This week's reading proposed two interesting schools of thought. The two ideas seemed to clash as either prop oriented or content oriented make-believe. The author presents the idea that we as humans simultaneously participate in "make-believe" in our normalized usage of metaphors, toys, and "props." In all our readings, I have taken a sociological or psychological perspective on the theories and ideas presented. This is the first reading that has really given me cognitive dissonance on the digestion of the reading. Firstly, the reading leads with the idea of "make-believe" but as we discussed in class, I didn't find a clear distinction as to what the author defines as make-believe. I feel that "make-believe" suggests a finite line between existent and imaginary. Perception (which is important to the analysis of games) lies between the two. Would we classify an illusion as make believe or real? Secondly, I feel that the author's idea of make believe is a relabeling of what we could call fiction, figurative language, symbolism, or even perception. One example in class was whether color really exists, or whether it is part of the make believe we accept. Surely there are physical properties of light that undeniably exist, but our interpretation/perception of them is really what I believe drives the "make-believe" that Walton describes. Walton's proposal that make-believe exists in many parts of our lives is intriguing. I lean towards content-oriention in certain contexts, like toys or the unpacking game however, I believe prop-oriented and content-oriented is too small a domain to define how we conduct game analysis.

The unpacking game surprised me. While I was invested in the story, I quickly became bored with the repetitive and time consuming action of unpacking. I think if the character in the game was more similar to me I would have been more excited to "unpack their life." My experience with the game seemed to unique. *Unpacking* is a huge success overall. The aesthetics, smooth interactivity, and well-designed reward reinforcement system creates an engaging and alluring game. One thing that stuck out to me is that everyone in class had a similar experience in the actual gameplay but their thoughts and interpretation of the character were alot different (one point for Sicart). Additionally, I was impressed with the technical skill it takes to create such a multifaceted game (in which the physical combo of property placements are seemingly endless).

The walkthrough in class was extremely helpful for the homework this week. I didn't find myself googling "how do I ___ in Godot?" too often. Scene One was the most time consuming, as I have imported a sprite before but not a tilemap. It took me a bit to understand the relationship between a tileset and a tilemap node/file. Furthermore, I had to located a terrain and a house tileset to put together for the Godot bot. Using the tilemaps wasn't as fluid as I thought initially. I downloaded what I thought were the perfect sprites to use but it was extremely obvious when similar looking sprites didn't align correctly. Resizing was a challenge, especially for the roof of the house. I used some layering of similar looking sprites, which didn't end up looking bad visually, and I used the rotate ability in the tilemap editor frequently. The rest of the scenes were pretty smooth because I could visually test to see if I completed the task. If one thing worked or didn't, I could respond accordingly.