the interconnections between herself, her avatar, and the avatar of the other player, suggesting that the relationship complicates notions of one body and one subjectivity, given the multiplicity of performers, ~~both human and nonhuman~~, that took part in the romance. Reflecting on her desire for the other avatar-player, Sundén (2012: 169) asks: '[w]as it her, regardless of the game? Was it her through the game? Was it her

Formatted: Level 1

Formatted: Level 1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 through the orc woman and the ways in which she moved and talked and somehow managed to reach out to
14 me and touch something within me through the screen?'. The mediation of digital romantic attachments
15 through the psychical bodies that control their movements means that spaces between subjectivities refuse
16 clear separation between player and avatar: “Hi Jenny and Bricka! I smile. Slap grins. We flex our muscles”
17
18 (Sundén, 2012: 174).
19

20
21 Sundén’s (2012: 177) own relationship to her avatar-self is described as ‘[p]art identification, part
22 desire’. Sundén (2012: 177) explains her connection to Bricka as both an inseparable sameness and fascinated
23 difference: this incorporation being ‘an intriguing part of game experiences’ (2012: 177).- Along with Sundén
24 (2012) and others (e.g. Filiciak, 2003; Gee, 2008), we also argue for a horizontal, intra-dependent
25 interdependent relationship in avatar-gamer relationship interaction: what is new in our work is the alignment
26 of this with posthuman theory (see for exception to this gap in the scholarly literature Boulter (2015) on how
27 gaming enacts and narrates posthuman themes). What is created and hosted by the game is a particular
28 example of posthuman subjectivity that blends the embodied materiality of the gamer with the informational
29 avatar.
30
31

32
33
34
35
36 Where the romantic relationship between avatar-player and another avatar-player might seem
37 remarkable, these experiences have become increasingly everyday. In the “networked society” personal lives
38 are increasingly co-constructed through technological interaction with a screen (McCarthy, 2001). Recent
39 approaches document the very embodied, emotional and connected meanings of technologically enabled
40 subjective experiences (Taylor, 2006). In game studies, for example, Filiciak (2003) notes how gameplay
41 actions shape subjectivity have a real effect on the subject, and so constitutes an important part of their
42 experience. He suggests these connections bring us closer to new sets of interrelated subjectivities that are not
43 bound in the same way by traditional territories or industries (e.g. local villages or venues for consumption).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 Shinkle (2012) too notes how interaction between player and screen creates a connection, not only of
14 excitement and awe, but also repetition, boredom, and frustration: for example, when the machine crashes or
15 fails to load properly. Not necessarily utopian or remarkable, such emotional accounts of digital culture
16 demonstrate the capacity for feelings of belonging (Ferreday, 2009), affective responses (Karatzogianni and
17 Kuntsman, 2012) and embodied, visceral ways of interacting with the screen (Hillis, 1999). However,
18 although much research has demonstrated the extensions of the body through an online, digital and networked
19 society, few have drawn a close conceptual link between gaming and posthuman subjectivity.
20
21
22
23

24 In this article, we contribute to recent empirical research that explores the application of posthuman
25 subjectivity to ~~real~~ lived experiences. Using empathy as our ~~main~~ analytical concept, we apply a posthuman
26 reading to fieldnotes produced during gameplay in *World of Warcraft*. Before doing so, we document our
27 understanding of posthuman subjectivity below, showing how this body of thought could develop
28 understandings of the relationship between gamer and avatar in gaming culture research.
29
30
31
32
33

34 **The posthuman gamer**

35 Posthuman subjectivity is a heavily contested term. Notions of posthuman subjectivity are not homogeneous,
36 nor easy to define, and a vast body of work has explored various “posthuman” accounts as a response to a
37 highly mediated twenty-first century ~~and as evidence of a more substantial shift in the meaning of being.~~ Of
38 these accounts, many have gained critical attention for proposing a version of disembodied, high-tech,
39 transcendental subjectivity. Borrowing heavily on codes from science-fiction, these accounts tend to lead to
40 non-human notions of “the posthuman” (see Herbrechter, 2013 for a genealogy of posthumanism and the
41 posthuman). Caricatured as either utopian, allowing us to overcome, for example, categories of age, gender,
42 class, race (e.g. Plant, 1997; Haraway, 1991), or dystopian, where the ~~non-human~~ cyborg-self becomes
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: Level 1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 inhuman and emptied of feeling (e.g. Turkle, 2011), we suggest both exaggerations limit what the notion of
14 'posthuman subjectivity' can do.

15
16 With this caveat in mind, we draw on a notion of "the posthuman" that posits new forms of
17 subjectivity have been emerging in technologically mediated societies, which nevertheless only serve to
18 highlight already existing forms of subjectivity that are ~~not~~neither necessarily high-tech, ~~nor~~ disembodied, ~~or~~
19 ~~historically recent~~ (Braidotti, 2013; Hayles, 2006; Herbrechter, 2013). Instead, a view of subjectivity emerges
20 that ~~resists subjectivity as is not~~ singular, unchanging ~~and~~ self-contained, ~~rejecting and so rejects~~ ideas
21 implicit in the concept of the liberal human subject (e.g. autonomy, self-determination and individualism).
22 ~~Although not explicitly associated with the posthuman~~, Blackman's (2012) account of 'immaterial bodies',
23 for example, suggests understanding the self as constantly permeable. She provides examples of this
24 permeability from early psychology, where suggestion, hypnosis and 'mental touch' trouble notions of
25 separate, bounded bodies. In another example, crowd mentality represents a concept ripe for the
26 interdependence of one body with another, and is clearly evident in a range of spaces, such as ~~at~~ festivals,
27 dance and clubbing spaces (Blackman, 2012; Thrift, 2008). The experience of these spaces is not of an
28 individual, unified body, but is rather ~~felt~~experienced collectively and affectively.

29
30 From this viewpoint, Haraway (1991: 178) pointedly asks, '[w]hy should our bodies end at the skin,
31 or include at best other beings encapsulated by skin', when subjectivity is defined so much by experiences
32 that happen beyond the body. This is a not a refusal of the flesh: rather than *transcending* the body we instead
33 *extend* our embodied awareness (Braidotti, 2013; Hayles, 1999). Contra accounts of posthuman subjectivity
34 as anti- or dehumanising, we might instead posit a subjectivity whereby 'we are no less human than the first
35 time an ancestor picked up a stick to extend an arm' (Tufekci, 2012: 34). Taking into account the further
36 studies into affect, embodiment, and permeability, not to mention the different subjectivities that we inhabit,
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 the idea of the “rational” and autonomous being becomes outdated, and hence a posthuman model that
14 accommodates a more fluid understanding of “being” can be usefully employed. The singular subject is
15 replaced by the view of subjectivity as a flow and a fold, where our materialities are shaped by others in our
16 environment, who may be both human and non-human.
17
18

19 As ~~the~~ clear distinctions between self and other begin to collapse, we should also consider what
20 Braidotti terms a “posthuman ethics”. She states that the non-unitary subject includes ‘an enlarged sense of
21 inter-connection between self and others, ~~including the non-human or “earth” others,~~ by removing the
22 obstacle of self-centred individualism’ (Braidotti, 2013: 49-50). We do not want to propose a gaming
23 exceptionalism, ~~neither do we see it as a particular technological effect:~~ however, gaming does provide a
24 strong example where we see a ‘relationship between organism and the machine’ (Toffoletti, 2007: 2) that
25 challenges ~~any~~ clear distinction ~~between them~~ and where posthuman subjectivity can emerge from the
26 amalgamation of human and ~~informational non-human~~ entities. As Boulter (2015: 2) points out, ‘gaming
27 enacts [...] a practical realization that the human is a fluid, dynamic, unstable, discontinuous entity. The digital
28 game thus, in its radical critique of the idea of a transparent, unified self, becomes a site of interrogation and
29 sustained philosophical analysis’. Gaming therefore might provide us with ~~a~~ good ground on which to ask ~~the~~
30 ~~question,~~ “what does posthuman subjectivity do?”
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 ~~Game Gaming culture~~ research has already recognised the ~~subjective~~ effects of gameplay
40 experiences. The concept of the cyborg as a metaphor of human-machine hybridity (Haraway, 1991) has been
41 ~~used~~ extensively ~~used~~ by game research to understand new subjective experiences enabled by the game.
42 O’Riordan (2001), for example, explores her relationship with Lara Croft as one cyborg-subjectivity activated
43 by human agency, and so moves us away from dystopian constructs of technological determinism. Drawing
44 on the cyborg, research has also shown interconnections between real life and game life (e.g. Taylor, 2006).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 and technology and culture (Crogan and Kennedy, 2009). Research has paid attention to how gaming~~the way~~
14 ~~the game~~ allows a heightened experience of the cyborg-body, through for example rumble packs and ~~the~~
15 gameplay visuals (e.g. where the avatar's experience of blindness or blurred vision is re-presented on screen)
16
17 (Lahti, 2003). Such research usefully demonstrates the promise of the cyborg asis mythical, showing how
18 notions of the transcendental body overlook that we are still located in gender, class and race structures
19
20 (Lahti, 2003).

21
22 The cyborg provides one way of understanding~~is helpful in recognising~~ the temporality of the
23 ~~extension of~~ self through gameplay. But for some, this ~~is an~~ approach positions~~whereby~~ the avatar asis merely
24
25 a vessel waiting for the player to inhabit, and not a relationship that flows both ways. O'Riordan's (2001)
26 emphasis on human agency, for example, focuses too much on human capacity in the gaming relationship.
27
28 Similarly, Farrow and Iacovides (2012: 5) state that '[w]e do not relate to bodies in virtual world... in the
29 same way that we relate to our own corporeality... phenomena are experienced as representation, not as
30 subjective experience'. Our understanding of gameplay is a counterpoint to such perspectives. Banks (2015),
31
32 for example, has suggested that gaming research has assumed a parasocial relationship between player and
33 avatar, where the avatar only exists for the psychological needs of the player. By contrast she proposes a
34 social relationship exists, whereby gaming is a fully embodied, emotional and shared experience. We side
35
36 with Banks' (2015) critique of avatar-gamer research, and attempt to move away from a one-directional
37 hierarchical and wholly separate embodiment that moves from gamer to avatar. We do not suggest that we
38
39 live in the body of a machine, but instead consider how a posthuman subjectivity is something that arises from
40
41 a *mutual* reciprocation from entwined entities previously defined as distinct.

42
43
44
45 Gee (2008: 259) suggests that the avatar allows for a 'projection' of the player's own desires and
46 intentions. However, Gee (2008) also suggests this is a two-way process, where the player also conforms to
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 the desires and intentions of the game. Gaming thus becomes an exchange, allowing for negotiation between
14 avatar and player. Tronstad (2011: 254) takes this further, suggesting that ‘the capacities of the character and
15 those of the player are experienced as being in perfect balance... The character now becomes an extension of
16 the player while still being perceptible as a separate identity with which the player may identify through either
17 embodied or imaginative empathy (or both)’. Taylor (2009) too explores gameplay as an assemblage, an
18 interrelationship between various components that flattens out hierarchies between player and avatar and
19 where agency exists outside of any particular agent (see also Filiciak, 2003; Shinkle, 2012). A more seamless
20 ~~entanglementinteraction~~ between avatar and player is proposed here, which opens spaces for thinking of the
21 relationship between “human” and “machine”. This, to us, comes closer to the kinds of posthuman
22 subjectivity that we ~~also~~ suggest is engendered by Sundén’s (2012) research, ~~allowingand which allows~~ a
23 romantic relationship that is neither completely embodied by avatar nor player.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 Thus, ~~posthuman gameplay could be easily described as ‘posthuman’ (Shinkle, 2012). Posthuman~~
32 subjectivity can be ~~easily~~ used to define gameplay, as a fluid, horizontal and relational experience between
33 human and machine. ~~B~~but it does not explain what facilitates this subjectivity, especially if we understand
34 posthuman subjectivity existing everywhere, as a general state of ‘humanness’ (Braidotti, 2013). Nor does the
35 definition of gameplay as posthuman make sense of the very visceral emotions that take place, such that one
36 ~~avatar-player assemblage~~ can fall in love during gameplay with another avatar-~~player~~. In this paper, we
37 propose that a posthuman concept of empathy ~~developsmight help develop~~ such thinking by opening up ways
38 of analysing the posthuman condition and permitting a more horizontal relationship between avatar and
39 player. ~~We~~in this paper, we argue that empathy is a useful tool in exploring the ~~connection with the non-~~
40 ~~physical other that is~~ simultaneously imaginative, embodied and cognitive. ~~in our connection with the non-~~
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

~~physical other~~. Our understanding of empathy is ~~intentionally purposefully~~ fluid, where ~~by~~ the binary between the cognitive and corporeal break down and ~~the two~~ intertwine.

~~That said~~. But empathy is not an unproblematic concept to bring to posthuman analysis. Therefore we outline our concept of posthuman empathy below, before applying it to our data. In our analysis we demonstrate the usefulness of this concept through fieldnotes that reflect the embodied, emotional and permeable experiences of *World of Warcraft*. We conclude by suggesting that gaming research could ~~further develop~~ contemporary thinking on posthuman subjectivity by developing accounts of the constantly negotiated and fluid ~~intra-action interaction~~ between avatar and gamer. We believe that such a concept could have wider application in ~~game gaming culture, and in~~ research, ~~and for others~~ interested in the ~~relationships~~ space between the subject and the screen.

Methods

The data presented here is part of a broader 18-month immersion in *World of Warcraft*, with fieldnotes that have been collected during the first author's gameplay. In the context of the broader project, the aim has not been to explore the social aspects of the game (although social interactions, of course, do appear in the fieldnotes). Instead the focus ~~of the project~~ has been to explore experiences of gameplay as one instance of posthuman subjectivity.

We have drawn on approaches that emphasise the researcher as both object and subject of study (Ellis et al., 2010; Davies, 1999). In taking this approach we recognise the difficulties of using self-reflection for research on posthuman subjectivity. If "the subject" is no longer located ~~at~~ in the centre of experience, the collection of fieldnotes, by contrast, suggests self-knowledge and self-mastery: it would mean ~~that~~ the researcher could think rationally about themselves enough to ~~write the self~~. A similar claim could be made

Formatted: Level 1

Formatted: Font: Italic

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 about theories of affect: is it possible to collect fieldnotes about ~~thesomething that is arguably~~ pre-discursive
14 and visceral? In addressing these claims, we ~~would~~ contend that fieldnotes ~~discussed here~~ are not in
15 themselves a true reproduction of gameplay experience, nor could they be: they are, like this article,
16 constructed. They do however capture the sense of gameplay as ‘a fully embodied, sensuous, carnal activity’
17 (Crick, 2011: 267) that we view as congruous with posthuman subjectivity. We ~~would~~ also maintain that the
18 fieldnotes are not in themselves a demonstration of self-coherence and bounded uniqueness, but are
19 fragments, not least because ~~collectingthe collection of~~ fieldnotes is messy and open to revision.
20
21
22
23

24 As with traditional ethnographic research, the data analysis has been a process of cycling: applying
25 and reapplying theory, and returning to the field to explore instances and themes in more depth (Van Maanen,
26 1988). Our analytic of empathy emerged when we recognised a theme concerning the connection between the
27 first author and her avatar, Etyme. In recognising this theme, we then took it back to the field, to think
28 through these experiences with our concept of posthuman empathy. Below we briefly explore our
29 understanding of posthuman empathy.
30
31
32
33

34 *Posthuman empathy*

35
36 A ~~relatively~~ recent shift in critical theory to notions of “affect” has emphasised the importance of empathy as
37 an emotional interaction with another. ~~For Braidotti (2013: 78) empathy has the potential to encompass~~
38 ~~posthuman ideals, through its capacity as a selfless quality and its focus on the emotional rather than the~~
39 ~~“rational” being of humanism. However, we suggest that a posthuman empathy needs to be wary of the~~
40 ~~problematic humanist traits that the term “empathy” might indicate. In the Merriam-Webster dictionary, ~~h~~~~
41 ~~her account, for instance, empathy is defined as ‘the imaginative projection of a subjective state into an object~~
42 ~~so that the object appears to be infused with it’. For us, this definition is insufficient, given that it proposes a~~
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: Level 1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 | ~~one-directional and hierarchical empathy. In her account~~example, Coplan (2011: 5) suggests that common
14 | uses of “empathy” have made definitions ambiguous, often co-existing with similar terms and states. With
15 | this in mind, she aims to provide a clarification in terminology that is, as she terms it, ‘conceptually cleaner’
16 | (Coplan, 2011: 6). Informed by psychological and neuroscientific research, Coplan (2011: 5) defines empathy
17 | as a ‘complex imaginative process in which an observer simulates another person’s situated psychological
18 | state while maintaining clear self-other differentiation. To say that empathy is ‘complex’ is to say that it is
19 | simultaneously a cognitive and affective process’.

20
21
22
23
24 | Coplan’s (2011) definition of empathy has been, for us, a useful starting point. We were interested in
25 | understanding gameplay as an example of posthuman subjectivity, and such definitions are suggestive of a
26 | notion of empathy that complicates simple mind/body dualisms by refusing the singularity of cognitive or
27 | affective processes. Equally, we were drawn to Coplan’s (2011) definition of empathy given the centrality of
28 | imagination, which we recognised in our fieldnotes. And yet in another sense, ~~empathy could be understood~~
29 | ~~as fundamentally at odds with posthuman subjectivity.~~ Coplan (2011) states that empathy is a ‘human-to-
30 | human’ concept that requires ‘simulating’ the other’s ‘psychological state’ but ‘maintaining clear self-other
31 | differentiation’. This means that the empathic subject would remain distinct, maintaining the problematic
32 | discrepancies implicit with the concept of the unified, liberal human subject. Therefore, this use of the term
33 | “empathy” is one that we work both with and against throughout this paper.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40 | Recognising empathy as an imperfect analytic tool, our definition of a *posthuman* empathy would
41 | include: a) recognising the empathetic capacity of others who are non-human, including the empathetic
42 | capacity of the avatar, which is in keeping with our discussion of posthuman subjectivity; and b)
43 | acknowledging that such empathy only works through the network along a complex range of assemblages in
44 | multiple relationships with other actors (in this case avatar-gamer assemblages). We are not suggesting that
45 |
46 |
47 |
48 |
49 |
50 |
51 |
52 |
53 |
54 |
55 |
56 |
57 |
58 |
59 |
60 |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 the avatar is an empathetic subject with the capacity for imagination in and of itself. This capacity only exists
14 intra-actively in relation to other parts of the assemblage, including the player-avatar one. A posthuman
15 empathy would mean recognising that there is no primary subject, but that empathy is always already an
16 interconnected network of dynamically intra-acting/interacting forces, or agencies. This aligns well with
17 traditional concepts of empathy, where empathy can occur viscerally between subjects, while sympathy, for
18 example, might be understood as more one-directional. It is also important to state that whilst empathy might
19 be enhanced, we would disagree with claims that it is only “projected” – this would imply some degree of
20 humanistic, conscious “control” over the empathy that is experienced. A posthuman empathy refutes such
21 anthropocentric understandings, instead considering empathy as an affective, intra-active encounter.

22
23
24
25
26
27
28 The~~But the~~ notion of more than one empathetic subject engenders our first criteria of posthuman
29 empathy. Although research has explored~~focuses on~~ our capacity to empathise with biological others (e.g.
30 Rogers, 1975; Hoffman, 2000; Coplan and Goldie, 2011), our focus here is empathy between the material
31 human-gamer and the pixelated technological~~immaterial~~ avatar. This is a very specific other~~non-human~~ to
32 share an empathetic relationship, and it should be noted that the following arguments are based on the avatar
33 as a characterised, humanoid form – i.e. a “being” with ‘human characteristics, identities, personality traits
34 and personal history’ (Martin, 2013: 318). Therefore, rather than simply viewing the avatar as only a “tool,”
35 we also perceive the avatar as ‘capable of inducing empathy’ (Martin 2013: 318).
36
37
38
39
40

41 As suggested above, our concept of empathy is not complete, fixed or static. Nor would we argue
42 that the empathy we explore in this paper is limited to the avatar-gamer relationship. Context necessarily
43 shapes the cognitive-affective construct of empathy - which we demonstrate with the example of the remote
44 control. The television-remote-human assemblage could be easily understood as an extension of the human
45 hand (in the McLuhan sense). However, a more complicated picture is required if we think of empathy as a
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: English (U.K.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 decentred experience. The electrical current, the batteries in the remote, the sensors on the TV, and so on,
14 would all need considering alongside the human hand, so that all are acting with empathy towards each other
15 for the event (switching on the television) to take place, creating a different cognitive-affective relationship
16 than the one in gameplay. This aligns ~~well~~ with Bennett's (2010) analysis of the vibrant life of matter. Where
17 different materialities have historically been understood as passive in their engagement with the world,
18 Bennett (2010) proposes a vitalism where objects are able "to act": for example, in the above the electricity
19 may blow, preventing that actant from engaging in the empathetic relationship that's needed for the TV to
20 come on. Far from a naive, wholly intentional or conscious agent, objects nevertheless have an ~~ea~~ffect on the
21 world, ~~with both: the human and non-human~~ 'always perform an intricate dance with one another' (Bennett,
22 2010: 31). Considered in this light, a posthuman empathy might include, in the case of gameplay, the
23 gameplayer-neurons assemblage, where 'the response of mirror neurons to the game's audio-visual
24 information activates the player's motor systems, recreating the conditions of the virtual world in the body'
25 (Martin, 2013: 317-318). Our argument isn't that empathy ~~only~~ exists between the avatar and player. ~~Rather,~~
26 ~~an empathetic relation emerges through~~ However, in this paper, we focus specifically on the empathy within
27 ~~and between~~ the avatar-player ~~assemblage~~relationships.

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 In exploring empathy as avatar-player, we take up Sundén's (2012) position of inseparable sameness
39 and fascinated difference, but ~~we~~ view this as a horizontal ~~and interdependent~~ relationship, where both avatar
40 and player coexist. ~~On occasion~~At times, empathy is experienced as complete incorporation. ~~This is seen~~For
41 ~~example, at times~~ in our data ~~when~~ the self/avatar become inseparable, with I/Etyme being used
42 interchangeably. But at other times the "I" makes observations about Etyme, and vice versa. For example, in
43 an equal and opposite way, Etyme responds when the keys are pressed; and yet ~~elsewhere~~at other times she
44 separates from the player by complaining that there's "nothing to target"²² or proclaiming "I'm not ready". In
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: English (U.K.)

total incorporation, we might not find these effects. But if we understand empathy as a posthuman affect, we can read it as distributed, meaning that empathy is no longer a concept to explain “putting ourselves in someone else’s shoes” only to return to the “safety” of our own bodies. Empathy instead demonstrates how humans and non-humans are intertwined permeable through their ability to affect and be affected by circumstances, environments, and feelings (Bennett, 2010). Citing Deleuze, Bennett (2010: 21) suggests that ‘the power of a body to affect other bodies includes a “corresponding and inseparable” capacity to be affected’. Likewise, our understanding of the avatar as active, agentic, and empathic recognises the vibrancy of non-human agency.

We use this concept of posthuman empathy below. In the first section of the analysis, we explore how a posthuman empathy creates moments of embodied experience, which appear to take place almost instinctively. Our second section describes how these empathetic relations are connected to others within the gaming environment. Finally, we suggest that this concept of posthuman empathy can be put to use when understanding the avatar-gamer relationship as a continuum, where the interaction between self and machine is more than incorporation of body and subjectivity. Where Sundén’s (2012) work has shown how the player empathises with another player through the body of the avatar, we aim to take empathy further, through the empathetic relationship that is generated by shared within the avatar-player assemblage.

Empathy as embodied experience

Empathy can be broadly understood as an affective response to what another is experiencing. In gaming this is often an immersive act: the avatar body becomes what we navigate the world through. It is therefore felt not only to be an object of perception, but also a means of perception (Martin, 2013) that involves an empathetic relationship where our eyes, for example, see through the avatar, but where equally the avatar sees through us

Formatted: Level 1

(Clough, 2000). An ~~instance~~example of this would be how the avatar's position in gameplay highlights the potentials in the gameworld landscape that are interactive (e.g. objects, avatars, NPCs) ~~etc.~~ and "sees" the value and prospects that engagement with the interactive elements of the game could provide. Put simply, the player cannot act on or progress in the game without the avatar, but neither can the avatar ~~do so~~ without the player. The visual field is therefore ~~intra-dependent~~interdependent, opening up the complexity and heterogeneity of the perceptual and agential circuits through which posthuman subjectivity is experienced ⁱⁱ. Similarly, when the gaming environment or ~~monsters (known as "mobs")~~ affect the ~~is~~ avatar body, ~~we find our~~ "human" ~~own~~ bodies affected along those channels of feeling: '[a]s any player knows, the rush you get from a good game is not confined to the space of the screen; it is a subrational, bodily thing as well' (Shinkle, 2005: 22).

In our data, ~~for we find evidence for the interdependence of embodied experience. For~~ example, the extract below captures a sense of the interconnectedness of ~~the~~ gamer-avatar's embodied experience. Empathy emerges at the most instinctive of "human" acts: holding your breath underwater.

I'm completing a quest underwater, diving for relics in a deep, wide lake. I'm absorbed in my task, deep beneath the water where the colours and sounds are dulled and I am lulled into that ethereal state of being. Etyme's air supply seems ample – until suddenly it doesn't and I am forced to ascend. I begin to worry when I don't break the surface – I hadn't realised I was so deep. I need to get Etyme to the surface and I find myself holding my own breath, a worried look adorning my face as I watch the air supply dwindle and watch her body rise... I make it, and breathe againⁱⁱⁱ.

⁺We would like to thank the reviewers of this paper for their helpful comments here.

I'm completing a quest underwater, diving for relics in a deep, wide lake. I'm absorbed in my task, deep beneath the water where the colours and sounds are dulled and I am lulled into that ethereal state of being. Etyme's air supply seems ample—until suddenly it doesn't and I am forced to ascend. I begin to worry when I don't break the surface—I hadn't realised I was so deep. I need to get Etyme to the surface and I find myself holding my own breath, a worried look adorning my face as I watch the air supply dwindle and watch her body rise... I make it, and breathe again².

In this extract, the avatar was experienced through a visceral reaction inthrough the body of the gamer. We could make sense of this embodied empathy in two ways. One way we can analyse this form of empathy would be through Blackman's (2012: 82) description of affect as nonconscious mimicry or 'attunement', which is 'not about conscious recognition but about forms of bodily affectivity'. When one human smiles at another, the "instinct" is to smile back; likewise, in gameplay Etyme's experience of being underwater is enacted through mimicry on the body of the gameplayer. The avatar-gamer relationship creates the space to react in ways that are not only imitation, but happen beyond conscious recognition. More than this, the gamer's experience is one of being underwater - *I'm absorbed in my task, deep beneath the water* - while re-emerging similarly engenders a shared avatar-human reaction - *I make it, and breathe again*.

A second way we could explain the complex forms of empathy at play when the avatar-player extend into one another is Coplan's (2011) 'affective matching', which she lists as an essential feature of empathy. In Coplan's (2011: 7) definition, 'this matching must come about in a particular way, namely through other-oriented perspective-taking', where, in her view, this perspective-taking is more than nonconscious mimicry,

²See Wilde, 2015 for more examples of the data.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 so that emotional contagion alone does not constitute empathy. Instead, ‘affective matching occurs only if an
14 observer’s affective states are qualitatively identical to a target’s [...], though they may vary in degree. The
15 observer must therefore experience the same type of emotion (or affect) as the target’ (Coplan, 2011: 6). She
16 continues:
17
18
19

20
21 One of the key differences between emotional contagion and empathy is that contagion is a direct,
22 automatic, unmediated process. Empathy is never fully unmediated since it requires perspective-
23 taking. Roughly, perspective-taking is an imaginative process through which one constructs another
24 person’s subjective experience by simulating the experience of being in the other’s situation (Coplan,
25 2011: 9)
26
27
28
29
30

31 Gameplay empathy, by its nature, is never unmediated. And although the fieldnotes certainly demonstrate
32 instances of emotional contagion, such that there is automatic imitation of one another in the avatar-gamer
33 relationship, we argue that the extract above demonstrates more than this. Holding one’s breath is instinctive;
34 but in this instance there is also concern and panic. In the empathetic intertwining of embodied,
35 affective and cognitive, such fieldnotes demonstrate a reaction to the situation, including recognition of what
36 the consequence of the immediate danger is: for instance, drowning. We expand on how this perspective-
37 taking is facilitated through the game below. In this extract, empathy emerges directly through the mechanics
38 of the game, which produces an embodied reaction in the avatar that directly affects the player.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *I am “disorientated” – this is both a spell that hits me and an actual feeling! The disorientation spell*
46 *forces the person hit with it to run off in the wrong direction, changing suddenly at a tangent, and*
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 *then again, and again. It is a brilliant “spell” for the fact that it is subjectively experienced exactly*
14 *as intended - it is completely disorientating and I’m totally thrown by it, having no idea where I have*
15 *ended up when the spell is over.*
16
17

18
19
20 As we have discussed above, empathy is more than the impulse to repeat, but is a deeply felt perspective-
21 taking that produces affective reactions and extends the feeling of self. In the above, this shared perspective
22 between Poppy and Etyme is enhanced by a sudden change during gameplay.
23

24 The “disorientation spell” creates a seamless experience between player and avatar, whereby one, the
25 avatar, physically reacts to it, and the other, the player, feels it. The account given refutes traditional
26 boundariesany boundary between playerhuman and avatarnon-human and the lines between thephysical
27 reaction and the feeling of disorientation interminglemerge, shaping the holistic experience of the
28 disorientation spell. We could take this analysis even further: while we cannot ever know what Etyme *feels*,
29 this is true of all other human and non-human objects. At the very least, the intra-actioninteraction between
30 avatar and player demonstrates a distributed empathy, whereby the body has the capacity to affect and to be
31 affected, so that both have a vibrancy that deems the relationship between the two horizontal, non-hierarchical
32 and heterogeneous (Bennett, 2010).
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Reading the concept of empathy through Coplan’s (2011) notion of ‘affective matching’ and
40 Blackman’s (2012) nonconscious mimicry, we would argue that the embodiment of gameplay represented by
41 the extracts above is a *post*-biological one: ‘both organic and inorganic, living and non-living, material and
42 immaterial’ (Blackman, 2012: 13-14). This takes gameplay beyond the view of the avatar as a tool.
43
44

45
46
47 *Empathetic connections in pride, skill and achievement*
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: No underline

Formatted: Level 1

I realise I feel really proud of these achievements, like me and Etyme have become a more formidable team, working together and eliminating our foes.

The empathetic relationship, however, goes beyond moments of shock or bodily affect, but is also produced through a cognitive matching. In the note above, distributed cognition experienced by the gamer becomes clear (e.g. “me and Etyme”) and the empathetic direction lines less so. Is the player experiencing empathy for the avatar’s achievement, or vice versa? Just as Boulter (2015: 65) asks, ‘who is playing? Who is *being* played?’, we could ask: “who is achieving? Who is being achieved?”. The sense of achievement is distributed, and the source of either achievement or rightful “ownership” of the achievement is unclear, becoming in “human” terms an example of “good teamwork”.

Therefore, in addition to empathy facilitating the experience of an extended body, the narrative of the game also elicits emotional responses that engender imaginative empathy, especially in the shared experiences of the avatar-human as the two co-develop. Although “imaginative” might suggest these empathetic connections are fictional, we would argue that a posthuman empathy would not require a distinction between the “real” and the “imagined”. The broad field of posthumanism has already identified the problems that occur from creating or enforcing binary positions such as machine/human, real/virtual, man/woman to name but a few, and to consider gaming as an experience outside of “real life” ignores it as a situated, embodied practice.^{iv} In gaming, the emotional reactions that empathy provokes are experientially real, although admittedly with less longevity or consequence than some out-of-game scenarios.

³ Additionally, in the traditional sciences, empathy itself has been shown to make use of the same neuronal pathways, regardless of whether the events are ‘fictional’ or ‘real life’ (Kemp, 2012: xviii), so that the

Formatted: Font: Italic

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 As with our above analysis ~~above~~ of shared embodiment, this imaginative empathy between avatar-
14 player can at first occur as affective embodied reactions to events in ways that demonstrate the
15 interconnections between mind, body and cognition. The extract below retells a moment where Poppy and
16 Etyme experienced something unexpected, which challenges their concept of skill and provokes a desire for
17 retribution.
18
19
20
21

22
23 *I round a corner at one point, climbing a tower, and suddenly encounter a mob which, for one*
24 *reason or another, I wasn't expecting. "Whoa, fuck!" I involuntarily gasp, my heart lurches and I*
25 *quickly scramble to regain equilibrium and kill off the offending mob. It is unlikely that it would*
26 *actually succeed in killing me but there is a particular kind of vengeance I feel towards it for having*
27 *taken me by surprise and I dispatch it quickly - in my mind brutally. It panicked me, disrupting my*
28 *equilibrium and shaking me from my perceived skill and feeling of prowess. I take a moment, and*
29 *vow to be more diligent as I scrutinise the remaining enemies below. I drop down on them from*
30 *above, and unleash my anger in efficient blows.*
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 In the above, we see a similar pattern emerging, where a seamless and nonconscious reaction to the game
38 produces a visceral affective response – “Whoa, fuck!”. In addition, however, there is also an imaginative,
39 emotional engagement with the game, which cannot be reduced to the body alone. Instead cognitive and
40 affective experiences expand ~~our~~ embodied awareness through their different operations (Braidotti, 2013;
41 Hayles, 1999). Here, for example, the avatar-player reaction to this moment of gameplay produces an emotive
42
43
44
45

46 ~~biological body empathetically reacts in chemically similar ways to characters in books and films as it would~~
47 ~~to another material body.~~
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 | reaction, retold ~~here~~ as vengeance, pride and anger. The perception of anger being unleashed in “efficient
14 | blows” seems to indicate a projected empathy from the part of the avatar, responding to the anger of the
15 | player and externalising it through action. Part of these emotions are facilitated by the affordances of
16 | MMORPGs, which enable both player vs. environment and player vs. player gameplay, meaning that the
17 | experiences of the game are in some way mediated by the existence of other avatar or avatar-player bodies.
18 | The further denomination of these “others” as either Alliance or Horde creates a social context through which
19 | various power relations are shaped (Chen, 2009; Williams et al., 2006). ~~Recognition~~ ~~The recognition~~ of the
20 | avatar-~~player~~human self, expressed above as being skilled, having “prowess” and an ability to land “efficient
21 | blows”, means that, like all forms of subjectivity, self-awareness is formed through recognition (and
22 | misrecognition) of the self as separate to others (both human and non-human), thereby imagining these others
23 | to also have self-awareness.

24 | Emotions during gameplay are therefore not asocial or individual, but are ~~entangled~~~~constituted~~
25 | ~~through the interaction~~ with ~~in-game~~ objects ~~in the game~~. For us, the emotional entanglement of avatar-player
26 | has been most evident in fieldnotes collected during player vs. player scenarios and battlegrounds. Emerging
27 | as events that occur when Alliance and Horde factions meet, battlegrounds facilitate empathetic relations to
28 | emerge between avatar-player and other avatar-players, and encourages the feeling that gameplay has a real,
29 | meaningful impact on the environment.

30 | *I enjoy the sense of achievement which I get in battlegrounds, as it makes your proficiency public.*

31 | *It's basically an opportunity to show off, highlighting how much of a performance it is as it serves as*
32 | *an opportunity to display to others how skilful you are, how good you look. You are rewarded by*
33 | *conquering your foes and collecting on the achievement points, ultimately winning the battle. At the*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

end of each battleground the achievements for each player are displayed, further accentuating this public moment of glory - or failure.

There is such a level of pent up excitement on these battlegrounds, and even when you spend much of your time dead (as I do) this is made more obvious through the forced procedure of waiting the allotted amount of time before you can resurrect and get back to the fight. At one point I engage in one-on-one combat with another hunter: we both circle each other slowly, our awareness of the space reduced to that which flows between us and ignoring all of the other players who flow around us. Our ranged attack on each other is interrupted by the end of the battleground.

Above, the first author recounts the emotions of pride, excitement, glory and impatience in gameplay, which are again coupled with affective embodied reactions such the temporal feeling of time passing when waiting to “resurrect”, or in losing spatial awareness and getting lost in the moment. Unlike earlier extracts from the fieldnotes, the narrative retelling often appears without “Etyme”, with both avatar and player becoming “I” and the events within gameplay affecting this “I”. This has already been noted by Hand (2005: 215) as an element of gaming-language that ‘reveals how the multiple dialects – external versus internal, objective versus subjective, active versus passive and so on – are complicated in the worlds of performance and gaming’. Moreover, the former extract also demonstrates the potential emotional payoffs within social interaction. The empathetic connection between avatar-player are so intertwined as to create another form of empathy, where the avatar-player joins into the assemblage ~~other perspective~~ of other avatar-players. We

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 would suggest that in this interaction there is a continuous affective flow, where the avatar-player are not only
14 one posthuman subjectivity, but are actively affective and affecting other objects (including other avatar-
15 players) in their environment, creating a vast network of posthuman subjectivities.
16
17

18
19
20 *Human-non-human permeability*

21 ~~We~~So far we have argued gameplay empathy creates a range of posthuman subjectivities by shaping cognitive
22 and affective extensions of the avatar-player assemblage and emotional perspective-taking with other players.
23
24 The avatar-player subject is integral: they feel together through the body, while the existence of other feeling
25 avatar-players means that this posthuman embodiment is shared, distributed and connected, creating the space
26
27 for emotions such as pride, skill and achievement. We ~~would~~ suggest this is both a conscious and
28
29 nonconscious extension in a human-machine world that has co-evolved (Hayles, 2006), ~~and~~so that the two
30
31 “objects” - avatar and human - ~~are~~become inseparable subjects. In our fieldnotes, this is provoked when
32
33 empathy ~~entwines~~connects one subject ~~with~~to another through the very human fear of death:
34
35

36 *Etyme falls from a great height and I gasp. It is completely involuntary, I am in that moment, her,*
37 *falling, perhaps to her/my death. It is a ridiculous concept because even if Etyme were to die I would*
38 *be fine, and it would take just moments to run my spirit through the graveyard to find her body and*
39 *resurrect. Note the my/her complications. The boundaries are blurred. She is not me but she is not*
40 *not-me. Just as Daboo (2007: 264 and 271) notes as actors create characters who they 'both are-*
41 *and-are-not [...] It is both me-and-not-me at the same time'.*
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: No underline

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 Although the gamer is in no danger, the perceived threat against the avatar is felt empathetically through the
14 holding of a breath, a gasp, a “lurch” in the heart. Such instances demonstrate the displacement blurring of
15 boundaries that occurs in gaming, where gamer-avatar are experienced as enmeshed permeable, because they
16 put into practice the fundamental fear of impermanence. Such experience experiences of permeability allows
17 for a body-subject that operates with and through technical extensions and enables a flow of bodily being,
18 whereby:
19
20
21
22
23

24 The term ‘body’ is usually replaced by the concept of body-subject [...] which displaces a mind-
25 body dualism but does not reduce bodies to material (physiological, neurological, biological)
26 processes. The incorporations enacted by a body-subject include technical, material extensions which
27 articulate the body in new ways. (Blackman, 2012: 9)
28
29
30
31

32 We would take Blackman’s (2012) suggestion of the body-subject further, and would argue that empathy
33 allows for a state that is neither wholly about distributed embodiments nor distributed emotions, but a concept
34 that allows for the dynamic interaction between the two: an ‘ontological inseparability of agentially intra-
35 acting components’ (Barad, 2007: 33). In Poppy’s own self-reflections on gameplay, this dynamic also means
36 that to be *both me-and-not-me* involves something more than becoming Etyme, demonstrating that posthuman
37 subjectivity is not only about living in the body of the machine. Etyme herself is a necessary part of this
38 empathetic relationship. At times, Etyme dying can be experienced as the player dying (or provoking the fear
39 of death); at other times, gameplay can feel like a negotiation (or even struggle) between two separate-but-
40 connected subjects. By refusing the boundary between human and non-human and rethinking this relationship
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 as one which is ~~in a constant state of becoming~~~~constantly in flux~~, we can conceptualise the avatar differently,
14 capable of an affective exchange with the gamer, and creating resonance between avatar and gamer.
15
16

17 18 **Conclusion**

19
20 As suggested, much theoretical work has been ~~carried out with a view~~~~done~~ to ~~describing~~~~understand~~
21 subjectivity as ~~variously~~–“posthuman” ~~through the relation of the human to, variously, the animal, the~~
22 ~~machine or the environment~~. In this paper, we specifically considered one example of posthuman subjectivity
23 engendered by the ~~non-human~~, techno-informational aspects in the game world. Whilst the incorporation of
24 machinic elements are not always necessary to posthuman subjectivity ~~and other domains of experience could~~
25 ~~also be defined as posthuman~~, we have nevertheless used this example to illuminate the ways in which an
26 ~~intra-dependence~~~~interdependence~~ between ~~traditionally separate~~~~human and non-human~~ elements can form a
27 non-hierarchical assemblage.
28
29
30
31
32

33 Our deployment of empathy, we would argue, also moves concepts of posthuman subjectivity
34 beyond an account of what the subject is, and allows us to provide a methodological framework from which
35 to provide an empirical analysis of posthuman ~~intra-active~~ subjectivity. Our concept of a posthuman empathy
36 is decentralized: it is not “owned” by either player or avatar/game ~~but rather emerges out of their relation in~~
37 ~~the process of playing the game~~. We have explored how the empathetic relationship between avatar-player
38 actively ~~makes problematic~~~~blurs~~ any clear distinctions between human and machine. We have deployed the
39 use of empathy in a more fluid understanding of the experience, expanding the concept ~~of empathy~~ to include
40 an acknowledgement of the empathetic capacity of ~~the avatar~~~~non-human elements~~ in an assemblage and a
41 rhizomatic understanding of the different agencies at play. Our “posthuman empathy” blends the principles of
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

posthumanism (e.g. in a post-anthropocentric acknowledgement of the permeability of beings) with the principles of empathy (e.g. a dynamic interaction of cognitive and affective responses).

In this respect, the idea of “the posthuman” does not need to elicit fear of the change in “the human”, but rather celebrates the prevalence of the emotional, embodied and permeable throughout different contexts. For example, in our analysis, the relationship between Poppy and Etyme is one of care, concern and connection, despite the avatar’s ~~pixelated, technological~~ ~~immaterial~~ form. Such avatar-human relationships are testament to the deep intra-connections between human and machine. Our empathetic relationship with the avatar is indicative of the very real experience of being (always already) connected ~~connecting~~ with ~~non-human~~ others, in ways that do not fight for dominance of human over machine but accept the equality of both player and avatar: a principle central to posthuman ethics (e.g. Braidotti, 2013; Bennett, 2010). What emerges is ‘a more relational ontology that explores how entities emerge from intra-actions consisting of human and non-human agencies’ (Blackman, 2012: 174).

The shifting flows between self and other are complex yet easily apparent in the fieldnotes – for example in the switches between “I”, “we” and “Etyme”. The relationship is a continuous ~~constant~~ negotiation between the avatar and player, as the desires of one cannot be achieved without the actions of another, so that each part must be receptive to the goals of the other. This empathy is further facilitated by the game mechanics which constantly seek to bring the avatar and player together and allow a spectrum of feelings to proliferate, demonstrated above through feelings from disorientation to pride. Connecting with the avatar demands an emotional and embodied connection in order to succeed at the game, and using empathy we have been able to acknowledge these particular moments in order to demonstrate the intra-dependence ~~interdependence~~ at the centre of avatar-gamer relationships.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Empathy has therefore been used as one analytic for how posthuman subjectivity has arisen from/out of the relationship between the player and avatar in *World of Warcraft*. We have demonstrated how empathy helps to conceptualise the connection between a human and non-human other, in a way that shares perspectives and bodies along channels of affective feeling. The experience is one that shows how undeniably fuses human and machine are undeniably fused, retaining emotional and embodied feelings in a permeable way. As such we have shown how “being posthuman” is as complex as being “human” ever was.

Notes

ⁱ We take inspiration from Barad’s (2007: 33) concept, where ‘in contrast to the usual “interaction,” which assumes that there are separate individual agencies that precede their interaction, the notion of intra-action recognizes that distinct agencies do not precede, but rather emerge through, their intra-action’.

ⁱⁱ We would like to thank the reviewers of this paper for their helpful comments here.

ⁱⁱⁱ See Wilde, 2015 for more examples of the data.

^{iv} Additionally, in the traditional sciences, empathy itself has been shown to make use of the same neuronal pathways, regardless of whether the events are ‘fictional’ or ‘real life’ (Kemp, 2012: xviii), so that the biological body empathetically reacts in chemically similar ways to characters in books and films as it would to another material body.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Professor Gary Hall for his helpful comments on a version of this paper.

References

Formatted: Level 1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Banks J (2015) Object, Me, Symbiote, Other: A social typology of player-avatar relationships. *First Monday*,

20(2), available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.5210/fm.v20i2.5433>.

Barad K (2007) *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. London: Duke University Press.

Belman J and Flanagan M (2010) Designing Games to Foster Empathy. *Cognitive Technology* 14(2): 5-15.

Bennett J (2010) *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. London: Duke University Press.

Blackman L (2012) *Immaterial Bodies: Affect, Embodiment, Mediation*. London: Sage.

Boulter J (2015) *Parables of the Posthuman: Digital Realities, Gaming, and the Player Experience*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Braidotti R (2013) *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Broadhurst S (2012) Digital Practices: New Writings of the Body. In: Broadhurst S and Machon J (eds) *Sensualities/Textualities and Technologies*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.9-22.

Cairns P, Cox A and Nordin I (2004) Immersion in Digital Games: a Review of Gaming Experience Research. In: Angelides MC and Agius H (eds) *Handbook of Digital Games*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Chen MG (2009) Communication, Coordination, and Camaraderie in World of Warcraft. *Games and Culture* 4(1): 47-73.

Clough P (2000) *Autoaffection: Unconscious Thought in the Age of Teletechnology*. London: University of Minnesota Press.

Coplan A (2011) Understanding Empathy: Its Features and Effects. In Coplan A and Goldie P (eds) *Empathy: Philosophical and Psychological Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.3-18.

Formatted: No underline

Formatted: Underline

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 Coplan A and Goldie P (eds) (2011) *Empathy: Philosophical and Psychological Perspectives*. Oxford:
14 Oxford University Press.
- 15
16 Crick T (2011) The Game Body: Toward a Phenomenology of Contemporary Video Gaming. *Games and*
17 *Culture* 6(3): 259-269.
- 18
19 Crogan P and Kennedy H (2009) Technologies Between Games and Culture. *Games and Culture* 4(2): 107-
20 114.
- 21
22 Daboo J (2007) Michael Chekhov and the embodied imagination: Higher self and non-self. *Studies in Theatre*
23 *and Performance* 27(3): 261-273.
- 24
25 Davies CA (1999) *Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others*. London: Routledge.
- 26
27 Ellis C, Adams TE and Bochner AP (2010) Autoethnography: An Overview. *Forum: Qualitative Social*
28 *Research* [online] 12 (1) available online at [http://www.qualitative-](http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095)
29 [research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095](http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095).
- 30
31 Farrow R and Iacovides I (2012) 'In the game'? Embodied subjectivity in gaming environments. In: *6th*
32 *International Conference on the Philosophy of Computer Games: the Nature of Player Experience*,
33 Madrid, Spain, 29-31 January 2012. Available online at [http://oro.open.ac.uk/33357/1/82-Farrow-](http://oro.open.ac.uk/33357/1/82-Farrow-Iacovides_FINAL.pdf)
34 [Iacovides_FINAL.pdf](http://oro.open.ac.uk/33357/1/82-Farrow-Iacovides_FINAL.pdf).
- 35
36 Ferreday D (2009) *Online Belongings: Fantasy, Affect and Web Communities*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- 37
38 Filiciak M (2003) Hyperidentities. In: Wolf M and Perron B (eds) *The Video Game Theory Reader*. London:
39 Routledge, pp.87-102.
- 40
41 *Games and Culture* 4(2): 107-114.
- 42
43 Gee JP (2008) Video Games and Embodiment. *Games and Culture* 3(3-4): 253-263.
- 44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 Hand R (2005) Theatre of Interactivity: Video Games in the Drama Studio. In: Garrelts N (ed) *Digital*
14 *Gameplay*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, pp.208-220.
15
16 Haraway D (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Oxon: Routledge.
17
18 Hayles NK (1999) *How We Became Posthuman*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
19
20 Hayles NK (2006) Unfinished Work: From Cyborg to Cognisphere. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23(7-8): 159-
21 166.
22
23 Herbrechter S (2013) *Posthumanism: A Critical Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury.
24
25 Hillis K (1999) *Digital Sensations: space, identity, and embodiment in virtual reality*. Minneapolis:
26 University of Minnesota Press.
27
28 Hoffman ML (2000) *Empathy and Moral Development: Implications for Caring and Justice*. Cambridge:
29 Cambridge University Press.
30
31 Karatzogianni A and Kuntsman A (eds) (2012) *Digital Cultures and the Politics of Emotion: Feelings, Affect*
32 *and Technological Change*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
33
34 Kemp R (2012) *Embodied Acting: What neuroscience tells us about performance*. London: Routledge.
35
36 Lahti M (2003) As We Become Machines Corporealized Pleasures in Video Games. In: Wolf M and Perron B
37 (eds) *The Video Game Theory Reader*. London: Routledge, pp.157-170.
38
39 Martin P (2013) Embodiment in skateboarding videogames. *International Journal of Performance Arts and*
40 *Digital Media* 9(2): 315–327.
41
42 McCarthy A. (2001) *Ambient Television: Visual Culture and Public Space*. Duke University Press.
43
44 O’Riordan K (2001) Playing with Lara in virtual space. In: Munt S (ed) *Technospaces - Inside the New*
45 *Media. Critical Research in Material Culture*. London: Continuum, pp.224-238.
46
47 Plant S (1997) *Zeros + Ones: Digital Women and the New Technoculture*. London: Fourth Estate.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 Rogers CR (1975) Empathic: An Unappreciated Way of Being. *The Counseling Psychologist* 5(2): 2-10.
- 14 Shinkle E (2005) Corporealis ergo sum: affective response in digital games. In: Garrelts N (ed) *Digital*
15 *gameplay: essays on the nexus of game and gamer*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, pp.21-35.
- 16
17 Shinkle E (2012) Videogames and the Technological Sublime. In: Karatzogianni A and Kuntsman A (eds)
18 *Digital Cultures and the Politics of Emotion: Feelings, Affect and Technological Change*. Hampshire:
19 Palgrave Macmillan, pp.94-108.
- 20
21
22 Simon B (2006) Beyond Cyberspatial Flaneurie: On the Analytic Potential of Living With Digital Games.
23 *Games and Culture* 1(1): 62-67.
- 24
25 Smethurst T (2015) *Playing with Trauma in Video Games: Interreactivity, Empathy, Perpetration*. PhD
26 Thesis, Ghent University, Belgium.
- 27
28 Sundén J (2012) Desires at Play: On Closeness and Epistemological Uncertainty. *Games and Culture* 7(2):
29 164-184.
- 30
31 Taylor TL (2006) *Play Between Worlds: Exploring Online Game Culture*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- 32
33 Taylor TL (2009) The Assemblage of Play. *Games and Culture* 4(4): 331-339.
- 34
35 Thrift N (2008) *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. London: Routledge.
- 36
37 Toffoletti K (2007) *Cyborgs and Barbie Dolls: Feminism, Popular Culture and the Posthuman Body*.
38 London: I B Tauris & Co Ltd.
- 39
40 Tronstad R (2011) Character Identification in World of Warcraft: The Relationship Between Capacity and
41 Appearance. In: Corneliussen HG and Walker Rettberg J (eds) *Digital Culture, Play, and Identity: A*
42 *World of Warcraft Reader*. London: MIT Press, pp.249-263.
- 43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 Tufekci Z (2012) We Were Always Human. In: Whitehead NL and Wesch M (eds) *Human No More: Digital*
14 *Subjectivities, Unhuman Subjects, and the End of Anthropology*. Boulder: University Press of
15 Colorado, pp:33-47.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Turkle S (2011) *Alone Together: Why We Expect More From Technology and Less From Each Other*. New York: Basic Books.
- Van Maanen J (1988) *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilde P (2015) The Empathic Gamer. In Wain V and Pimomo P (eds) *Encountering Empathy: Interrogating the Past, Envisioning the Future* [ebook]. Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press, pp:139-149.
- Williams D, Ducheneaut N, Xiong L, Zhang Y, Yee N and Nickell E (2006) From Tree House to Barracks: The Social Life of Guilds in World of Warcraft. *Games and Culture* 1(4): 338-361.