Routledge Studies in Affective Societies

1 **Affect in Relation**
Families, Places, Technologies
Edited by Birgitt Röttger-Rössler and Jan Slaby

Affect in Relation

Families, Places, Technologies

Edited by Birgitt Röttger-Rössler and Jan Slaby

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2018 selection and editorial matter, Birgitt Röttger-Rössler and Jan Slaby; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Birgitt Röttger-Rössler and Jan Slaby to be identified as the authors of the editorial matter, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-1-138-05905-4 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-315-16386-4 (ebk)

Typeset in Baskerville
by Wearset Ltd, Boldon, Tyne and Wear

MIX
Paper from responsible sources
FSC® C013056

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

Contents

List of illustrations vii
Notes on contributors viii
Foreword xii
Acknowledgments xvi

1 Introduction: affect in relation 1
JAN SLABY AND BIRGITT RÖTTGER-RÖSSLER

PART I
Affective families 29

2 Ageing kin, proximity and distance: translocal relatedness as affective practice and movement 31
MARUŠKA SVAŠEK

3 *Education sentimentale* in migrant students' university trajectories: family, and other significant relations 50
JOANNA PFAFF-CZARNECKA

4 Germans with parents from Vietnam: the affective dimensions of parent–child relations in Vietnamese Berlin 72
BIRGITT RÖTTGER-RÖSSLER AND ANH THU ANNE LAM

PART II
Affect and place 91

5 Spatialities of belonging: affective place-making among diasporic neo-Pentecostal and Sufi groups in Berlin's cityscape 93
HANSJÖRG DILGER, OMAR KASMANI AND DOMINIK MATTES

6 "Midān Moments": conceptualizing space, affect and political participation on occupied squares 115
BILGIN AYATA AND CILJA HARDERS

7 Muslim domesticities: home invasions and affective identification 134
GILBERT CALUYA

PART III
Affect at work 153

8 Immersion at work: affect and power in post-Fordist work cultures 155
RAINER MÜHLHOFF AND JAN SLABY

9 Managing community: coworking, hospitality and the future of work 175
MELISSA GREGG AND THOMAS LODATO

10 Automation and affect: a study of algorithmic trading 197
ROBERT SEYFERT

PART IV
Affect and media 219

11 Affect and mediation 221
LISA BLACKMAN

12 Intensive bondage 241
MARIE-LUISE ANGERER

13 Beyond Turkish-German cinema: affective experience and generic relationality 259
NAZLI KILERCI AND HAUKE LEHMANN

Index 281

Illustrations

Figures

5.1 Spatial distribution of Sufi centers (circles) and Pentecostal churches (diamonds) in Berlin (2016) 98
5.2 Followers assist in dismantling the interior of the *tekke*-mosque in Neukölln (Berlin, 2016) 100
5.3 Worshipping members of Deeper Life in Lagos are projected on a screen during the Sunday service of their fellow congregants in Berlin 104
13.1 The face as a catalyst for affective transformation 266
13.2 Hotel room as stage/video image, Şenay 267
13.3 Hotel room as stage/video image, Zeki 267
13.4 Inscribing the gang's reign over the streets 271
13.5 The law of the everyday 272
13.6 The car as psychic interior, separated from the outside 272
13.7 Disintegration as haptic visuality 275
13.8 From undead … 276
13.9 … to action hero 276

Table

2.1 Interviewee groups 46

Acknowledgments

In April 2016 the newly established, Berlin-based Collaborative Research Center *Affective Societies. Dynamics of Social Coexistence in Mobile Worlds* held its first international conference, titled *Affective Relationality*. The present book grew out of the papers and discussions produced from this conference. It is the first volume of the new Routledge book series *Affective Societies*, designed to publish studies on the affective dynamics unfolding in the complex, networked societies of the 21st century, which emerge from this interdisciplinary research group and related projects. The conference was funded by the German Research Council (DFG) and organized by the two editors of this volume.

To realize the conference and complete this book we relied upon the support and collaboration of many individuals. First, we thank all the authors contributing to this volume for their excellent work and their willingness to respond to our many editorial requests. We also want to thank all the conference participants for their stimulating presentations and inputs to the discussions. We owe enormous gratitude to the helping hands behind scene, especially to Katharina Metz, the Managing Director of our Collaborative Research Center, for solving manifold organizational problems and for helping to make the first conference of our initiative such a success. As regards the present volume, we are immensely grateful to Marie Wuth for her excellent assistance in proofreading and formatting matters – tedious work that she did patiently and with great precision. We also thank Friederike Ruge, Christian von Scheve and Rainer Mühlhoff for their help along the way. Moreover, we thank Routledge's Elena Chiu and Emily Briggs for their friendly and competent support through the production of this book; and Alison Shakspeare for her excellent copy editing. Last but not least, we want to express our gratitude to all fellow researchers at the CRC *Affective Societies*: it was mainly through the challenging discussions with them that this volume achieved its final shape. Working within this team of enthusiastic and highly committed researchers is a wonderful and encouraging experience.

Berlin, December 2017
Birgitt Röttger-Rössler and Jan Slaby

1 Introduction

Affect in relation

Jan Slaby and Birgitt Röttger-Rössler

The promise of affect

Since the mid-1990s, the study of affect has emerged as a key area of transdisciplinary research and scholarship across the humanities, the social sciences and cultural studies. Early on in this movement, much was made of imports from neuroscience, psychological research, evolutionary anthropology and other behavioral disciplines, so that some critics even conflated the entire movement of the "turn to affect" with an attempted biologization of the humanities and cultural studies (Papoulias and Callard 2010; Leys 2011). However, in recent years the excitement about bio-scientific leanings has noticeably waned within cultural inquiry. Today, affect studies are known more for their careful probing into subtle layers of human experience, for their work on modes of belonging and forms of attachment, or on the dynamics of everyday practices and on the affective workings of old and new media. Likewise, scholars of affect investigate novel forms of governance, developments in politics such as the recent surge of right-wing populism and the maintenance of oppressive structures through the workings of apparatuses, arrangements or institutional settings. As a generic domain of inquiry, the field of affect studies has turned out to be more complex, more dynamic and more ambivalent than its early critics had assumed. No definition or articulation has exhausted the range of affective phenomena covered by the turn to affect. No single discipline or cluster of disciplines – for instance, the psy-complex or the social sciences – can lay claim to monopolizing the affective realm.

There is one particular strand of inquiry – predominantly in cultural studies, media theory and anthropology – that does rally around what we call here the "promise" of affect. This is the conviction that affect epitomizes a dimension of meaning in human affairs that is not a matter of established discourse, of stable identities, institutions, codified cultural norms or categories, but is rather something that is lived, from moment to moment, at a level of sensuous bodily reality beyond codification, consolidation or "capture". Affect, from this perspective, incessantly transgresses individual perspectives and frames of reference (notably the perspective

of the "autonomous subject" of the liberalist tradition). Affect is what unfolds "in-between" – in between interacting agents, in between actors and elements in communal everyday practices, within processes of transmission, be they medial, symbolic or aural, and in the involvement, absorption or immersion when the boundaries of the self become porous (or when they have not even been properly drawn to begin with). While it is impossible to grasp this sensuous immediacy directly, proponents of affect studies undertake it to cultivate a sensitivity for these fleeting moments, these shimmers, these stirrings of the nascent, the not-yet formed, the pre-reflective, the nuanced presences prior to reflection and articulation (cf. Gregg and Seigworth 2010). Such a sensitivity deviates from established methodological canons and, occasionally, from the strictures of theory. Practitioners of this strand of affect studies are accordingly inclined to explore poetic and personal styles, toy with allegiances to the arts, experiment with unusual modes of articulation and presentation (e.g., Stewart 2007; Cvetkovitch 2012). This has led some critics to question the intellectual potency and scholarly credentials of affect studies (Brinkema 2014; Leys 2011; Lutz 2017; Martin 2013; Wetherell 2012) and its political feasibility (Hemmings 2005). Others, however, see in it a much-needed response to the current conjuncture and a timely continuation, under different historical and political conditions, of earlier critical projects of cultural articulation (such as those of Walter Benjamin, Roland Barthes, Henri Lefebvre, Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall among others; cf. Gregg 2006).[1] Moreover, powerful approaches to affect within feminism and critical race theory (e.g., Ahmed 2010; Berlant 2012; Berg and Ramos-Zayas 2015; Butler 2009; Ngai 2005) aptly illustrate the political potency and critical impact of the turn to affect. While problematic issues remain and the debate is very much ongoing (e.g., Palmer 2017), the outlook for affect studies is better – more plural, more critically vigorous, more versatile in style and range – than most of its critics assume.

Our aim in compiling the present volume is to stay tuned to this inventive and engaged strand of affect studies while working towards a more systematic and theoretically coherent perspective on affect. We are convinced that the motivating insights of the "turn to affect" can be preserved and developed further in the form of a conceptually and methodologically more elaborated perspective. In particular, our focus is on the role "relational affect" plays in processes of subject formation. This is what our book's title, *Affect in Relation*, is driving at. This volume brings together perspectives from social science and cultural studies in order to analyze the formative, subject constituting potentials of affect. We understand affect not as processes "within" a person, but as social-relational dynamics unfolding in situated practices and social interaction. Affect is *formative* of human subjects as it binds them into shared environmental (e.g., social, material and technological) constellations, which in turn shape modalities of agency, habit and self-understanding. Such situated

affective comportments coalesce into characteristic subject positions which are addressed, policed, nudged and reckoned with as part of the practices of paramount institutions and social domains. In turn, relational affect, while it is a key formative and consolidating factor for both individuals and collectives, might provide crucial hints to processes of transformation, as affective stirrings may signal changes in institutional routines, in styles of interaction, in habits and practices, and thus indicate the dynamic transition from one given social and cultural formation to another. Relational affect, as we understand it here, is both *formative of* and *transformative for* individual subjects and for the practices, institutions, life worlds and social collectives they are engaged with and enmeshed in.

The volume aims to sharpen a transdisciplinary and cross-methodological understanding of affective relationality. It combines empirical case studies and theoretical contributions from social and cultural anthropology, sociology, cultural geography, culture and media studies and related fields. Expert authors from these disciplines have joined forces to articulate the conceptual framework of affect studies and showcase the field's potential for exemplary domains, opening up avenues for co-operation. In this introduction, we hint at several theoretical developments that led to our understanding of relational affect and its role in subject formation, and we sketch a number of working concepts that helped to consolidate our transdisciplinary perspective. We then introduce the four thematic sections of the book, the separate chapters and the various interrelations.

Affect in relation: idea and theoretical background

The motivating idea of this volume is that affect is best understood as dynamic, intensive relations that unfold between human actors, in and with complex environmental settings, material formations, (urban) landscapes and designed spaces, various artifacts, technologies and media. This marks a significant break from the individualist approaches that are predominant, for example, in the psy-disciplines, while strengthening the lines of thought that view the human psyche less in individual and more in social, relational and political terms. In this section, we contextualize our theoretical starting point by relating it to a number of accounts that inform it. In recent years, several lines of work on affect and emotions have converged on a situated, dynamic and interactive view of affect critical of individualism, mentalism and biological reductionism. We chart some of these proposals in the present section, before we sketch several working concepts that provide a clearer grasp of the main thrust of our perspective.

A first important point of contact between our working understanding of relational affect and the existing literature lies within recent accounts of situated, social-relational, enactive, embedded or even "extended" accounts of affectivity. A good place to start is the influential text

"Emotions in the Wild" by the philosophers Paul E Griffiths and Andrea Scarantino (2009). In programmatic fashion, Griffiths and Scarantino align emotion theory with work on "situated cognition," disconnecting from assumptions of psychological internalism similar to that of other authors in the area of cognition (e.g., Edwin Hutchins' seminal "Cognition in the Wild" [1995]). Instead of psychic interiority and "inner machinery," Griffiths and Scarantino stress social relationality, skillful engagement with the world, and the dynamic coupling of emoting organism and environment, linking their proposal with work in social psychology that emphasizes similar features (e.g., Parkinson, Fischer, and Manstead 2005). We share the interdisciplinary spirit of this paper and of the debates it ignited. However, we want to expand the scope of these perspectives further by taking up ideas and concepts from cultural studies and related disciplines in the humanities.

Additional important groundwork comes from the intersection of phenomenology and cognitive science, where there is a focus on the enactive embeddedness of sense-making organisms in their environment (Thompson and Stapleton 2009; Froese and Fuchs 2012), and on embodied interaction and corporeal "interaffectivity" (Fuchs and Koch 2014). These lines of work have informed efforts to radicalize the philosophical understanding of situated affectivity into accounts of "extended emotions," where the token emotional state is said to *constitutively* involve parts of the emoter's environment (Slaby 2014; Stephan, Wilutzky, and Walter 2014; Krueger and Szanto 2016). So far, however, not much exchange has taken place between this work and the highly productive scholarship on affect within cultural studies.

To get a sense of how these philosophical approaches might resonate with work belonging to the "turn to affect," some clarification is called-for on the understanding of affect and on affective relationality in these strands of scholarship – usually from cultural studies and related fields. Most of these approaches assume a version of a dynamic, non-categorical and relational understanding of affect that aligns with the philosophical tradition of Baruch de Spinoza, although these links are not often developed in detail.[2] In the Spinozist perspective, affect is construed as dynamic, relational and thus primarily "transpersonal" – as opposed to something that goes on in the interior of an individual subject. In Spinoza's monistic and naturalistic metaphysics, affect is viewed as *relations of affecting and being affected* between co-evolving bodies in the immanence of the one "substance" (or "nature"). On this understanding, affect is what unfolds between interacting bodies whose potentialities and tendencies are thereby continuously modulated in reciprocal interplay. In the most radical construal this means that affective relations are ontologically prior to the individuated actors and actants – they are, as feminist theorist Karen Barad puts it in a different context, "relations without pre-existing relata" (Barad 2007). While this is a contested formulation, the point we take

from it is an emphasis on formative processes and on the conditions – both enabling and obstructing – of subject constitution.

With this orientation, the Spinoza-inspired perspective on affect is not too far from what philosophy theorizes under the label of "enactivism," where relational processes of organism-environment coupling are taken as continuously shaping and reshaping – "enact" – the boundaries between an organism and its life-sustaining ambient. Dynamic relations take precedence over individual corporeal and mental states (cf. Di Paolo 2009; Colombetti and Thompson 2008; Colombetti and Krueger 2015). Likewise, in this perspective, processes of formation and development are prioritized over their "products," such as comparatively stable affective states or affective dispositions.[3] Problematically though, these discourses and theories have been conducted so far in a mostly depoliticized manner, so that issues such as the differential allocation of resources, processes of social marginalization, structural violence and political strategies of precarization have not received enough attention in relation to the theoretical terms of enactivism (an exception is Protevi 2009; 2013; see also Slaby 2016).

An understanding of affect as transindividual processes not attributable to individual bearers also implies that affect cannot be equated with emotion. Yet there is a place for emotion within this perspective, namely as recurring sequences of affective interaction that have come to be socially and culturally coded, that is, categorized, narrativized (e.g., in terms of "paradigm scenarios," cf. De Sousa 1987) and subjected to normative regulation with regard to agreed-upon "feeling rules" (cf. Hochschild 1979) in an "emotional community" (Rosenwein 2002) or as part of "emotional regimes" (Reddy 2001), displaying varying "emotional styles" (Gammerl 2012). Thus, contrary to some authors' views – such as Massumi (1995, 2002) – there is no sharp rift between affect and emotion. In effect, just like many anthropologists and sociologists who deal with affective and emotional phenomena, many proponents of cultural affect studies adopt what amounts to a *developmental constructivist approach* that takes relational affective dynamics to be primary, and emotion – including "subjects" of emotion – to be derivative.[4] Yet once emotional dispositions or emotion repertoires have consolidated and become culturally codified, they have an important role in how communal and individual affectivity subsequently play out. Researchers of affect are thus well-advised to have both "affect" and "emotion" in their conceptual repertoire. As this issue is of some importance and is a continuous source of confusion, it is worth elaborating on our take on the putative "affect-emotion gap".

A strong claim for why not to lose sight of emotions when dealing with affect has recently been put forward by social anthropologists. Some scholars, such as Lutz (2017) and Martin (2013), take issue with the sometimes overly sharp distinction between affect – as preconscious, bodily felt intensities – and emotions – as those feelings that are fixed through

various discursive practices. This critique partly echoes objections made by Leys (2011), Wetherell (2012) and other critics of the cultural "turn to affect" – objections directed mostly against Brian Massumi and his followers. Lutz and Martin argue that a sharp affect/emotion dichotomy holds strong traces of the old opposition between body and mind.[5] Both opine that affect is conceptualized by many theorists as "something that belongs to an interior life fundamentally beyond social articulation" (Lutz 2017, p. 187), and emphasize that affect might be defined as presubjective and asocial but by no means as a *presocial* intensity; that it is – like emotion – embedded within and shaped by social processes (Martin 2013, p. 156). However, social anthropologists agree that there is a gap between the signifying order (emotion codes, convention, meaning) and the affective order (non-signifying, autonomic processes taking place beyond the levels of consciousness and meaning; cf. Martin 2013, p. 155; White 2017, p. 177). This epistemological gap "between how bodies feel and how subjects make sense of how they feel" (White 2017, p. 177) is especially demanding when analyzing the entanglement of emotion and affect within particular environments and social processes. A theoretically challenging aspect concerns the question of how far this "affect-emotion gap" encompasses a transformative potential, which might be at the interstices or fault lines between emotion and affect that subjects and collectives gain the power (motivation) to refigure their life or life worlds. However, on the flip side, the "affect-emotion gap" is – as White (ibid., p. 176f.) emphasizes – not only appealing to affect theorists but also to those seeking to capitalize on its generative power, for example, technological companies that create emotional robots, such as the Japanese giant SoftBanks, or that develop artificial intelligence programs specialized in reading facial expressions (e.g., Affectiva); or other affect-sensitive technologies, like those numerous apps that help individuals to perceive and label their feelings (e.g., GFK App Empathy) and thus implement new regimes of technological knowledge on how bodies might feel and react. These emerging technologies of affect and emotion constitute challenging new sites for researchers on affect. Accordingly, several contributions to this volume critically engage with novel technological apparatuses and setups that specifically target user affectivity.

In light of this, we consider the distinction between affect and emotion as analytically helpful. Where the focus is on emotion, the interest lies with consolidated patterns of felt forms of relatedness, viewed from the perspective of persons or collectives and their formulated self-understanding. Where the focus is on affect, the main thrust is towards subtle forms of relationality and processes of becoming; dynamics that are formative of subjects and their emotional orientations, but that might initially escape reflective awareness on the part of those involved. Affect, as heuristically *distinguished* but not sharply *separated* from emotion, is thus a lens to render visible such ongoing relational processes and the surprising turns

they might take. Ultimately though, these two conceptual perspectives work best in concert.

Central concepts

Part of the promise – and the challenge – of the turn to affect has been its rigorously transdisciplinary orientation. It is our conviction that well-made and precisely elucidated *concepts* are required as connectors between different academic and scientific fields, engendering collaboration, enabling the transfer of insights, linking different disciplinary histories and theoretical outlooks, while inspiring debate and contestation. Working concepts help bridge theory and methodology as they inform collaborative viewpoints on complex subject matters in the manner of *sensitizing concepts* (see Bowen 2006), while also showing a capacity for cross-fertilization between different fields and domains of study (*traveling concepts* – see Bal 2002). Such concepts need to be sufficiently concrete but have to remain open-textured enough to allow domain-specific elaboration. In this section we sketch the contours of several such concepts that will appear in the following chapters, and that all contribute to the guiding idea of "affect in relation". If only in outline, the following provides a glimpse of an evolving field of interrelated notions, a larger set of working concepts that has begun to take shape in the day-to-day research within the Berlin-based Collaborative Research Center *Affective Societies* (see Foreword to this volume). The multi-disciplinary team of researchers involved in this initiative collaborates to further consolidate, expand and elaborate this conceptual tableau – work that will be reflected in subsequent volumes of this new Routledge book series (see the forthcoming volume entitled *Affective Societies: Key Concepts*, edited by Slaby and von Scheve).

The first notable concept in this regard is that of *relationality* itself. Here, the provisional, domain-general and theory-neutral character of a working concept is most obvious. "Relationality" indicates an analytical perspective that can be deployed in various fields and for different empirical and theoretical purposes. Thus, no particular type of relation is prioritized. The point is that affective phenomena are approached with a view to their embeddedness within ongoing complex situations in which various actors, objects, spaces, artifacts, technologies and modes of interaction coalesce, all contributing to the particular character of the affective process in question. Thus, researchers might focus on interactive dynamics between persons, from basic forms of preconscious embodied coordination, synchrony and affect attunement up to fully self-conscious forms of practical engagement. However, person-to-person relationality is inextricable from further layers of embeddedness, from formative relations to the environment ranging from the immediate socio-material surroundings of interacting agents, to broader discursive, medial or institutional arrangements of various kinds.[6] As a methodological orientation,

generic relationality works as a template for concept formation, as it leads scholars and researchers to construct relational conceptions of phenomena that were previously thought of as separate entities and individual capacities. Other prominent examples of this, outside the realm of affect, are relational conceptions of autonomy in feminist theory (Mackenzie and Stoljar 2000), relational construals of knowledge in social epistemology (Code 1991; Fricker 2007), relational approaches to social actors in sociology and economics (Granovetter 1985) and relational accounts of subject formation in poststructuralist thought (Butler 1997), to name just a few salient instances.

A key fault line between differing approaches to affect has been whether to prioritize interpersonal relatedness (articulated, for instance, in terms of interactive practices among human actors), or whether to focus on the dynamic material dimensions of relatedness, as highlighted in post-human, new materialist approaches (e.g., Bennett 2010; Coole and Frost 2010). In our view, it is crucial not only to keep both strands in play but also to understand them in their interrelatedness. To do this, we suggest that concepts from practice theory are combined with notions articulating a dynamic materialist ontology. This is why contributions to this volume combine notions such as "affective practice" and the related "domain" or "domain of practice" from practice theory (see e.g., Reddy 2001; Reckwitz 2012; Scheer 2012; Wetherell 2012), with notions such as *agencement* or *arrangement* – concepts whose purpose it is to illuminate close-knit entanglements of human and non-human elements, and to allow a focus on dynamic and agentive phenomena partially beyond the scope of human intentional agency and self-understanding.

The concept of an *affective practice* has gained particular purchase in recent scholarship, and is central to several chapters in this collection. Practices are social, situated and normative, not reducible to the contributing intentional comportment of individual actors viewed in isolation (cf. Rouse 2006). Accordingly, a notion of affective practice does justice to the distributed, socio-materially situated character of relational affect, while it keeps in play individual agency and skillful engagement. It allows us to "follow the actors" while assuming that more is going on than what is summoned, brought about or reflected upon by the actors alone (cf. Wetherell 2012, pp. 4, 12). A praxeological perspective strikes a balance between the assumption of order and the expectation of change or transformation – "affect does display strong pushes for pattern as well as signaling trouble and disturbance in existing patterns" (ibid., p. 13). An important dimension of elaboration lies in the direction of affective place-making or, more generally, the active and passive *sedimentation* of affective practices into relatively permanent formations inherent to particular sites and locales (cf. Anderson 2014; Massey 2005; Reckwitz 2012). To approach such affectively shaped and imbued settings, we employ the open-textured notion of a "domain of practice". This concept refers broadly to those socio-spatial settings that have reached a certain level of stability and permanence due to repeated and ongoing affective performances and interactions. "Domain of practice" is required as an initial identifier of fields of interest for research but stands in need of concretization in the form of site-specific elaboration.

As a bridge in the other direction, that is, from dynamic materialist ontologies to the realm of human practice and interaction, we have found the concept of an *affective arrangement* particularly useful – not least because it can help achieve the kind of local specificity that the concept of a "domain of practice" calls for (see Slaby, Mühlhoff and Wüschner 2017). Inspired by Deleuze's and Guattari's notions of *agencement*, by Foucault's *dispositive of power* and by elaborations of their ideas within *apparatus theory*, *actor-network* approaches and *assemblage theory* (Latour 2005; DeLanda 2006; Buchanan 2015), the concept of "affective arrangement" helps scholars carve out heterogenous ensembles of diverse materials that are directly involved in enabling and sustaining a local tangle of affective relations. An affective arrangement is a dynamic formation comprising persons, things, artifacts, spaces, discourse, behaviors and expressions in a characteristic "intensive" mode of composition, demarcated from its surroundings by shifting thresholds of intensity (cf. Deleuze and Guattari 1986; 1987; Foucault 1980; 1995). This provides a welcome concretization of affective relationality, as the assumption is that relational affect always unfolds locally as part of specific dynamic meshworks that knit together human and non-human elements. In such dynamic formations, a given instance of relational affect is patterned, channeled and modulated in recurrent and repeatable ways. In each case, an affective arrangement brings multiple actors into a co-ordinated dynamic conjunction within a local setting, and these actors' mutual affecting and being-affected – as kindled, sustained and mediated by the elements and conditions at hand – is the central dimension of the arrangement. The analytical perspective opened up by this notion can help researchers come to terms with an ongoing affective relationality in complex and initially opaque domains, in particular where actors with different positions, roles, histories, dispositions or habits regularly engage and interact against a background of specific formative elements (such as technological, architectural or institutional arrangements of various kinds). From the perspective of this volume, affective arrangements are seen as *intensive milieus* (Angerer 2017) of subject formation and as key factors in the subsequent stabilization – and in the variation and transformation – of subject positions and their paramount patterns of affecting and being affected. Affective arrangements always emerge in particular domains of practice, on the one hand they are shaped by the social structures, histories and materialities of the given domains and, on the other hand, they shape these structures themselves. Examples discussed in this volume are: the scenes and settings of religious routines (Chapter 5); political mass events on public squares, such as the

Tahrir Square protests in Cairo in 2011 (Chapter 6); the increasingly informal, technologically framed work environments of "network corporatism," with their emphasis on teamwork, communication and connectedness (Chapter 8); co-working spaces with their carefully crafted affective atmospheres and styles of interaction (Chapter 9); and the novel forms of man-machine hybrids in the domain of affective computing (Chapter 12). Also, the affective forms of *kin work*, that is, the practices applied by members of transnational families to perform "intimacy at a distance" that take place in, and create particular kinds of, affective arrangements (Chapter 2).

The daily lives of people who are embedded (like most migrants) in "transnational social fields" (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004; Glick Schiller 2005), that is, in networks of interpersonal connections stretching across many states, are framed by diverse legal, political and social institutions predominant in the nation-states which their networks transcend. These persons thus experience in their daily lives "multiple loci and layers of power and are shaped by them, but can also act back upon them" (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004, p. 1013). Incessant flows of information, resources, objects, ideas and services circulate through the sets of multi-layered and multi-sited interlocking networks of social relationships that make up transnational social fields. These flows – which are inextricable from communication technologies and media practices – involve people in different affective arrangements, both prompting and giving shape to specific affective interactions and practices. A particularly important dimension within transnational social fields are family relations. The contributions to the first thematic part of this volume deal with the different forms of *kin work* (Di Leonardo 1987), or "doing family" in transnational family constellations. They focus on the affective practices migrants engage in so as to come to terms with the complex challenges of living in dispersed family constellations. The practices and experiences connected with transnational life worlds deeply impact the processes of subjectivation, they influence how persons position themselves in their environments, how they mold their social relations, and how they articulate and sentimentalize their belonging.

This perspective on the affective practices of kin work in transnational social fields gives shape to the multi-dimensional understanding of affective subject formation discussed in this volume. The focus on relational affect allows a fine-grained analysis of the processes and activities that result in socially prevalent subject positions, it allows us to focus on both non-discursive and discursive elements, and it widens the scope of the paramount domain of subject constitution from well-researched settings (such as the nuclear family typical of Western middle classes) to a broader range of emerging social arrangements – for example digitized workplaces, online communities, users of novel technologies, or the new political collectives emerging "from below". Highlighting relational affect in the study of subjectivation enables researchers to identify operations of power that might otherwise go unnoticed or remain under-theorized, such as the subtle – or not so subtle – forms of oppression operative, for instance, in everyday social situations or in the procedures of public institutions (cf. Ahmed 2007; Berg and Ramos-Zayas 2015). Affectively shaped subject positions raise questions of social legibility, of tacit preconditions for the allocation of recognition and esteem, and provide a lens on the unifying or divisive factors within or between communities.

Thematic parts

Affective families

Part I of this volume deals with the affective dynamics unfolding within transnational families. In a highly mobile contemporary world family constellations are marked by tremendous economic, social and political transformations. A high percentage of families around the globe are scattered throughout different regions and nations. Families with members living in two, three or even more countries are in no way unusual. They all face the challenge of keeping in touch, to stay related and to care for each other across long distances. Very few of these transnational families can afford to meet on a regular basis; most have not seen each other for years, or even decades, due to poor financial conditions and/or legal restrictions. But, besides geographical distances, transnational families have to come to terms with manifold rearrangements in their relationships that are linked to the living conditions, social structures and normative orders prevailing in the countries in which they dwell.

The contributors to this theme, who are all anthropologists, share the assumptions that being embedded in transnational kin relations affords particular forms of affective *kin work* or kin practices, which they analyze from two different vantage points. The first perspective concerns *kin work across long distances*: how do dispersed family members manage to stay related? By what mediatized *affective practices* do they create long-distance intimacies? How do they care for each other across space and time? The last aspect relates not only to long family separations but also to the reshaping of intergenerational relations due to aging. The second perspective deals with kin relations and *kin work beyond long distances;* it focuses on the affective dynamics unfolding within immigrant families living in diasporic contexts. Key issues concern the reshaping or transformation of basic kin relations – for example, parent–child relations – through the particular migration regimes, social structures, values and family patterns that prevail in the "country of immigration." How do family members negotiate their roles and contesting ideas about partnership, family responsibilities, parent–child relations and forms of parenting? What intergenerational conflicts and affective tensions result from the

reconfiguration of family roles and clashing expectations and orientations? How do family members handle such dissonances?

The first contribution comes from Maruška Svašek, "Ageing kin, proximity and distance: translocal relatedness as affective practice and movement," who explores the affective practices by which dispersed family members create – or fail to – a kind of "long-distance intimacy." Svašek focuses on the role of communication technologies in transnational kin relations, particularly on the impact of different technological devices on long-distance care dynamics. Special attention is paid to the changing relations of dependency due to age progression, that is to the changing care needs of aging kin and the ways these are dealt with in migrant families. Svašek's contribution builds on empirical research conducted in Northern Ireland on the relationships between adult children and their parents in "transmigrant" families.[7] Her sample includes cases from differing transnational social fields, not only families who are scattered throughout India, Northern Ireland and the USA, or throughout Northern Ireland and Iran, but also families who are only separated by the Irish sea. Her case studies illustrate that many of the challenges faced by transmigrant families are independent of their social and cultural backgrounds but are rooted in their geographical separation and produce quite similar mediatized affective kin practices in order to stay related and lead a translocal family life. Svašek's contribution raises the theoretically important question of how far the technologically mediatized interactions that shape the life of transnational families generate similar affective dynamics, which transcend social and cultural differences between migrants and merge them into "affective communities."

The search for a better future through education is one focal motive for human mobility. Families who can afford it send their offspring abroad to study at internationally acknowledged universities; often parents work extremely hard, or migrate themselves, to earn the money needed to enhance the education of their children. Schools, especially universities, are sites of much hope, aspiration and expectation. The contribution by Joanna Pfaff-Czarnecka, "*Education sentimentale* in migrant students' university trajectories: family, and other significant relations," follows the educational trajectories of individual university students with a "migration background" in Germany. Special attention is paid to circumstances where academic education becomes a means of social mobility, that is to the interplay of spatial and social mobilities. Based on biographical interviews with young students, who – as in the case of Svašek's study – are from heterogenous socio-cultural backgrounds, she analyzes how they perceive their affective relations with kin, friends and peers, and argues that at this transitional stage of life kinship relations need to be considered against the backdrop of other forms of affective relatedness. The affective dynamics of kin relations are not comprehensible without considering the other social realms in which a person is embedded. The central social sites

in this case study are the complex space of the university, parental homes and transnational family configurations, and the peer constellations within and outside academia. Pfaff-Czarnecka conceives studying as a period of transition between late adolescence and early adulthood, a period of upmost importance for subject formation. She argues that studying affords – often hard – affective "boundary work"; in order to fit in the academic realm university students have not only to develop new relationships (with peers and academic teachers), to learn new interaction styles and modes of behavior, but also to negotiate and redefine older social bonds like their familial relations. (A challenge that most of the students in her sample have to meet is coming to terms with high parental expectations, which often go hand in hand with emotional care and economic support and thus form quite rigid "regimes of belonging".) In her fine-grained analysis Pfaff-Czarnecka depicts that the affective self-formation, the *education sentimentale*, of the students takes place during their navigation through the different social sites and domains of practice that make up their transnational life worlds.

The chapter from Birgitt Röttger-Rössler and Anh Thu Anne Lam, "Germans with parents from Vietnam: the affective dimensions of parent–child relations in Vietnamese Berlin," also deals with family relations within transnational constellations, but unlike the two other chapters in this part it focuses on one particular transnational social field, namely Vietnamese Berlin. It addresses the challenges Vietnamese parents and their children have to meet in the context of their immigration to Germany. Based on an ethnographical study of parent–child relations within the families of former Vietnamese contract laborers, who worked in the previous German Democratic Republic and are now living in Berlin, the authors describe the intergenerational conflicts arising in these families from the perspective of the immigrant's offspring. They depict the affective relations unfolding between parents and children and explore how far these affective patterns are entangled, on the one hand, with the particular socio-political structures of this Vietnamese migration and, on the other hand, with the particular parenting styles and practices of the Vietnamese immigrants. The analysis highlights that the children of Vietnamese immigrants do not form a homogenous group but differ strongly from each other. Depending on whether they have done most of their growing up in Germany or in Vietnam, their childhoods have been shaped by extremely different social and familial patterns, power structures, values and practices. These diverse experiences lead them to position themselves differently within the multi-layered and complex field of Vietnamese Berlin and shape their affective relations – to their families and to the other social domains they belong to. Röttger-Rössler and Lam argue that the different childhood experiences separate the offspring of Vietnamese immigrants into different affective communities; that is, into communities that are formed by their affective relation to the world. While Svašek and

Pfaff-Czarnecka point to the fact that shared experiences create affective communities that cut across national, ethnic and cultural boundaries, Röttger-Rössler and Lam demonstrate that emerging affective communities have the power to divide even close social groups like families. Taken together, these contributions raise an important theoretical issue, namely, how emotion and affect shape processes of social differentiation.

Affect and place

Part II deals in different ways with space and place-making practices in their complex affective dimensions. The contributions, on the one hand, focus on affective relations to place in migration and diaspora contexts, on the other hand, they examine the political dimensions of public and private spaces and places. Affective attachments to place – with their intensively sensuous, bodily dimensions – are among the most significant dimensions of socialization. The multi-sensuous perception of places, that is, of the colors, forms, sounds, smells, odors, haptic textures and architectonic structures connected with them effects a complex somato-sensoric habituation to places, which people do not often fully realize until they leave familiar places. It is thus not surprising that new studies of transnationalism and transmigration in sociology, social anthropology and cultural geography emphasize the central importance of place for feelings of belonging and focus on the multiple strategies of migrants to create "homes away from home" (e.g., Svašek 2012; McKay and Brady 2005; Conradson and McKay 2007; Wise and Chapman 2005). These studies show how many resources and capacities members of diaspora communities dedicate to place-making practices in order to attach themselves to a new place, or to more than one place simultaneously. They raise the question of how much people who are on the move need concrete, sensuously perceptible places, spaces and landscapes to integrate into new environments and to feel "at home". This issue is addressed, on the one hand, from the vantage point of religious practices in different migrant settings, which are deeply entangled with spatiality and materiality and can thus be conceived as affective ways of place-making. On the other hand, the issue of place or home making is approached from the perspective of endangered homes. The deliberate destruction of homes by powerful political agents – be it the displacement of persons in the context of urban gentrification programs or the demolishing of homes through police raids in the name of security (e.g., governmental surveillance of potentially dangerous groups) – is a widespread and highly consequential means of social control. Violating private spaces is an affective practice of domination.

The entanglement of politics, place and affect also becomes manifest in the role particular places play in social and political movements. Although the fundamental importance of emotion and affect in political processes has long been widely ignored in political and social sciences it is now

receiving increased attention (e.g., Cepernich 2016; Goodwin, Jasper and Polletta 2001; Gould 2009). However, the interlinkage of place, politics and affect has not been much studied up until now. The case studies in this part delve into the complex interconnections between place, space, politics and affect. They comprehend the attachment of person to place as a dynamic affective relationality, which is deeply shaped by social and political processes.

The first contribution, "Spatialities of belonging: affective place-making among diasporic neo-Pentecostal and Sufi groups in Berlin's cityscape" by the social anthropologists Hansjörg Dilger, Omar Kasmani and Dominik Mattes, explores the ways in which the members of two diasporic religious groups (the neo-Pentecostal church and the Sufi order) settled in Germany's capital try to embed themselves in Berlin's cityscape through different religious practices. The authors show that these bodily focused, religious-spiritual practices prove an effective means to instill a *sense of belonging* in the actors and can thus be read as affective practices. Through their religious routine, which can involve highly interactive bodily performances, the community members relate themselves to each other and to their socio-material environments; they ground or place themselves through these practices into their new local lifeworlds and reshape these local worlds at the same time. The authors take a comparative perspective and examine the similarities and differences between the two religious groups with regard to their place-making practices. Their results point to interesting affective similarities across the two communities, despite their highly different orientations and historical trajectories. They show, for example, that both religious groups engage in affective practices that transcend their actual location in Berlin's cityscape and involve them in a network of translocal social relations and material flows. In their gatherings and prayers, and through the mediatized circulation of religious objects (video-sermons, books, spiritual music, etc.) the believers connect themselves to significant spiritual leaders and sacred places in other parts of the world. It is through such localized religious practices that they create translocal *affective communities*. Similarities also emerge regarding the affective relation to what is conceived by both religious communities as the "sinful," immoral Western style of life. Both groups developed practices to protect themselves and to withstand the manifold seductions of their new social environment. Such practices, the authors argue, constitute an important means of place-making, that is, a means of affectively grounding oneself in a new lifeworld.

The part's second chapter, "'Midān Moments': conceptualizing space, affect and political participation on occupied squares" by the political scientists Bilgin Ayata and Cilja Harders, deals with the occupation of urban squares in the context of political protest movements. Drawing on empirical data on the uprising in Egypt in 2011 the authors offer a "thick reading" of Tahrir square as an affective space. They interpret the highly

affective dynamics enfolding on the square during the 18 days of its occupation in January 2011 as "Midān Moments". The Arabic term *midān* (English: square) refers to the central square of Egypt's capital, the *Midān at-Taḥrīr*, a place closely linked to Egypt's political history; while the noun "moments" denotes the temporal dimension of the events that took place in Cairo's "Liberation Square". With "Midān Moments" the authors refer to periods out of ordinary times on a delineated space, periods that are characterized by an intense affectivity unfolding through the bodily co-presence of protesters and their practices in this space. Ayata and Harders argue that the practices of protest in conjunction with the materiality of the occupied square created an "affective arrangement" that enabled the protesters – at least momentarily – to downplay and neglect all gendered, political, economic, religious or ethnic differences between them, in order to form an affective community – however fragile and short-lived. Ayata and Harders provide a rich description of the mass protest on *Midān at-Taḥrīr*. They depict in-depth how the affective atmosphere of the square was changed through the affective arrangements connected with its occupation (the tents and fire places, the unusual absence of traffic noise, the conversion of the mosque into a provisional hospital, the reshaping of the place's spatial order through barricades and checkpoints, the manifold activities of the protesters and so on) and argue that, due to these affective rearrangements, during the 18 days of occupation the *Midān at-Taḥrīr* turned from a battlefield into a utopian space, a place of becoming the "independent republic of Tahrir," as it was called in 2011.

The third contribution in this part, "Muslim domesticities: home invasions and affective identification," by Gilbert Caluya, who is an expert in gender and cultural studies, addresses the affective processes that unfolded during the course of home raids among Australian Muslims mandated by the Australian government in the context of state-organized counter-terrorist efforts. Caluya's contribution maps out the affective meaning of home as a place of security, familiarity and intimacy, from the vantage point of domicide. He illustrates that police and military invasions of houses and flats always constitute violent acts against the home as a place of belonging, as the crystallization point of important social relations, and shows that these acts alter the affective relations of the persons concerned in a fundamental way; not only do their affective relations to the state and to their daily social environments become dissonant and flawed, but also their relations to each other become fragile. In his analysis, Caluya depicts how the circulation of images and stories of Muslim home destruction and invasion across the internet and in everyday life, produces "scenes of affective identification" (Berlant 2008) that simultaneously generate a Muslim counter-public. News media regularly film such raids to report them, they thus bring into circulation lots of images of Muslims being arrested and their homes being vandalized, which are shared not only in the public media, but also among different Muslim networks. "In each shared post," Caluya states, "members of the Muslim community express their heartbreak, share condolences for the affected family and pledge their prayers." Through and with these expressions of sympathy and the sharing of sadness, pity and anger a sense of solidarity, of connectedness and belonging to the *ummah* (world community of Moslems) is created. In other words: the *ummah* as an *affective community* is enacted through these shared feelings.

Affect at work

In many countries of the Western hemisphere, capitalist corporations have long begun to rival the nuclear family as a significant formative milieu of affective socialization. The office has turned into a breeding ground for personality – a dwelling place where actors are both habituated and policed so as to fit the mold of their work environments with their characteristic styles of interaction and requirements for performing professional etiquette according to changing "laws of cool" (Liu 2004). In most work environments a team of co-workers, a "boss," a leader or divisional supervisor, and the styles of interaction and etiquette paramount in the respective workplaces, are key factors for shaping individual comportment and demeanor and for formulating the display rules of personality, self-image and character (Boltanski and Chiapello 2007). In terms of affect and emotion, corporate environments thus merit attention not only as a site for research into processes of subject formation, but also as a domain that calls for genealogical elucidation and critical reflection.

The contributions to Part III inquire into the ways in which affective involvements continue to function as an important dimension of subjectivation during adulthood. Perspectives from sociology, cultural and media studies and social philosophy aim to assess the complications that lie in those affective relations specific to the work cultures of modern "network corporatism". Increasingly, reciprocal and dynamic forms of affective involvement – as opposed to hierarchical and authoritarian – have become focal in these domains. Now prevalent are those forms of affective involvement and skillful practical engagement with stylized workplaces, with informal networks of co-workers, and also with digital workplace technologies, that seamlessly mix the realms of professional and private life – such as, for instance, a Facebook friends list or group chat applications (Gregg 2011).

The framework of relational affect can help theorists achieve a more nuanced understanding of how these intensive, multiply mediated affective engagements are experienced as meaningful and rewarding, while they might at the same time play a role in subtle schemes of (emotional) exploitation and other precarious arrangements. Over time, affect-intensive workplace arrangements can turn out to be draining or outright toxic, leading to exhaustion, hopelessness or pain, especially on the part

of those who have to shoulder the brunt of the affective labor required to keep these spaces buzzing with energy and ostentatious joyfulness. Likewise, notwithstanding all talk of eye-level interaction and flat hierarchies, modern workplaces remain engines of difference when it comes to gender-related interaction patterns, hidden biases and stereotypes (see e.g., Koch et al. 2005).

In light of this, it is important to ask at which exact point an affective arrangement ceases to be enabling, motivating and empowering and instead becomes toxic, oppressive and exploitative. Which criteria might enable those involved to tell the difference? Is it even possible to gain a critical distance in the midst of one's own, full-on affective involvement, especially in times when professional work continues to be unrivalled as a major source for meaning in standard biographies? Relational affect shows up here in its full ambivalence. The joys of connection, the near-addictive thrill of the online contact and real-time feedback might play a role in numbing the critical faculties of those involved. High-octane information workplaces *affectively habituate* not only office-regulars, but also home workers or occupants of co-working spaces, by way of the immersive quality of their affective arrangements. In response to these developments, the focus of analysis needs to shift to the devices and techniques whose purpose is to govern employees by stimulating and intensifying affective relatedness, thereby potentially giving rise to new emotion repertoires. From teamwork to real-time employee engagement and creative open space arrangements, as in Google's offices or the hip co-working spaces springing up across the globe, employee governance – including templates for gratuitous self-governance – draws on techniques operating on a register of affect and social relations. Individual commitment, performance and creativity are stimulated not by coercion but by selective intensification of affective and interpersonal experiences, often within arrangements specifically designed for such purposes. As a result, affective over-identification with one's firm, mediated by the "team" as a friendly micro-habitat, and self-exploitative behaviors – often in line with traditionally gendered interaction patterns – are made more likely and seem more natural.

The contributions to this part inquire into the roles of affect and affective relationality within the organizational cultures of contemporary forms of corporate capitalism. The changing affective relevance of work-related activities is critically reflected, both on a case-based empirical level and in terms of conceptual foundations. Affective arrangements with immersive qualities, socio-technical assemblages that engender symbiotic man-machine couplings and a transformed guise of care work – epitomized in the new social position of "community manager" in co-working spaces – are focal points in these contributions.

The part's first chapter, by philosophers Rainer Mühlhoff and Jan Slaby, is programmatically entitled "Immersion at work". The authors

begin their text with a review of the main lines of the affect theoretical perspectives of Spinoza and Deleuze, focusing on relationality, power (*potentia*) and on the concept of an affective arrangement. On these grounds, they then argue that the new affect-driven type of governmentality in network corporatism comes with a new form of subjectivation, which is not based on discipline but on immersion; the encompassing involvement of individual actors by means of a full-on engagement of all available personal and affective forces. Immersive arrangements do not merely govern the employees' outward behavior but also their *potentials*: creative and motivational resources on a deeper level of personhood. In a framework that combines the study of power relations with a philosophy of the subject, enriched by insights from affect theory and workplace ethnography, Mühlhoff and Slaby differentiate these new regimes of "governance by affect" from earlier disciplinary regimes.

In Chapter 9, media theorists and workplace researchers Melissa Gregg and Thomas Lodato attempt one of the first-ever, all-encompassing empirical studies of co-working spaces in the US and worldwide. These are places that not only sell workspaces and facilities but also community and conviviality to the "solopreneurs" of post-financial-crisis embattled economies. The authors' observations circle in on the role of community managers – often self-employed, untrained, job-sharing individuals who run those spaces, providing everything from concierge and clerk services to network culture match-making, inspiration and emotional support for members – a tech-inflected "infrastructure of care and guidance". The diffuse task profile of the position is often matched by the precarious situations and patchwork characters of the occupants' biographies. A new guise of affective labor emerges, albeit with resonances to earlier, gendered types of office-based carework such as, classically, the secretary of the Fordist corporation. It turns out that the affects that are so priced as the atmospheric backbone of these informal workspaces need to be constantly fueled by the labor and commitment of these novel *affect agents* of network sociality, often in arrangements whose exploitative nature is barely covered by a veneer of mandated cheerfulness, energy and optimism. In a writing style that might be dubbed *tech melancholia*, Gregg and Lodato mediate on the sometimes sad, sometimes hopeful realities of affective labor at the current margins of professional work.

Sociologist and affect theorist Robert Seyfert (Chapter 10) ventures into the realm of algorithmic trading with his case study on "Automation and affect". Drawing on his own fieldwork, Seyfert focuses on the intensive, multimodal and "symbiotic" nature of close-knit human–machine relations in the domain of high-frequency trading (HFT). One of his findings is that, contrary to what one might expect from "automated" trading systems, the higher degree of technological sophistication in HFT environments does not come with fewer but with more forms of affective involvement. Paramount in these domains are the intimate *bonds* between

humans and machines. This type of automation intensifies affective relationality and thus the level of engagement and absorption on the part of traders, and this is vital for the functioning of these systems. Seyfert points out that this has important consequences for the types of subjects that emerge on the digital trading floor. Steeped in cyborg-like symbiotic relationships to their machinic environment, these subjects are not reflectively *operating* the algorithmic trading systems but turn *themselves* into components of the systemic set-up. Accordingly, the subjectification at issue is not a matter of disciplining independent individuals, but a matter of *de-subjectifying* them so as to engender a more encompassing absorption – symbiosis – with the digital infrastructures on the trading floors. Inextricable from this are changes to patterns of attention, bio-physiological body types, aural regimes and pharmacological inclinations, as compared to earlier generations of stock market personnel, potentially with far-reaching consequences for habits of perception, reflection and decision-making. Seyfert's study, while exploring a novel type of human–machine affective relationality, also leads us to the final topic of this collection: the relationship between affect and media.

Affect and media

As a phenomenon of *relationality* – which here means, among other things, the dynamic *transmission* of impulses, energies, forms and expressions – affect displays an obvious proximity to media and processes of mediation. Historically, it can be shown that forms of inquiry into affective phenomena have long had an affinity to ideas of mediation, sometimes at the border between the ordinary (empathy, emotional contagion, atmospheres) and the occult (hypnosis, telepathy, séances with the dead or distant, and so on). Early forays into telecommunication and broadcasting technologies had fired up the scholarly imagination at the intersection of what would only later turn into the separate disciplines of sociology, psychology and communication and media theory (cf. Blackman 2012).

Resonating with these early trends, the renewed cultural turn to affect in the past 20 years is inextricable from changes to prevalent media regimes in digitized network societies. Affect – particularly when it is understood in terms of pre-personal intensities and relational dynamics – is congenial to a media landscape dominated by ultra-fast, often subliminal, stimulation, by constant multi-modal affecting through ambient technologies and ubiquitous computing, and to the increasing density of multiple media practices, technologies, forms and formats in tangles of transmediality (Chow 2012). The pre-personal, non-categorical and relational understanding of affect that is discussed in cultural affect theory fits this post-Gutenberg-Galaxy media landscape, but thus far, the broader implications of this media-invoked reformatting of subjectivity are not very well-understood. Given this, it is an important task for contemporary affect studies to refine its command of media analyses. Studies of the co-evolution of affective relationality and changing media practices, ambient technologies and regimes of media use in various sites of public and private life are urgently needed. The contributions to Part IV explore aspects of this co-evolutionary entanglement between affects, subjectivity and media by focusing on transformed and complexified milieus of subject formation. Not coincidentally, they also bring into view aspects of a profoundly transformed *public sphere* in an age of ubiquitous mediation and in increasingly fragmented, dispersed and participatory media landscapes.

There is no contemporary scholar better suited to be a guide for these debates than Lisa Blackman, cultural theorist and "postdisciplinary" media historian at Goldsmiths University. Blackman is acclaimed not least for her comprehensive historical discussion of the early entanglements between notions of affect and mediation, which links work on early sociology, psychoanalysis and crowd psychology with debates on hypnotic suggestion and paranormal phenomena (Blackman 2012). In Chapter 11, "Affect and mediation," Blackman charts a tableau of vital issues at the intersection of media and subject theory from a present-day viewpoint. Her main points of interest are the emergence of social media and dispersed, increasingly user-driven, media environments characterized by the imbrication of different media formats and practices (transmediation). An important part of her survey is devoted to illustrating how the new media landscape overlays different temporalities in a register of performativity, involving users ("prosumers") at a level of affect and agency rather than representation, co-shaping mediated events through forms of re- and premediation while manifesting spectral versions of the past at the margins of the dominant frames of presentation. In a more critical vein, Blackman expresses skepticism not only with regard to ahistorical, psychobiology-informed conceptions of affect but also with regard to work on media practices forgetful of the complex histories of discussions on mediation, transmission and relationality.

Complementing Blackman's perspective Chapter 12, by German media theorist and affect-studies-pioneer Marie-Luise Angerer, discusses transformations in embodied subjectivities in times of intensified human–machine couplings, socio-technical hybrids and affective computing. Angerer adopts a rigorously ecological perspective on both affect and media, an optic that is well-suited to grasping technological transformations to the background dimension of contemporary lifeworlds and interactive practices. Crossing an influential line of critical feminist work on human-technology imbrications – from Donna Haraway, Sadie Plant and Patricia Clough – with her own innovative approach to media ecology, Angerer inflects recent developments in digital consumer technologies with their pop-cultural uptake (e.g., recent movies centered on human-form AI systems, such as Spike Jonze's *Her*). Suggestively entitled "Intensive

bondage," the chapter explores ways in which human actors come to find themselves bonded affectively to a growing panoply of "technological others" – digital assistants, control systems, network infrastructures – thereby forming intensive milieus. Particular emphasis is put on how the evolving algorithms of affective computing close-in ever more intimately on user subjectivities, signaling the dawn of a new age of biomediated bodies and psycho-cybernetic assemblages. Angerer's text might be read as a plea to scholars of affect to update their perspective on affect and media so as to better understand today's unprecedented degree of entanglement between subjectivity, milieu and digital technologies.

The final contribution in Chapter 13, by Berlin-based film scholars Nazlı Kilerci and Hauke Lehmann, marks a change of register which is still focused on the affective workings of contemporary media. The authors undertake a detailed case study of affect-poetic forms employed in recent Turkish-German cinema. By way of a close analysis of film sequences, it explores the role of affect in conceptualizing the link between political dimensions and the realm of audiovisual images. Inspired by the work of political philosophers Nancy and Rancière, Kilerci and Lehmann oppose the framework of identity politics. As an alternative, they conceptualize the political in terms of the conditions and conflicts that constitute a community, focusing on a dimension of the cinematic image in which aesthetic forms and modalities of perception provide the conditions for the description of commonly shared worlds. The text lays out building blocks for an approach that looks to concepts of affective experience and generic relationality in order to conceptualize the political relevance of cinematic images in a new way. Thereby, the authors locate the political significance of genre films on a deeper and more specifically affective level. In an exemplary fashion, this closing chapter demonstrates how an affect analytic perspective can approach contemporary art forms with a high degree of formal sophistication without losing touch with the wider contexts and conditions of art production and reception.

Outlook

Besides addressing their specific research questions, several of the contributions also assess the potentials, prospects and future pathways of affect studies more broadly. For more than two decades affect has been a productive, albeit contested, field of inter- and transdisciplinary inquiry. It is time to probe into *affect's future*. It is our conviction that the best way to do this is by conducting case studies that not only ignite a focused reflection on the state of the field, but also showcase the fascination of affect, affective dynamics and affective arrangements as an inspiring and productive field of research.

To conclude this introduction, we want to point to one dimension of the topic that strikes us as particularly relevant and pressing for future

work. This concerns the specifically *political* character of relational affect. As several contributions to this volume elaborate, affect is a collectivizing force as it lets individuals coalesce into groups or "affective communities," often on the grounds of interactive practices and relational dynamics that initially elude conceptualization. "Affective communities" are often extremely heterogenous, made up by persons stemming from different social, ethnic, national or religious groups. These different actors are united not by a unitary orientation, but by a set of partially shared experiences, practices and concerns. We conceptualize "affective communities" as complementary to Barbara Rosenwein's notion of "emotional communities". Rosenwein (2002) coined this term to describe groups of people who are united by a set of shared feeling rules or codes, that is, by a single predominant and normatively regulated way of labeling, expressing, controlling and evaluating feelings. Members of an emotional community are socialized into the same feeling systems, they know and master the same emotion repertoires. In contrast to emotional communities, which form around particular social and historical emotional regimes (Reddy 2001) and gain a certain stability over time, affective communities do not depend on shared feeling rules and emotion repertoires. On the contrary, as several chapters in this volume illustrate, affective communities emerge through experiences, practices and concerns that may cross-cut social, cultural, ethnic, religious and gendered differences. That is, affective practices and affective arrangements are capable of uniting actors into novel collective formations, if only transiently. Thereby, affectivity has the power to divide even close-knit social entities, such as families, for instance when family members are engaged in different social fields and thus come to be immersed within different affective arrangements, as is often the case in immigrant families. This may stir up tension and cause conflict, but may also contain the seeds for sustained social change. Here lies an important issue for future work on affect, namely to assess whether (and how) the emergence of affective communities out of shared experiences, practices and concerns facilitates not only the transformation of established social differences and boundaries but also the creation of new emotion repertoires and thus, in the long run, new emotional communities. Part of the promise of affect lies in its power to transcend and reshape conventional social and emotional orders and thus to alter societies.

Notes

1 An important but somewhat under-credited figure in this trend is Lawrence Grossberg. See, for instance, Grossberg (1992) and his highly informative interview with the editors of the *Affect Theory Reader* (Gregg and Seigworth 2010, pp. 309–338).
2 This metaphysical background is complex and multi-faceted. It includes the choice of a process-ontological instead of a substance-ontological framework.

See Seyfert (2012) for a concise explication of the theoretical core of affect studies. Schaefer (2015) likewise provides a balanced theoretical and genealogical reconstruction.

3 Dorothy Kwek (2015) has elucidated Spinoza's conception of power as the capacity to affect and be affected (cf. Spinoza 1985). Kwek emphasises the aspect of receptivity or sensitivity (*being affected*), so that it becomes clear that the potentialities of bodies – in the sense of power (*potentia*) – at issue always include their agentive and their receptive capacities, respectively. See also Balibar (1997) and Gatens and Lloyd (1999) and especially the Deleuze branch in the Spinoza reception, for instance Deleuze (1988; 1990).

4 In sociology, symbolic interactionist approaches (e.g., Katz 2001; Collins 2004) stress the social situatedness of emotions, while work in social psychology takes emotions to be configurations of social relationships (Parkinson, Fischer and Manstead 2005). Christian von Scheve (2017) recently provided a discussion of these and related constructivist approaches vis-à-vis cultural affect studies. Other social relational accounts of affect/emotion of recent date are Burkitt (2014) and Wetherell (2012).

5 See for example the critique of Lutz (2017, p. 187) in Michael Hardt's (2007, ix) introductory statement to the volume *The Affective Turn* (Clough and Halley 2007).

6 See Pedwell (2014) for a convincing approach to affective relations that resonates in several respects with the one developed here.

7 The term "transmigrant" was introduced by Glick Schiller, Basch and Szanton Blanc (1995, p. 48) in reference to "immigrants whose daily lives depend on multiple and constant interconnections across international borders and whose public identities are configured in relationship to more than one nation-state."

References

Ahmed S 2007, "A Phenomenology of Whiteness", *Feminist Theory*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 149–168.

Ahmed, S 2010, *The Promise of Happiness*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Anderson, B 2014, *Encountering Affect: Capacities, Apparatuses, Conditions*, Ashgate, Farnham.

Angerer, ML 2017, *Ecology of Affect*, meson press, Lüneburg.

Bal, M 2002, *Traveling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Balibar, E 1997, *Spinoza: From Individuality to Transindividuality*, Eburon, Rijnsburg.

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

Bennett, J 2010, *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Berg, U and Ramos-Zayas, AY 2015, "Racializing Affect: A Theoretical Proposition", *Current Anthropology*, vol. 56 no. 5, pp. 654–677.

Berlant, L 2008, *The Female Complaint: The Unfinished Business of Sentimentality in American Culture*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Berlant, L 2012, *Cruel Optimism*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Blackman, L 2012, *Immaterial bodies: Affect, Embodiment, Mediation*, Sage, London.

Boltanski, L and Chiapello, E 2007, *The New Spirit of Capitalism*, Verso, New York.

Bowen, GA 2006, "Grounded Theory and Sensitizing Concepts", *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 12–23.

Brinkema, E 2014, *The Forms of the Affects*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Buchanan, I 2015, "Assemblage Theory and Its Discontents", *Deleuze Studies*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 382–392.

Burkitt, I 2014, *Emotions and Social Relations*, Sage, London

Butler, J 1997, *The Psychic Life of Power*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Butler, J 2009, *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* Verso, London.

Cepernich, C 2016, "Emotion in Politics", in *The International Encyclopedia of Political Communication*, 4 January. Available from DOI: 10.1002/9781118541555.wbiepc238

Chow, R 2012, *Entanglements, or Transmedial Thinking about Capture*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Clough, PT and Halley, J (eds) 2007, *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Code, L 1991, *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and Construction of Knowledge*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Collins, R 2004, *Interaction Ritual Chains*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Colombetti, G and Krueger, J 2015, "Scaffoldings of the Affective Mind", *Philosophical Psychology*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 1157–1176.

Colombetti, G and Thompson, E 2008, "The Feeling Body: Toward an Enactive Approach to Emotion" in WF Overton, U Mueller and JL Newman, (eds), *Developmental perspectives on embodiment and consciousness*, pp. 45–68. Lawrence Erlbaum, New York.

Conradson, D and McKay, D 2007, "Translocal Subjectivities: Mobility, Connection, Emotion", *Mobilities*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 167–174.

Coole, D and Frost, S 2010, *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Cvetkovitch, A 2012, *Depression: A Public Feeling*, Duke University Press, Durham.

De Sousa, R 1987, *The Rationality of Emotion*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

DeLanda, M 2006, *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*, Continuum, London.

Deleuze, G 1988 [1981], *Spinoza: Practical philosophy*, trans. by R Hurley, City Lights Books, San Francisco.

Deleuze, G 1990 [1968], *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza*, trans. by M Joughin, Zone Books, New York.

Deleuze, G and Guattari, F 1986 [1972], *Kafka: Towards a Minor Literature*, trans. by D Polan, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Deleuze, G and Guattari, F 1987 [1980], *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. by B Massumi, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Di Leonardo, M 1987, "The Female World of Cards and Holidays: Women, Families, and the Work of Kinship", *Signs*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 440–453.

Di Paolo, E 2009, "Extended Life", *Topoi*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 9–21.

Foucault, M 1980 [1977], "The Confession of the Flesh" in C Gordon, (ed.), *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, pp. 194–228. Pantheon Books, New York.

Foucault, M 1995 [raiser 1975], *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. by A Sheridan, Vintage, New York.

Fricker, M 2007, *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Froese, T and Fuchs, T 2012, "The Extended Body: A Case Study in the Neurophenomenology of Social Interaction", *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 205–235.

Fuchs, T and Koch, SM 2014, "Embodied Affectivity: On Moving and Being Moved", *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 508. Available from DOI 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00508.

Gammerl, B 2012, "Emotional Styles – Concepts and Challenges", *Rethinking History*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 161–175.

Gatens, M and Lloyd, G 1999, *Collective Imaginings: Spinoza, Past and Present*, Routledge, London/New York.

Glick Schiller, N 2005, "Transnational Social Fields and Imperialism: Bringing a Theory of Power to Transnational Studies", *Anthropological Theory*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 439–461.

Glick Schiller, N, Basch, L, Szanton Blanc, C 1995, "From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration", *Anthropological Quarterly*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 48–63.

Goodwin, J, Jasper, JM and Polletta, F 2001, *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Gould, D 2009, *Moving Politics. Emotion and ACT UP's Fight Against AIDS*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Granovetter, M 1985, "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 91, no. 3, pp. 481–510.

Gregg, M 2006, *Cultural Studies' Affective Voices*, Palgrave, Basingstoke.

Gregg, M 2011, *Work's Intimacy*, Polity, Cambridge.

Gregg, M and Seigworth, GJ (eds) 2010, *The Affect Theory Reader*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Griffiths, PE and Scarantino, A 2009, "Emotions in the Wild" in P Robbins and M Aydede, (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition*, pp. 437–453. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Grossberg, L 1992, *We Gotta Get Out of this Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture*, Routledge, New York.

Hardt, M 2007, "Foreword: What Affects are Good for" in PT Clough and J Halley, (eds), *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*, pp. ix-xiii. Duke University Press, Durham.

Hemmings, C 2005, "Invoking Affect: Cultural Theory and the Ontological Turn", *Cultural Studies*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 548–567.

Hochschild, AR 1979, "Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 85, no. 3, pp. 551–575.

Hutchins, E 1995, *Cognition in the Wild*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

Katz J 2001, *How Emotions Work*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Koch, SC, Müller, SM, Schroeer, A, Thimm, C, Kruse, L and Zumbach, J 2005, "Gender at Work: Eavesdropping on Communication Patterns in Two Token Teams" in L Anolli, S Duncan Jr, MS Magnusson and G Riva (eds), *The Hidden Structure of Interaction: From Neurons to Culture Patterns*, pp. 265–281. IOS Press, Amsterdam.

Krueger, J and Szanto, T 2016, "Extended Emotions" *Philosophy Compass*, vol. 11, no. 12, pp. 863–878.

Kwek, D 2015, "Power and the multitude: A Spinozist view", *Political Theory*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 155–184.

Latour, B 2005, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.

Levitt, P and Glick Schiller, N 2004, "Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society", *International Migration Review*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 1002–1039.

Leys, R 2011, "The Turn to Affect: A Critique", *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 434–472.

Liu, A 2004, *The Laws of Cool. Knowledge Work and the Culture of Information*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Lutz, C 2017, "What Matters", *Cultural Anthropology*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 181–191.

Mackenzie, C and Stoljar, N (eds) 2000, *Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency, and the Social Self*, Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford.

Martin, E 2013, "The Potentiality of Ethnography and the Limits of Affect Theory", *Current Anthropology*, vol. 54, pp. 149–58.

Massey, DB 2005, *For Space*, Sage Publications, London.

Massumi, B 1995, "The Autonomy of Affect", *Cultural Critique*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 83–109.

Massumi, B 2002, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*, Duke University Press, Durham.

McKay, D and Brady, C 2005, "Practices of Place-Making: Globalisation and Locality in the Philippines", *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 89–103.

Ngai, S 2005, *Ugly Feelings*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.

Palmer, T 2017, "'What Feels More than Feeling?' Theorizing the Unthinkability of Black Affect", *Critical Ethnic Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 31–56.

Papoulias, C and Callard, F 2010, "Biology's Gift: Interrogating the Turn to Affect", *Body & Society*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 29–56.

Parkinson, B, Fischer, AH and Manstead, ASR 2005, *Emotion in Social Relations: Cultural, Group, and Interpersonal Processes*, Psychology Press, New York.

Pedwell, C 2014, *Affective Relations: The Transnational Politics of Empathy*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Protevi, J 2009, *Political affect: Connecting the Social and the Somatic*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Protevi, J 2013, *Life, War, Earth*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Reckwitz, A 2012, "Affective Spaces: A Praxeological Outlook", *Rethinking History. The Journal of Theory and Practice* 16(2), pp. 241–258.

Reddy, WM 2001, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotion*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rosenwein, B 2002, "Worrying about Emotions in History", *American Historical Review* 107, pp. 821–845.

Rouse, J. 2006, "Practice Theories", in DM Gabbay, P Thagard and J Woods, (eds), *Handbook of Philosophy and Social Science*, vol. 15, pp. 500–540. Elsevier, Cambridge MA.

Schaefer, DO 2015, *Religious Affects: Animality, Evolution, and Power*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Scheer, M 2012, "Are Emotions a Kind of Practice?", *History and Theory*, vol. 51, pp. 193–220.

Seyfert, R 2012, "Beyond Personal Feelings and Collective Emotions: Toward a Theory of Social Affect", *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 27–46.

Slaby, J 2014, "Emotions and the Extended Mind", in M Salmela and C von Scheve, C, (eds), *Collective Emotions*, pp. 32–46. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Slaby, J 2016, "Mind Invasion: Situated Affectivity and the Corporate Life Hack", *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 7, no. 266, Available from DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00266.

Slaby, J, Mühlhoff, R and Wüschner, P 2017, "Affective Arrangements", *Emotion Review*, 20 October. Available from DOI: 10.1177/1754073917722214.

Slaby, J and von Scheve, C, *Affective Societies: Key Concepts*, New York, Routledge (forthcoming).

Spinoza, B 1985 [1677], *Ethics*, ed. and trans. by E Curley, *The Collected Works of Spinoza*, vol. 2, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Stephan, A, Wilutzky, W and Walter, S 2014, "Emotions Beyond Brain and Body", *Philosophical Psychology*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 65–81.

Stewart, K 2007, *Ordinary Affects*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Svašek, M 2012, *Emotions and Human Mobility. Ethnographies of Movement*, Routledge, London.

Thompson, E and Stapleton, M 2009, "Making Sense of Sense-Making: Reflections on Enactive and Extended Mind Theories", *Topoi*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 23–30.

von Scheve, C 2017, "A Social-Relational Account of Affect", *European Journal of Social Theory*, 26 January. Available from DOI: 10.1177/1368431017690007.

Wetherell, M 2012, *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*, Sage, London.

White, D 2017, "Affect: An Introduction", *Cultural Anthropology*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 175–180.

Wise, A and Chapman, A 2005, "Introduction: Migration and the Senses", *Journal of Intercultural* Studies, vol. 26, no. 1–2, pp. 1–3.

Part I

Affective families