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**Reflection:**

For this assignment, I replaced the little Godotbot with my character “Floppy.” While both are just a collection of pixels on a screen, resized and transformed to my liking, one can see a distinction between their identities. There’s a welcoming smile and attentive eyes on the Godotbot, whereas Floppy has no mouth and a laser-focused gaze. In addition, Godotbot cannot rotate without adjusting the script, but I’ve gone out of my way to establish Floppy as someone who can. That said, when one adjusts the parameters like the “jump height, speed limit, or friction,” they are contributing to the real-time animation that brings character traits to life in the first place.

I find it important to understand that a character’s animation is not just the culmination of technical skills an individual or group has, but also the values that they hold in the first place. While almost certainly not on the level of Kara from this week’s reading, I wouldn’t have created Floppy had it not been for my own biases disclosed in last week's character proposal. Thus, Kara's creation, her short film, and the implementation of her facial expressions weren’t simply a collaboration on a technical level. There was an unconscious moral give-and-take between all the animators. The collaborative nature of animation almost certainly caused the criteria of what will evoke sympathy to be adjusted more towards the staff majority. Thus, It's important to keep expectations with human-like characters in check, even if it seems obvious that they aren't people. They're still a collection of images and polygons subject to the whims of biased creators. A lack of mindfulness could cause harmful biases to slip into a given character’s look, whether intentional or not.