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**Reflection: Week 4**

This week, I’ve visualized the act of play as a formal, partnered dance between the player/operator and the game/machine. One partner makes a move, the other responds, and both base their actions on the characteristics and values (whether physical, moral, or mechanical) that they bring to the scene. I came to this idea because of both Galloway’s article and my experience with the Godot assignment. Upon booting up the scene with my solar system, the only thing that a person can do is either watch the result of my code or close the program. The person and solar system can act independently, but the inability of either party to reciprocate impactful actions towards each other prevents them from cultivating that “dance” experience. In contrast, *Device 6* utilizes controls based on everyday phone interactions to craft a meaningful story, even if the game sacrifices independent operations for the sake of the “dance.” Without the operations specific to the phones, the game would either be stuck as a simulation, as with my solar system, or an e-book.

I believe it doesn’t matter if the actions a player makes are diegetic or not, despite the distinction being useful for understanding the interactions between operator and machine. While I am biased, due to my proclivity for flipping through menus in RPGs, I can attest to the emotional impact of the operator/non-diegetic actions that Galloway describes. As an operator, there’s a sense of satisfaction that comes with knowing that your actions matter to the machine. Even simple non-diegetic elements, such as pushing a start button (as parodied in the in-class cartoon clip), or the excessive scrolling and rotating from *Device 6*, become “real” for the player, due to it becoming so ritualized in an untold number of console and mobile games respectively.