

# Harassment or light-hearted? Examining the normative rules of trash talking in CS:GO esports

**Sidney Irwin**

Central Queensland University  
44 Greenhill Road, Wayville SA  
[sidney.irwin@cqumail.com](mailto:sidney.irwin@cqumail.com)

**Anjum Naweed, Michele Lastella**

Appleton Institute, Central Queensland University  
44 Greenhill Road, Wayville SA  
[anjum.naweed@cqu.edu.au](mailto:anjum.naweed@cqu.edu.au), [m.lastella@cqu.edu.au](mailto:m.lastella@cqu.edu.au)

## Keywords

Esports, Multiplayer First Person Shooter, Counter Strike: Global Offensive, Trash Talk, Banter, Practice Theory.

## INTRODUCTION

To date, the growth of esports has attracted and formed sporting organizations, governing bodies, and computer gaming companies to establish teams and events across different sporting genres. Much like traditional sports, the popularity of esports has become a focus of ever-growing research, primarily to understand the culture norms shared across professional players and spectators. While esports are governed by detailed rules and regulations across specific games (Taylor, 2012), the social norms of “trash talking” are governed by unwritten and normative rules shared across diverse communities. Thus, investigating the practice of trash talking is complex, but made even more by a lack of consistency in its nomenclature and non-consensual definitions in current sporting literature. Implementing an overarching theoretical framework of Practice theory, which examines how humans are shaped and/or can shape the *structure* (e.g., history, power relations and culture) within a given system (Myers, 2017; Ortner, 2006), this research focused on understanding the normative rules of trash talking within *Counter Strike: Global Offensive* (CS:GO) esports (Hidden Path Entertainment, 2012).

Thirty hours of online observations of CS:GO esports tournaments via Twitch and semi-structured interviews among esports spectators ( $n = 15$ ) were undertaken using a qualitative design. In line with previous esportsing/livestreaming literature, all data were analysed and triangulated through systematic application of open, axial, and selective coding (Cheung and Huang, 2011; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). To facilitate an open and interpretive understanding of trash talking during analysis, current definitions of trash talk were obtained from sporting and video gaming literature to formulate markers of its practice.

The findings revealed that while trash talking has conventionally been perceived through *verbal* conduct, in esports, *non-verbal* methods of trash talking abound. These could be *physical* (e.g. hand gestures), communicated by professional players at opposing sides of the stage. However, trash talking could also be *virtual*, an aspect

Proceedings of DiGRA Australia 2020

© 2020 Authors & Digital Games Research Association DiGRA. Personal and educational classroom use of this paper is allowed, commercial use requires specific permission from the author.

unique to esports where players manipulate in-game mechanics to express practices, such as “teabagging.” Through online media such as Twitter or during pre-match interviews, professional players evidently engage in trash talk to stimulate motivation for themselves, or promote hype for spectators. From a spectator perspective, consumers may draw on this to promote shared experiences and social identification with esports athletes. Trash talking was also expressed between members of the CS:GO community, with esports stage talent, including commentators, hosts and desk analysis taunting players, or spectators virtually “heckling” them in online streaming chat rooms.

The findings extend the current literature base on the various forms of trash talking evident in CS:GO esports. Through Practice theory, trash talk can be interpreted as an ostensibly distinctive and appealing aspect within the CS:GO community. While its practice has been apparent in past games of the Counter Strike series, the social conventions among casual players have grown and shifted towards the professional CS:GO esports scene. The findings suggest trash talking norms are dialectical and alter based on context and motive. For instance, malicious trash talk or personal attacks are proscribed themes which diminish the spectator experience though light-hearted *banter* may be a permissible symbol of respect between players. Given the absence of substantive literature, the insights in the way trash talking is observed and debated in esports literature warrants further investigation.

## **BIO**

Sidney Irwin is a PhD candidate at the School of Health, Medical and Applied Sciences at Central Queensland University. She received her bachelor of psychological science (with Honours) from the same university. She is currently working on a dissertation exploring more on the psychological aspects of esports.

Anjum Naweed is an associate professor of Applied Cognitive Science at the Appleton Institute for Behavioural Science in South Australia. He received his PhD in psychology from Sheffield University, United Kingdom. His focus on decision-making and knowledge representation is concerned with the relationship between people and technologies, tools, environments, and systems, beginning with the user experience.

Dr. Michele Lastella is sleep researcher at the Appleton Institute for Behavioural Science at CQUniversity Adelaide, South Australia. His primary area of expertise is sleep, recovery, sport psychology, psychological well-being and performance. Being a former elite athlete Dr. Lastella brings experience from both an athlete perspective as well as a researcher’s perspective. He has worked with several elite sporting organisations such as the Australian Institute of Sport and South Australian Institute of Sport examining sleep, recovery, and performance.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Cheung G and Huang J. (2011) Starcraft from the stands: understanding the game spectator. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Vancouver, BC, Canada: ACM, 763-772.

Hidden Path Entertainment. (2012) *Counter Strike: Global Offensive*. [Video Game]. Bellevue, WA: Valve Cooperation.

Myers B. (2017) Friends With Benefits: Plausible Optimism and the Practice of Teabagging in Video Games. *Games and Culture*.

Ortner SB. (2006) *Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power, and the acting subject*: Duke University Press.

Strauss A and Corbin J. (1990) *Basics of qualitative research*, Newbury Park, CA.: Sage publications.