In regard to your first main point, I appreciate your mention of “walk-throughs” and their relation to cheating in formalist/structuralist definitions. Many people resort to walkthroughs when they reach a point in a game where a problem is too difficult to solve. While the developers of the game did not intend for the players to look up how to beat a certain problem, players inevitably do, and in many ways, the developers should take this into account. From a formalist point of view, however, walkthroughs are considered cheating. When looking at the Undertale, while the game itself isn’t difficult to the point where walkthroughs are necessary, walkthroughs can be used to find the certain string of actions that will lead to a unique ending since the game offers multiple endings. This, however, is definitely not considered cheating using Consalvo’s structural definition.

Your subpoint in your second main point about the divide created within a gaming community when a device to cheat is introduced really stuck out. The example that Consalvo uses in regard to “non-cheaters” killing “cheaters” in WoW is a powerful example of how one group can determine what is acceptable and what is not within a game. I believe that whether certain forms of cheating are accepted in a game’s community depends on how strong/big the core gamer group is in comparison to the casual gamer group. In the case of WoW, the game has a very strong group of core gamers, so it is no surprise that they will sometimes resort to killing “cheaters” to preserve the rules of the game that they take seriously. However, what if a game doesn’t have a strong group of core gamers? Single player games are a good example since they don’t normally offer replay-ability which is a key aspect of fostering a core group. Thus, in the case of Undertale, I don’t believe that there are many who disagree with the use of walkthroughs (which we have established is cheating in the formalist viewpoint).

In regard to ethical gameplay in single-player games, I agree that Undertale does a really great job at creating real moral dilemmas that, as Sicart puts it in his article Moral Dilemmas in Computer Games, “require more than procedural thinking”. Whitbeck, an author quoted in Sicart’s article, argues that a game implores moral dilemmas well when “not only are the possible responses [to a player's actions] undefined, but the nature of the problem situation itself is often ambiguous”. In Undertale, we don’t know what will happen if we fight, spare, or do some other action when encountering an NPC in the Gameworld. Not only does this create ambiguity, as Whitbeck mentions, but the true nature of the ethical problem doesn’t truly manifest itself until the very end when we face Flowey.