

THE “GAMING SOCIETY” BETWEEN HOMOLOGATION AND DIVERSITY: TRENDS, EVOLUTIONS, PERSPECTIVES AND CRITICAL ASPECTS OF THE FRAGMENTED SELF IN ORGANIZED AND HYPERLINKED RELATIONS

Giuseppe Modarelli, University of Turin

INTRODUCTION

The famous sociologist and educator Durkheim & Fauconnet (1922) asserted that adaptation to the society in which we live necessarily derives from the educational contribution inherent in education and the social context of relationship. Therefore, the “*self in the individual case*”, through the educational contribution, must be transformed into the “*self in relation*”. In this regard, the organizational perspective of interest to scholars in the field underlies the human relationship as an interacting social case. The complete and profitable realization of the individual self, also with reference to Maslow (1943) pyramid of needs passes through the dynamics of the relationship. For which the transformation of the self as a social individual, considered in Aristorelian terms, does not involve a limitation of the individual extension (Belk, 1988), but a requalification, a readjustment and a fundamental explanation of the self as an individual towards a full exaltation of the uniquely “*social animal*” and organizationally integrated that is man. If education must tend towards human fulfillment, most of the dynamics in this area must take into account the “*game*” perspective (Obikwelu, & Read, 2012; Rosario & Widmeyer, 2009; Saurugger, 2013; Harkness, 2009) as a constructive paradigm (Cobern, 1993; Laroche et al., 1998) of the evolving self (Yost et al., 1992).

More and more society is subject and subjected to game as a dynamic of leisure (Bryce, 2001).

On the one hand it could generate benefits Kiryakova et al. (2014); Nah et al. (2014); Dicheva et al. (2015), on the contrary it provides innumerable negative effects (Toda et al., 2017). Therefore, it could be said that the gamification process Hamari et al. (2023); Seaborn & Fels (2015) involves the whole person both in the private individual and in the social sphere.

The game that accompanies man from birth is the basis of the activist learning dynamics Dewey (1986) on the construction of the self in evolutionary progression. The game as entertainment (Bryce, 2001), as a philosophy Nguyen (2017), as a method (Noemí & Máximo, 2014; Amory & Seagram, 2003) and as a dimension in which humanity is grafted, plays a pervasive role (Davies, 2016). In current society, the game while on the one hand serves to identify the parameters of the self, on the other hand deconstructs them, pulverizing their basic assumptions and behaviors (with the help of new disruptive technologies, such as smartphones, avatars, metaverses, etc.) Bresciani (2016); Kostoff et al. (2004), triggering extremely bidirectionally interacting effects, between the personal and the extensive virtual dimension. In this new two-way reality the self goes hand in hand between factual and virtual, sometimes reconstituting and integrating the first, sometimes depriving it of its nature in favor of the latter, depriving it of its effective connotations. The game, in the transposition of reality into a different parallel mediated and reproduced dimension, recontextualizes the self in relation to digital networks, in which man is inevitably inserted through his multiple actions both for leisure and work. These connections, these networks, do nothing but redefine the boundary of an already well-established immaterial reality that is increasingly based on the altered extension of the self (Belk, 2013).

The existing paradox between material and virtual reality (Yoh, 2001), such that each individual would be more present to himself when is projected into virtual reality (in which he spends most of his time) Winn & Heeter (2009), it would find new and regenerative meanings if brought back to proactive and healing perspectives of the fractures that the digital world itself produces in terms of divide (Cullen, 2001). If the society of hyperconnection is also that of separation (Brubaker, 2020) in which the tangible dimension is in relation to the infinite intangible dimensions in which the multiple ramifications created by the self in virtual reality and grafted into the networks in which one is digitally immersed are declined, the gamification trend must necessarily be managed appropriately and proactively towards holistic human well-being. The organizations in which people work, as dimensions of self-realization and extension of the self, as network microcosms of socially organized life, are to be considered key points of reference in the relational sphere. The working spaces could alternatively be defined as vital environments for the complete manifestation of the individual self in relation. From an ecological point of view (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), the environment would appear to be a force of influence on the person. Therefore, among the drivers relating to the well-being of the individual, the following must necessarily be brought back: inclusiveness and the management of diversity. The game in these terms would become a key mediator for establishing inclusive perspectives in work environments, but not only, in organizations of all kinds and in learning dynamics, properly useful for considering the person as a whole and in all operating conditions (World Health Organization, 2007). According to what has been made explicit since the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005), individual well-being, and consequently group relational well-being, begins with inclusive actions and mechanisms, as well as respectful of diversity as a value (Hunt et al., 2018; Alger, 1997). In this sense, not only disability or the atavistic labels of race, religion, language, etc., but also different intelligences (Gardner, 1993) become critical determinants of success and failure in structuring one or more work environments, in order to consider a culture linked to the inclusion and holistic promotion of diversity as a value, of social responsibility within the company, undoubtedly projected outwards, not only for cosmetic purposes.

In the contemporary world, it is necessary to recognize that the dynamics of society are constantly evolving, in response to various influencing factors, including networks and virtual immersive experiences, which in fact simulate reality as a game, do nothing but identify and align the human dimension more and more to that of a player, who while on the one hand proposes an escape from the tangible world, on the other hand creates infinite others in which to simulate and conceal more or less plausible situations, through which diversity is not only accepted, but reported as a positive contribution.

This editorial contribution opens the special edition of the journal for this number with the intention of placing the accent and focusing the attention of scholars, but also practitioners in the organizational and managerial area, in relation to the potential of valorizing the "*different*" in a society tending to homologation, which unites and divides at the same time, which makes human action concrete by pragmatizing it and virtualizes its explications by dissolving its concrete relational links.

Only a paradigm shift towards the self-realizing vision of the self in relation, which the dynamics of the game provides, can diametrically reverse the trend of social isolation, emerging opportunisms, relational conflicts in the fragmentation and disintegration of the essence of a society that can no longer to communicate, albeit hyper communicating, in which the role of technologies must necessarily be elevated to the rank of a healing tool and facilitator, not of offense, nor merely of performance.

The author suggests to approach the theme by a constructive-criticism toward the problems inherent the hyper connection, the networked society and the liquidity consequences of its relations concerning.

Re-shaping the constructs of human dimension based on the self-representation and affirmation should be a great solution for the well-being at work, considering the game under its double-swords potential, the one beneficial and the other lethal. A needed reflection is due by the community of Academics in the field for highlighting the way for a sustainable inclusive society able to sustain diversity as a value.

REFERENCES

- Alger, J.R. (1997). The educational value of diversity. *Academe*, 83(1), 20-23.
- Amory, A., & Seagram, R. (2003). Educational game models: conceptualization and evaluation: the practice of higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 17(2), 206-217.
- Belk, R.W. (2013). Extended self in a digital world. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(3), 477-500.
- Belk, R.W. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(2), 139-168.
- Bresciani, S. (2016). *Le innovazioni dirimpenti*. G Giappichelli Editore.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard university press.
- Brubaker, R. (2020). Digital hyperconnectivity and the self. *Theory and Society*, 49, 771-801.
- Bryce, J. (2001). The technological transformation of leisure. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19(1), 7-16.
- Cobern, W.W. (1993). Constructivism. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 4(1), 105-112.
- Cullen, R. (2001). Addressing the digital divide. *Online Information Review*, 25(5), 311-320.
- Davies, H. (2016). *The Growing Pervasiveness of Games and Play*. In Digital Games Research Association (DiGRA) Australia Queensland Symposium.
- Dewey, J. (1986). *Experience and education*. In The educational forum, 50, (3), 241-252.
- Dicheva, D., Dichev, C., Agre, G., & Angelova, G. (2015). Gamification in education: A systematic mapping study. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 18(3), 75-88.
- Durkheim, E., & Fauconnet, P. (1922). *Education and Sociology*. Presses Universitaires de France-(PUF).
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. Basic books.
- Hamari, J., Xi, N., Legaki, Z., & Morschheuser, B. (2023). *Gamification*. In Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.
- Harkness, S.S. (2009). Social constructivism and the believing game: A mathematics teacher's practice and its implications. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 70, 243-258.
- Hunt, V., Layton, D., & Prince, S. (2015). *Diversity matters*. McKinsey & Company, 1(1), 15.
- Kiryakova, G., Angelova, N., & Yordanova, L. (2014). *Gamification in Education*. In Proceedings of 9th international Balkan education and science conference, 1, 679-684.
- Kostoff, R.N., Boylan, R., & Simons, G.R. (2004). Disruptive technology roadmaps. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 71(1-2), 141-159.
- Larochelle, M., Bednarz, N., Garrison, J., & Garrison, J.W. (1998). *Constructivism and Education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*. 50 (4).
- Millennium ecosystem assessment, M.E.A. (2005). *Ecosystems and Human Well-being*, 5, 563-563.
- Nah, F.F.H., Zeng, Q., Telaprolu, V.R., Ayyappa, A.P., & Eschenbrenner, B. (2014). *Gamification of education: a review of literature*.
- Nguyen, C.T. (2017). *Philosophy of games*. Philosophy Compass, 12(8), e12426.
- Noemí, P.M., & Máximo, S.H. (2014). Educational games for learning. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 2(3), 230-238.
- Obikwelu, C., & Read, J.C. (2012). The serious game constructivist framework for children's learning. *Procedia Computer Science*, 15, 32-37.
- Rosario, R.A., & Widmeyer, G.R. (2009). An exploratory review of design principles in constructivist gaming learning environments. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 20(3), 289.
- Saurugger, S. (2013). Constructivism and public policy approaches in the EU: from ideas to power games. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20(6), 888-906.
- Seaborn, K., & Fels, D.I. (2015). Gamification in theory and action: A survey. *International Journal of human-computer studies*, 74, 14-31.
- Toda, A.M., Valle, P.H., & Isotani, S. (2017). *The dark side of gamification: An overview of negative effects of gamification in education*. In Researcher links workshop: higher education for all 143-156.
- Winn, J., & Heeter, C. (2009). Gaming, gender, and time: Who makes time to play?. *Sex roles*, 61, 1-13.
- World Health Organization. (2007). *International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health: Children & Youth Version: ICF-CY*. World Health Organization.

- Yoh, M.S. (2001). *The reality of virtual reality*. In Proceedings seventh international conference on virtual systems and multimedia, 666-674.
- Yost, J.H., Strube, M.J., & Bailey, J.R. (1992). The construction of the self: An evolutionary view. *Current Psychology*, 11, 110-121.

Received: 01-June-2023, Manuscript No. JOCCC-23-13747; **Editor assigned:** 05-June -2023, Pre QC No. JOCCC-23-13747(PQ); **Reviewed:** 19-June-2023, QC No. JOCCC-23-13747; **Published:** 26-June-2023