The Video Game Theory Reader

Edited by **Mark J. P. Wolf and Bernard Perron**

<div align="right">

CHAPTER **11**

From Gamers to Players and Gameplayers
The Example of Interactive Movies

BERNARD PERRON

</div>

For any film scholar who has begun to take an interest in video games, what is commonly referred to as the interactive movie seems a natural place to start. No other multimedia product came closer to crossing the threshold that separates the worlds of film and video games. However, a film scholar who commences research on this premise will be both disconcerted and disappointed, for many reasons.

In the early 1990s, following on the heels of laserdiscs, CD-ROMs were able to store digitized video, and thence became the standard, most widely distributed support for computer data. The interactive movie, which flourished in this technological environment, is not easy to categorize. The first popular game named as such, *The 7th Guest* (1992), is more a puzzle game with few live-action[1] cut-scenes. In that sense, to begin with the bestselling *Myst* (1993), a lot of games have embedded video clips that serve as informative sequences or simple transitions but they are not called interactive movies for all that.[2] What is more, in his 1995 lecture "The Challenge of the Interactive Movie," Ernest W. Adams noted that the term refers to a variety of games, from "a kind of space flight shoot-'em-up, with little bits of video in between" (*Wing Commander III: Heart of the Tiger,* 1994) to a graphic adventure (*Under a Killing Moon,* 1994), or from "a one-pass-through sort of

game" (*Critical Path*, 1993) to a movie in movie theaters where the audience votes on how they want the plot to go (*Mr. Payback*, 1995).[3] Also, curiously enough, the video games section of *All Media Guide* (*AMG*) considers digital video not as a technology but as a mode of presentation, confusedly listing "Adventure" as the game's genre and "Interactive Movie" as the game's "style" for *The Dame Was Loaded* (1995), *Star Trek: Borg* (1996) or *The X-Files Game* (1998), and so on. By contrast, the style of the live-action video game *Phantasmagoria* (1995) is characterized as a "Third-Person Graphic Adventure."[4] The expression is no longer used by *AMG*, but a few years ago, the style of *The Beast Within: A Gabriel Knight Mystery* (1995), another live-action game by Sierra similar to *Phanstamagoria*, was called "first person/cinematic adventure." As Adams said, all kinds of weird stuff here.

Obviously, games using live-action video rely on narrative and film conventions that could be analyzed. But for someone studying film, those aspects of the interactive movie are not of great interest. Even if a game such as *Urban Runner* (1996) claimed to have a script as good as a Hitchcock movie, interactive movies look much like B-grade films. The general plotline revolves around fighting some sort of evil spirit in order to save the world, save people your avatar knows, or save the avatar himself. All the genre clichés are used in order to facilitate the gamer's participation.[5] Except in longer, elaborate cut-scenes that still show nothing aesthetically new, the mise en scène and the montage are pretty basic. The rhythm and pace of the action is continually interrupted in order to make more of the gamer's decisions. As far as photography is concerned, live actors are usually shot in front of a blue or a green screen. Because 3-D computer graphics of those games (and of this period) are not photorealistic and lighting on actors does not always match the backgrounds, the virtual environments really look like layers added afterward.[6] From Chris Jones himself playing the detective he has created in the *Tex Murphy* series, to numerous unknown B-grades actors, the acting in interactive movies is very noticeable, but not for good reasons. Even when big name stars *are* involved, the result is often dubious.[7] On the whole, as Celia Pearce straightforwardly stated, "It is almost impossible to match the production, acting, and writing quality of film in a CD-ROM. Misguided attempts to do so have yielded such eminently unmemorable experiences as the *Johnny Mnemonic* game, whose mediocrity was rivaled only by the film on which it was based."[8]

Indeed, the film scholar will rapidly find that the media convergence between film and game was not well received in video game circles. For instance, even if *Phantasmagoria* was one of the top sellers of 1995, *Computer Games Magazine* called "this hotly-anticipated game 'overblown, unintentionally hilarious and incredibly dull,' labeling it a 'disaster.' "[9] The interactivity of interactive movies is described as selective, branching-type, or menu-based.

Most importantly, it is a closed interactivity in which "the user plays an active role in determining the order in which already-generated elements are accessed."[10] The interactivity in question is in fact an illusion.

> While the ideology of a self-selected narrative and open-ended storyline suggests freedom and choice, this is precisely what interactive cinema strives to conceal. The user colludes with being a "player", whose freedom can be summed up as: "you can go wherever you like, so long as I was there before you"—which is of course precisely also the strategy of the "conventional" story-teller (or narrational agency) whose skill lies in the ability to suggest an open future at every point of the narrative, while having, of course, planned or "programmed" the progress and the resolution in advance.[11]

Like the interactive narrative in general, the interactive movie is seen as an oxymoron. It is not possible to tell a story by putting the storytelling in the hands of the spectator. And the linearity of a story is going against the nonlinear nature of a game. Daniel Ichbiah has perfectly summarized this duality:

> . . . the genre "interactive movie" has lost its letters of nobility and its evocation arouses as much enthusiasm as an eruption of acne. It would seem that neither genre, cinema or game, really win with this mixture. When the gamer sees the action interrupted in order for him to choose the sequence of the movie, a share of what made *thrillers* interesting—the continuity—fails. And those who like the elation obtained by good gameplay lose patience when filmed sequences last forever.[12]

In the cyclical organization of the game, viewing is privileged over acting in the interactive movie. But playing a game is not about viewing a movie with a joystick in hand.

After all is said and done, the failure of the interactive movie seems to be total. But it need not be so if we look the other side of the picture. Interactive movies demonstrate that it is not always pertinent to try to "repurpose" the analytical and theoretical tools of other fields, in this case film studies, when studying video games. It is certainly not the film or the narrative part that is worth examining. Any researcher interested in video games should concentrate on the game aspect. One can never emphasize enough the importance and pertinence of Gonzalo Frasca's call for a ludology, a "discipline that studies games and play activities,"[13] and video games in particular. I'm following such a course here. From this perspective, the gameplay of the interactive movie makes itself conspicuous. As rudimentary and ultimately dull for the video game connoisseur as it might be, it still necessitates a particular activity in order to transcend the movie. This essay will analyze and characterize this activity, and more specifically the kind of player it necessitates. The reason is simple: "not only play taken as such refers to the player, but there is

240 · Bernard Perron

no play without a player. Play implies the playing."[14] Since my thinking is very much motivated by one of the last interactive movies produced, *Tender Loving Care* (1999), my analysis of this game will be much longer. However, as with any inductive reasoning process, my specific observations lead to a broader theory.[15]

A Question of Attitude

If, as Huizinga wrote at the beginning of *Homo Ludens: A Study of Play-Element in Culture*, "any thinking person can see at glance that play is a thing on its own,"[16] it is not so easy to define the scope of this "own." "Play" and "game" are used in various contexts, looked at from a wide range of points of view and studied by many disciplines. But when we talk about play in general, and Huizinga pointed it out right after the comment I have just quoted, it should never be forgotten that, "in acknowledging play you acknowledge mind, for whatever else play is, it is not matter."[17] It is the player's state and presence of mind that determine this free activity and make acceptable the given though arbitrary rules. The fun of play is the fun of the player. This is one of the fundamental characteristic of play and games. Furthermore, in his famous book *Les jeux et les hommes* (translated *Man, Play, and Games*), it is the player's attitude that Roger Caillois uses as a principle of classification capable of subsuming the multitude and infinite variety of games. He then proposes

> a division into four main rubrics, depending upon whether, in the games under consideration, the role of competition, chance, simulation, or vertigo is dominant. I call these *agôn, alea, mimicry,* and *ilinx,* respectively. All four indeed belong to the domain of play. One *plays* football, billiards, or chess (*agôn*); roulette or a lottery (*alea*); pirate, Nero, or Hamlet (*mimicry*); or one produces in oneself, by a rapid whirling or falling movement, a state of dizziness and disorder (*ilinx*).[18]

Still, for Caillois, this classification does not cover the entire universe of play. That's why he will place those four types of game on a continuum between two opposite poles.

> At one extreme an almost indivisible principle, common to diversion, turbulence, free improvisation, and carefree gaiety is dominant. It manifests a kind of uncontrolled fantasy that can be designated by the term *paidia.* At the opposite extreme, this frolicsome and impulsive exuberance is almost entirely absorbed or disciplined by a complementary, and in some respects inverse, tendency to its anarchic and capricious nature: there is a growing tendency to bind it with arbitrary, imperative, and purposely tedious conventions, to oppose it sill more by ceaselessly practicing the most embarrassing chicanery upon it, in order to make it more uncertain of attaining its desired effect. This latter principle is completely

> impractical, even though it requires an ever greater amount of effort, patience, skill, or ingenuity. I call this second component *ludus*.[19]

By doing so, Caillois introduces the bipolarity of the range of games accepted, according to French specialist Michel Picard,[20] by all human sciences and widely used, for example by Picard himself in his analysis of reading, and myself regarding the playful dimension of cinema,[21] Andrew Darley in his study of new media genres,[22] and Frasca when he looks at video games. These two modes of activity are differentiated by the term "play" in the English language, referring to the mode deploying itself freely in a way that is conceived as it unfolds like in the creative playing of a child,[23] and by "game," which is the mode defining itself by rules that order its course. Following the definitions of French philosopher Andre Lalandé, while keeping with Caillois's terminilogy, Frasca defines the two activities as follows:

> *Paidia* is "*Prodigality of physical or mental activity which has no immediate useful objective, nor defined objective, and whose only reason to be is based in the pleasure experimented by the player.*"
>
> *Ludus* is a particular kind of *paidia*, defined as an "*activity organized under a system of rules that defines a victory or a defeat, a gain or a loss.*"[24]

This fundamental duality allows one to delineate the particular forms that the gameplay can take and the playful or ludic activity this latter institutes. I am, here, more interested in the player's experience and the attitudes he or she may have. Contrary to Frasca, though these two English terms are often used until now without differentiation, I will still refer to play/player and game/gamer, for reasons that will follow. The pertinence of such utilization becomes apparent the moment one perceives that the two extremities discussed here are contained within the term "gameplay" itself.

It is also important to note that the attitude of the player is taken to be a consciously chosen one. As Jacques Henriot has shown, "distance is the initial form of play."[25]

> To play, it is necessary to know how to enter into the game. To enter in the game, it is necessary to know that it is a game. There must be, therefore, on the part of the one that starts to play, a preliminary comprehension of the sense of the game. The ludic attitude, as with all attitudes, is taken on. As with all attitudes, it is understood.[26]

The player then knows that the rules of a given game (or even of play, as we'll see) will limit his moves. But he accepts those by playing. More important, maybe, the ludic attitude implies "an intention of illusion"; illusion (*in-lusio*) meaning nothing less than beginning a game, recalls Caillois. Again, interactive movies demarcate this boundry clearly. The player knows his or her choices might be very limited and that his or her freedom will be

controlled in some ways but will act as if these were not. The "as if" is referring to the *mimicry,* the role-playing considered to be the heart of the video game's experience. In that sense, the clarification made by Janet Murray is really important:

> The pleasurable surrender of the mind to an imaginative world is often described, in Coleridge's phrase, as "the willing suspension of disbelief." But this is too passive a formulation even for traditional media. When we enter a fictional world, we do not merely "suspend" a critical faculty; we also exercise a creative faculty. We do not suspend disbelief so much as we actively *create belief.* Because of our desire to experience immersion, we focus our attention on the enveloping world and we use our intelligence to reinforce rather than to question the reality of the experience.[27]

The pleasure of playing also depends on "being played." Marshall McLuhan, among others, has observed: "A game is a machine that can get into action only if the players consent to become puppets for a time."[28]

The Gamer

In the video game industry, the player is called a "gamer" (usually designated as either casual or hardcore). Accordingly, in order to make a clear distinction, it would be preferable to talk about "movie games" instead of "interactive movies"[29] when talking about those live-action video games[30] (and talk in particular about 2-D movie games, which refers to full-motion video arcade games that were called interactive movies). Seen in a ludic perspective, this delineates, straight off, an activity and an attitude toward it.

The gamer of a movie game has to feel he is part of the movie; that he is in the movie. That's where the fun lies. As we know, not only is the gamer lead to identify himself with the main stereotyped character—Tex Murphy, for instance—but this character becomes his surrogate in the diegetic universe, the avatar. Therefore, the gamer is bound to the rules and limits of the game universe and of the gameplay. Caught in a branching structure pattern, more or less complex due to the limitations of the live-action video and more or less random in what could happen next, the gamer remains a pathfinder. The task is clear: explore the diegetic space of the game in order to find various rooms or locations where he will meet people and collect clues, objects and/or tools that will be useful to unfold the plot and kill the evil spirit. For example, Tex Murphy will have to get a silver dollar from Rook, the owner of the pawnshop in front of his place, in order to get in the place where he'll be able to play a game for the ticket that will finally bring him to the Moon Child space station he has to destroy. To play is also to bind oneself, as Henriot would say.

The action of the movie game generally organizes itself in shot-reverse shot combinations in order to leave room for decisions: the avatar is shown (shot), then the things he can look at and use or the places he can go to (reverse shot); a choice is made and the avatar is shown enacting this choice (shot), and so on. In the third-person perspective, the avatar is left immobile in a medium or wide shot. Moving the mouse over the image will make the cursor change or produce a highlight. This indicates that an action can be made. A click on that object or direction will show the avatar enacting the action. As was noted, the interactivity of the movie game is menu-based. It is not always as explicit as a dialogue box. Rather, the branching points and the menus are hidden within the picture. Choosing one exit over another will begin a new sequence of action or kill the avatar (*Johnny Mnemonic,* 1995). Moving the cursor over the image reveals the (menu of) objects the gamer has to choose from. In an adventure game, this will create other explicit menus, such as an inventory (*The Dame Was Loaded*) or a series of icons at the bottom of the screen (*The X-Files Game*).

It goes without saying that movie games (and a great majority of video games) lean toward the *ludus* pole. Although *ludus* is considered a pole that can amalgamate the four game rubrics, Caillois nevertheless distinguishes it from *agôn*:

> The difference from *agôn* is that in *ludus,* the tension and skill of the player are not related to any explicit feeling of emulation or rivalry: the conflict is with the obstacle, not with one or several competitors.[31]

Except for the first live-action arcade shooting games such as *Mad Dog McCree* (1990) and a few other live-action video games with the same shooting arcadelike episodes (such as *Eraser Turnabout* and *Hardlin*e, both from 1996), movie games are far from being about competiton (*agôn*) of the shoot-'em-up against computer-controlled opponents or against other hardcore gamers style.[32] The gamer toils much more to get through a zigzag narrative. Through problems, puzzles, tests, examinations, and/or simple questions, the gameplay's main purpose in an adventure game is to control the progression of discovery of a causal chain of events. In Caillois's terms, more embarrassing chicaneries render the gamer increasingly uncertain of attaining his desired effect. The stake is to get to the end of the adventure, that is, to win the game. But this will depend on the performance of the gamer. Thus, movie games require an amount of effort, patience, skill, or ingenuity. The gamer has to reflect, make decisions, and perform certain actions until he or she finds success. Tex Murphy might for instance try more than once to win the game he has to play in order to stay alive and get his ticket to the Moon Child. Those purposely tedious moments recall the *ludus* element of the game: "… the pleasure experienced in solving a problem arbitrarily

designed for this purpose also intervenes, so that reaching a solution has no other goal than personal satisfaction for its own sake."[33] The gamer goes for the challenge. Considered too easy to traverse, movie games were not greatly respected by experienced adventurers. But the fact that movie games were and are still not well regarded by the video game connoisseur allows one to take a look at the person who plays outside the territory of those enthusiasts expert in the realm of video game playing.

The Player

It is imperative we distinguish those "movie games" from the "interactive movies" that might not fit the usual marketing appellation of the video game industry. For instance, *Tender Loving Care* (1999), designed by Rob Landeros and directed by David Wheeler, who fathered the movie *The 11th Hour* (1995) together, and *The 7th Guest* (1993), created by Landeros on his own, does not fit the broad description of the "movie game" I have just outlined. The concept is something quite different, a concept that Landeros and Wheeler revived with slight changes in *Point of View: An Interactive Movie* (2001). Because I could not see how this would attract and satisfy a gamer, I had to discern the attitude and the state of mind of the person who would play it. To pursue my argument, I will therefore refer not to a gamer but to a player when talking about the interactive movie. *Tender Loving Care* helps clarify this distinction.

Tender Loving Care is one of the last productions to try to mix live-action video with a certain amount of gameplay. It is also one of the first interactive movies to be made available on standard DVD format,[34] inaugurating the trend of releasing arcade and PC games such as *Sherlock Holmes, Consulting Detective* (1999, a movie game from 1991), *Mad Dog McCree* (2001) and *Dragon's Lair* (2002, the famous arcade 2-D movie game from 1983) for normal DVD players, which are seen as another—possible[35]—gaming platform. There are two ways to see this adaptation: as a way to attract movie viewers to the interactive gaming world, or a way to make the interactive concept break into movie DVD rental and sales. Although the degree of storytelling and gameplaying may vary, *Tender Loving Care* is certainly more a story and less a game. If *The 7th Guest* had more gameplay time than movie time, the inverse is true here. The player literally views the movie with the remote in hand. There is no complex branching structure behind it. As Landeros describes it: "TLC doesn't branch, it bulges."[36] The narrative is linear but punctuated by slight differences: short scenes are added or removed, lines of dialogue change, scenes are done in different ways, or, and it is certainly a dimension on which the designers have played, erotic scenes are more or less explicit. Yet, those differences depend on

gameplay section choices, rudimentary and of limited number[37] as they may be.

But let me describe the opening of the interactive movie. Arriving in front of a house for sale, Dr. Turner, a psychiatrist played by John Hurt, looks around and then speaks directly to the camera. He tells the player that something strange happened in the house. Even if Dr. Turner was close to all the protagonists in this event, it is as much a mystery to him as it is for anyone. Then, he addresses the player: "Perhaps you can help. A fresh eye and an uncluttered view. And maybe together we can reassemble the happenings and have a better understanding of what took place. We can only hope." The events to be understood concern a couple, Michael and Allison Overtone. The first scene shows the arrival of Kathryn Randolph, a nurse/therapist coming to live with the couple for a while in order to nurse Allison, who acts as if their young daughter, an only child—dead in a family car accident—is still alive. Michael shows Kathryn her room. The psychiatric nurse, who was recommended to the couple by Dr. Turner, is so eager to meet her patient that she forces Michael out of the room by walking toward him while starting to get undressed. When the room's door closes, Dr. Turner reappears and initiates the three phases of gameplay.

First, there is an exit poll consisting of four to nine questions. While giving his own thoughts and theories about what's going on, Dr. Turner asks that players give their opinions on some of the things they have just seen (Was it a good idea to make Jody's room look "lived-in"?—I agree, I disagree, or I have no opinion; Do you believe Michael has ever been unfaithful?—Yes, No, or I have no opinion, etc.) and their impressions about the characters (Dr. Turner is hiding something.—I agree, I disagree, or I have no opinion; Which of the following best describes the way Kathryn appeared in the (nurse) uniform?—Angelic, Seductive, Powerful, Sinister, or Professional; etc.). He also addresses intimate and provocative questions to the player (A term that might describe my own sexuality would be?—Repressed, Average, Healthy, or Overpowering; How do you feel in the company of highly intelligent people?—Intimidated, Stimulated, Superior, Humiliated, or Comfortable ; etc.). Once these first questions are answered, the player is free to explore the Overtone's House, rendered in 3-D,[38] by choosing a room and navigating through arrow keys: looking at what's around the house, books, magazines, and TV or radio programs; rummaging in the character's private belongings such as diaries, e-mails, letters, professional files, Kathryn's commentaries on her microcassette recorder, and so on; and encountering characters who will directly share their feelings and thoughts.[39] When the player has terminated this exploration, he or she must then look for a spiral figure that will start a TAT, standing for "Thematic Apperception Test." The first time, Dr. Turner prepares the player. He says: "Sit back and clear

your cluttered mind. Let your thoughts go free, and leave your inhibitions behind." Then he shows some paintings, photographs, or drawings and asks between fourteen to twenty-nine questions about them and about the player themselves. Since it is a personality test, the questions are incredibly varied (Who is watching her (a painting showing a woman seen in a room through a window)?—A Passerby, A Peeping Tom, A Killer, The Artist, or Me; The artist who painted this (an abstract painting)—Is insane, Has a unique vision, Has some "issues" to deal with, Is a genius; If I was stuck behind the lines in enemy territory, I would most want to have—A gun, A white flag, A map, or A cyanide capsule; The best game to play at a birthday party is—Pin the tail on the donkey, Hit the piñata, Pass the orange, Croquet, or Spin the bottle; etc.). Curiously, Steve Ramsey, a reviewer from *Quandary Computer Game Reviews* said about this TAT: "When you have had enough exploring, you must find the hotspot that generates the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) (Dr. Turner will tell you where to look.) You "leave" the game and the good doctor shows you images and asks you questions, again some of them quite intimate."[40] But in fact, as we'll see, this is a fundamental part. Once the test ends, the movie resumes and the next story episode (lasting between four to ten minutes!) will be altered by all the answers given. This process will be repeated fifteen times during the interactive movie in order for the player to get to one of the four main endings.

The events, into which the player has to look, have already taken place. The whole dichotomy between story and discourse or narrative (between *histoire* and *récit* in French) then keeps its significance. One knows that interactivity unfolds at that very moment. When the gamer interacts in a game, it is always in the here-and-now. It's real time. What is happening can be changed, that is the story, but not the order, duration, or frequency of this happening. The gamer is cut off from all the narrative possibilities of the discourse, the main reason for the presence and existence of the cut-scenes. Not being able to occur at the same time, interactivity and storytelling are well separated in *Tender Loving Care*. Contrary to the gamer of movie games, the player remains outside the diegetic world. Position is reaffirmed by questions asked and direct address to the camera that calls on and reminds the player that he is watching. The same strategy is used in the interactive movie *I'm Your Man* (1998, originally released in 1992[41]), in which the three main protagonists question the player about what branch the action, placed in the present this time, should take. The role of the player is to react to story episodes, not to enact them. *Tender Loving Care* is not based on the action of players, but on *re*actions. As opposed to the gamer who has at the same time to find out details about his avatar (for example, the agent the gamer embodies in *The X-Files Game* has "forgotten" his password to log into the FBI system right at the beginning of the game[42]), the diegetic world and the plot, the player of

Tender Loving Care concentrates on his perception of the main characters. They all seem to hide something. What really are Kathryn's intentions? What is her relationship with Dr. Turner? Is Michael the loving husband he seems to be? This set of questions the player is being asked or asks of himself or herself during the gameplay sections is different from those of a gamer who must figure out how to get out of a room they've just entered (as at the beginning of *Urban Runner* for example).

Relying on the standard and basic DVD menu structure, the idea of the questionnaire in *Tender Loving Care* truly shows that the interactive movie (and interactive narratives in general) is more about hyperselectivity than interactivity, more about multiple choices (even true/false in movie games where a bad choice kills your avatar) than developed and open-ended answers. The questionnaire conceals neither the significance nor the range of choices. It is about controlling the unfolding of the movie, not the things inside the diegetic world. The player is capable of commenting *on* the movie, not intervening *in* the movie. As to Landeros and Wheeler's own aims, their production "provide[s] a form of gameplay in [a] non-game experience."[43] This is the whole point, the material is more about a play experience.

Having based the gameplay on the reactions rather than on the actions of the players, Landeros and Wheeler did not have to script the interactor. They did not have to ask themselves what to do so that the player would be correctly positioned when the dramatic climax would be ready to take place. Actually, the only place where the player controls action is during their exploration of the house. The potential of the interactive process of navigation is then exploited. This phase, which allows one to take a look behind the scenes of the drama and to seek clues there about the characters, is the sole situation left for the gamer who, moreover, sees it that way.[44] But it is not an obligatory phase. The effort demanded by the gameplay of the interactive film is really not huge. It concerns choosing among certain options. Rewards are not exceptional compared to the video game that offers substantial rewards; access to a superior level, to a best arsenal, to a best score, and so on. In *Tender Loving Care,* the rewards are always only other film sequences. The only appraisal players will have is a more or less detailed psychological profile of themselves at the end.[45]

It is clear that interactive movies, as opposed to movie games, lean toward the *paidia* pole. This mode of playful activity deploys itself freely. To return to Caillois's definition, an indivisible principle, common to diversion, turbulence, free improvisation, and carefree gaiety is dominant. *Paidia* manifests a kind of uncontrolled fantasy. As we have seen, at the beginning of the first TAT, Dr. Turner tells the player "to clear your cluttered mind, to let your thoughts go free and leave your inhibitions behind."

He thus institutes a free play in which the player has to let themselves go. There will be no hard thinking, no wrong answers, subsequently no need to cheat to be able to continue (but end codes might be needed by someone who wishes to see all endings). In addition, it is possible for the player to change their manner of answering in the course of the play, going from a conservative one (answering that heaven is a beautiful place, and not an harem or a golf course) to a more shameless one (confessing that one likes watching other people have sex). Besides, as few reviewers have noted, the logic behind the questionnaire of *Tender Loving Care* is really not obvious.[46] In Caillois's classification, this refers to the *alea,* the game of dice. To use another definition of the word "play" as in "a wheel has some play in it," meaning that it's rather loose, we would say that "there is play" between the player's answers to the questionnaire. The player knows that the gameplay section actualizes the narrative, but does not know how. The distinction is made by Wheeler himself; *Tender Loving Care* is "an adventure in which the choices are subliminal and intuitive as opposed to deductive or rational. Subconscious as opposed to solution-oriented."[47] The TAT is based directly on random access. But this randomness is not negative. In this case, "the purpose of interactivity is to keep the textual machine running so that the text may unfold its potential and actualized its virtuality."[48] One knows the questions of the TAT hide the computer codes, codes that will determine the way the next story episode will unfold. By answering the questionnaire, the player sets up one of the few possible outcomes and one of the endings. As in *The Sims* (2000), there is no total control over the results of player management. "Furthermore, the impossibility of impact on the cinematic is one of the sources of our pleasure in it. . . . Our distress will not influence [the characters'] behaviour."[49] That's why, despite what Steve Ramsay said about the TAT not being part of the game, it is a fundamental part of the gameplay. Since the player must choose one answer, without foreseeing the cause-and-effect relationship between choice and action, the player may let his or her fantasies reign.

After this analysis of *Tender Loving Care,* it is necessary to introduce some shades of gray into this somewhat stark notion of free play. According to Andrew Darley, who studied video games along with digital cinema and special venues attractions, the genres of visual digital culture cannot lean toward *paidia* or early or "ideal" manifestations of playing.

> Not only are they [the certain kinds of rudimentary play principle in operation in the genre of visual digital culture] further removed from the direct (imaginative and physical) control of the player, but they are also to an increasing extent mechanised (made more mechanistic) by their inscription in the expressions and genres in questions. The element of creative control and imaginative

> spontaneity that is attached to true play—"child's play"—is diluted. . . . Another way of putting this might be to say that the play principles in the forms of visual digital culture have been subjected to further processes of instrumentalisation.[50]

Obviously, players are not free in the sense that they may do anything they want, and this is even more true in games as closed and structured as an interactive movie. We are indeed far from the anarchic side associated with Caillois's *paidia* and the pure creativity at the heart of Winnicott's child playing. We are still talking about games. The type of game that is generally referred to as most faithfully approximating the liberty and the creativity of this pole is the MMORPG, in which players personify characters inhabiting a virtual universe that they themselves make evolve. But, by contrast, it is necessary to take into account the fundamental distance or detachment of play. As Darley says, after the McLuhan quote I've mentioned, and others, "it is not incorrect to say that it is the spectator who is 'played with.' "[51] In a ludic perspective, players know they are playing and being played. But that does not change the attitude they're invited to have and the illusion they maintain. Faced with the alternatives presented, restricted though they may be, the player selects the one preferred. It is not necessary to contemplate at length to decide if Kathryn is manipulative in *Tender Loving Care* or if one is going to follow a character escaping by a window or return with another to the party in *I'm Your Man*. The course undertaken to that point can influence decisions, as the actions of the characters will have predetermined effects, but one is not obliged to uphold a considered judgment. The player is making improvised decisions as they are required. The interactive movie interrupts itself only momentarily.[52] It does not remain blocked at a given stage because the player missed an element, a clue or some information. What is more, in Grahame Weinbern's conception of interactive cinema, while the player has some control over what is onscreen, being able to change the stream by freely touching the screen of *Sonata* (1991/1993) for example, the movie itself does not stop at all.[53] But still, the player has to make a decision within a regulated structure. This is fundamental. Like Frasca so relevantly pointed out, play, like games, is also predicated on strict rules: a child, for example, does not play an aircraft's pilot the same way he or she plays a doctor. This is not, there-fore, what distinguishes the two types of playful activity, but: "Games have results: they define a winner and a loser; play does not."[54] The player does not play to win or lose or to get a better score. There is no such result. The player does not have to cheat to get to the end. They may be disappointed, but they never lose. If the movie game is like a puzzle, the interactive movie is more a game of construction and editing. It is largely for this reason that interactive cinema in theater does not function. The procedure of the vote introduces

an *agôn* dimension to the improvised behavior of the player, who is more often frustrated at not seeing the movie progress through the turns chosen.

The Player in a Game

The dividing line between *paidia/ludus* or play/game is not as trenchant as it has been presented thus far. Following Henriot, it is necessary to extend the assessment. "We thus have, if one wants to apprehend the "play" phenomenon in its totality, to discern the share of play that enters into the performance of a game."[55] The gamer would then, in the game, take the attitude of a player. It is tempting to introduce the term "playgamer" to refer to this gamer acting as a player in a game, but since the attitude is comparable, I do not think it is necessary.

In her study of the multilinearity and open-form narrative of the movie game *Phantasmagoria,* Angela Ndalianis exposes, in a way, the change of attitude:

> If linearity and character motivation traditionally associated with Hollywood cinema are not the player's predilection (or if the player simply can't work out how to access all options present in the game design), it is possible to produce a narrative that has more in common with art cinema and avant-garde cinema forms of narration and nonnarration. In the case of bad game play, not only is it possible to miss entire portions of narrative action (thereby creating narrative gaps), but it is also possible to focus on actions that are in no way concerned with unraveling a narrative.[56]

The player of Ndalianis is, to begin with, a gamer who is supposed to find the cause-and-effect structures of *Phantasmagoria* and to follow the main character Adrienne's motivation, which is to kill the demon that possesses her husband Don. The gamer becomes a player by going away from these lines of Hollywood narrative form, following Ndalianis's examples, to make Adrienne wander aimlessly around the house and in town, make her eat in the kitchen or look at herself in the numerous mirrors littered around the house, go to the bathroom, comb her hair, put on makeup, or go to the toilet. It is by leaning toward the *paidia* pole, by the simple enjoyment of the doing of the gameplay and of the possibility to play with the movie that the player's activity loosens up the linear and causal relations of the action or focuses on "nonincidents" that undercut the narrative concerns. This produces, according to Ndalianis, art cinema narrative form and avant-garde cinema nonnarrative structures.

Once again, the obvious flaws and limitations of movie games are revealing. Compared to the gamer who will leave the game only upon arriving at the end of its course (unless they are unable to and quit), the player will put

an end to activity when they've had enough. The often quoted assertion of Stuart Moulthrop that describes the reading experience of hypertext applies here: "You are done when it is over for you."[57] But clearly, the player of *Phantasmagoria* would quite rapidly get tired of the little subversive games. That is explained in Frasca's accurate distinction:

> If *ludus* can be related to narrative plot, *paidia* can be related to the narrative settings. The ability to perform *paidia* activities is determined by the environment and the actions. By environment we mean the space where the player is (real, as in a school playground, or virtual, as in a videogame). The environment includes topology, objects, and other characters.[58]

Movie games are more about narrative plot than about environment. The live-action avatar can only do the actions that have been filmed (comb her hair as Adrienne). Nor does the virtual environment of movie games have the power of fascinating fabulous 3-D scenery. For instance, because there are no monsters, zombies, or enemies running after you, anyone playing one of the games of the *Myst* series generally ends up wandering around the island for the sake of the graphics, thus forgetting the goal of the search for a while. Moreover, one can see the evolution of video games by underlining the analogy used by the designers of *Grand Theft Auto III* (2001): "For the first time, players are put at the heart of their own gangster movie, and let loose in a full-realized 3 dimensional city, in which anything can happen and probably will."[59] We are here far from the linearity and light randomness of the movie game. And in the cyclical organization of the game, acting is now privileged over viewing. Referring to Janet Murray's description of digital environments, *Grand Theft Auto III*'s Liberty City is as interactive (procedural and participatory) as immersive (spatial and encyclopedic).[60] What makes the success of such a driving-shooting-action-mission-simulation game is that there is as much for the gamer that has to accomplish specific missions to do as there is for the player who wants to wander the city and just go on committing various criminal acts. And with *Grand Theft Auto III,* we truly find the turbulence, free improvisation, anarchic play, frolicsome and impulsive exuberance associated with *paidia.*

The Gameplayer

Insofar as it is possible to act like a player in a movie game, it would be possible to play like a gamer during an interactive movie by, for example, trying to go through every gameplay section of *Tender Loving Care* within a minute or to find the right combination of answers in order to get the most explicit erotic scenes.[61] But there is a much more important gamer's attitude to underline.

In showing that *Phantasmagoria* could lead to the production of other types of cinema, Ndalianis notes without underscoring it that this production came from "bad game play." From this angle, the share of play that enters in the performance of a game could be understood in the light of Winnicott's observations of the child's positive social attitude toward playing: "This attitude must include recognition that playing is always liable to become frightening. Games and their organization must be looked at as part of an attempt to forestall the frightening aspect of playing."[62] Aside from the social fear that shoot-'em-ups and video games arouse in general, this highlights the notion of control and regulation. The attitude of the player in a game, we should repeat, cannot transform itself into the pure play of a free child playing. There are rules to follow. The *ludus,* noted Caillois, disciplines the *paidia.* Nevertheless, thoses rules can be perverted or transgressed. For instance, in *The X-Files Game,* if your avatar is pointing a gun at a colleague, they'll unavoidably tell you not do that or ask what's the matter with you. If you shoot, your avatar will be seen in the traditional photo session before going to jail and that will make the game end. If you decide to shoot the wall instead, or handcuff anyone for fun, your superior will reprimand you and ask for your badge. But those transgressions do not lead very far in movie games. However, they're becoming more and more eclectic. Espen Aarseth has described perfectly the change in question:

> The fourth layer of the model, the user, is of course external to the design of the cybertext but not to its strategy. In the early adventure games, this strategy assumed an ideal reader, who would solve all the riddles of the text and thereby extricate the one definite, intended plotline. Eventually, this strategy changed, and now the reader's role is becoming less ideal (both in a structural and a moral sense) and more flexible, less dependable (hence more responsible), and freer. The multiuser, programable cybertext instigates a more worldwise, corruptible reader; a Faust, compared to the Sherlock Holmes of the early adventure games.[63]

Beyond simple cheating, taking the attitude of being a cheater, the gamer will try to take all possible advantage of the gameplay. He will test the limits of the game. It will not be a question of playing the game but of playing freely *with* the game. The attitude that characterizes the two poles of the range of games will, so to speak, merge in what we might call a gameplayer, a meta-player that will literally make their own game of the game. The gameplayer can drop the mandatory missions in *Grand Theft Auto III* and concentrate on specific actions that, compared to those of *Phantasmagoria,* can look like real challenges that can be achieved or not. It might not be possible to swim at the beaches of Liberty City, but there plenty of other things to do. For example, the gameplayer can try by all means to get inside the Bush Stadium of Staunton Island by flying over it or by piling up cars in order to get over

the frontage or to become a sniper hidden and waiting in ambush on the roof of a building to kill the most possible people for the purpose of raising the wanted level and triggering some sort of counterattacks by the police and the army. As the gamer who will post his walkthrough of a game, the gameplayer will show his "gameplay tricks." As an example, the gameplayers playing with *Halo* (2001) all take advantage of the procedural authorship of the digital environment that creates a world of possibilities.[64] Some are putting bodies in trees, others making vehicles jump over a hill or get to areas not yet documented or reached.[65] Some tricks take even weeks to accomplish.[66] The gameplayer uses a great amount of effort, skill or ingenuity to win a challenge that they have set for themselves of their own free will.

Coming to Terms

A new field of study often relies on neologisms in order to create its own terminology. The new words then allow us to talk more precisely about the aspects and concepts related to it. In the case of ludology, it might be relevant to do so, but it might also be important to clarify the utilization of terms already in use. As Seymour Chatman assumed in his book *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film,* from which I derived the title of my conclusion:

> . . . every discipline needs periodically to examine its terms. For terms are not mere tags: they represent—in some sense, even constitute—a theory. By scrutinizing its terms, we test and clarify the concepts that a theory proposes. Through that clarification we can better decide whether they help or hinder our work.[67]

The term "gamer," which dates from 1620–1630, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary,* refers to "one who hunts game."[68] It is associated with two other words that, ultimately, have greater bearing on the subject, the "gamester" and the "gamner," both of which define a player at any game. In Samuel Johnson's *A Dictionary of English Language (1755),* the term "gamester" is defined as the "one who is vitiously [*sic*] addicted to play."[69] But there is no mention of "gamer." Nowadays, video games have popularized the usage of this latter term, as "gameplay." In the same way, the study of games and video games in particular is actually putting the emphasis on the bipolarity of the range of games. Therefore, studying video games might bring a better understanding of ludic attitudes and lead to a more rigorous utilization of the terminology. For instance, to be precise, we should talk about the gamer of a chess game, whether on traditional board or on computer. Whether hardcore or casual, the gamer enjoys the challenge and wants to win the game. Otherwise, this might be a coincidence coming under the general utilization of the term, although the observation is really

not based on a scientific survey as I did not look to a great number of interviews. Will Wright, creator of the *SimCity* series and *The Sims,* really does talk more about the players than the gamers of his *paidia* video games.[70] What makes *Grand Theft Auto III* a great video game is that it is designed for all gamers, players, and gameplayers.

Obviously, the distinction between players, gamers, and gameplayers that I've just made works perfectly in many languages but not in English. To resort, for example, to these English words instead of only "joueur" in French stresses right away the type of attitude and activity at stake. But, as these terms are used without distinction and consideration in English, and as outside hardcore academic theoretical thinking "player" remains the common word used to refer to someone who engages in some game, it might be necessary— and it is easily enough done—to rereplicate their meaning by associating them with Caillois's increasingly well-known poles. As we would talk about *paidia* and *ludus* video games, we would then talk about the *paidia* player, the *ludus* gamer and the *ludus* gameplayer. However, it is certainly one of the tasks and goals of ludology to discipline the free and anarchic use of play and games related terms.[71]

Notes

1. Since full-motion video (FMV) is also applied to 2-D and 3-D animation games such as *Blade Runner* (1997), for instance, I prefer to refer to live-action video in order to make it clear I'm talking about movies.
2. However, since video games are largely compared to cinema, *Myst* is, for instance, considered to be an interactive movie by Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin in *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, [1999] 2002), 96. By contrast, in showing that video games are strongly seen as the extension of narrative, Gonzalo Frasca notes that "recent games such as *Metal Solid Gear 2* do really try to look and behave like an 'interactive movie.'" See "Simulation 101: Simulation versus Representation" (2001). Available online at <http://www.ludology.org/articles/sim1/simulation101.html>.
3. Ernest W. Adams, "The Challenge Of The Interactive Movie," *1995 Computer Game Developers' Conference.* Available online at <http://www.designersnotebook.com/Lectures/Challenge/challenge.htm>.
4. Here's how those two kinds of "style" are described by the video games section of *AMG* (<http://www.all.game.com>): (1) "The Interactive Movie uses full-motion video as a means to tell the story. In general, these titles require the user to make certain decisions that will help determine which subsequent video clips will be seen. Wrong choices will typically end the game, while correct choices will have the adventure continue until it is eventually completed"; and (2) "The Third-Person Graphic Adventure has traditionally been one of the most popular styles of adventure games, and it involves guiding a character (who is always visible on the screen) through a number of graphic settings that help illustrate the story. Many games in this style feature groups of words somewhere on the screen that can be strung together to form commands. These words are then selected through the use of an input device such as a mouse or joystick."
5. As Janet Murray said: "The more filmic CD-ROMs rely on later formulaic genres such as the murder mystery or the horror film. Genre fiction is appropriate for electronic narrative because it scripts the interactor. When I begin a CD-ROM murder mystery, I know I am supposed to question all the characters I meet about what they were doing at the time of the

WOLF, Mark J.P. and Bernard PERRON (dir.). THE VIDEO GAME THEORY READER, New York and London, Routeldge, 2003.

From Gamers to Players and Gameplayers · **255**

murder and keep track of all the suspects' alibis. I will use whatever primitives I am given (navigation through the space, conducting an interview, picking up pieces of evidence and looking at them under a microscope, etc.) for enacting these prescripted scenes. In a Western adventure I can be counted on to try to hoot at the bad guys, and in a horror story I will always enter the haunted house. I perform these actions not because I have read a rule book but because I have been prepared to do so by exposure to thousands of stories that follow these patterns." In *Hamlet on the Holodeck: The Future of Narrative in Cyberspace* (New York: The Free Press, 1997), 192.

6. For technical insights on the use of FMV, as for critical and historical perspective on the subject, see Ben Waggoner and Halstead York, "Video in Games: The State of the Industry," *Gamasutra.com* (January 3, 2000). Available online at <http://www.gamasutra.com/features/20000103/fmv_01.htm>.

7. Take, for instance, this critic of *Ripper* (1996): "The game's most famous cast member, Christopher Walken, is inexcusably bad as Detective Vincent Magnotta—a cop with a violent past and a personal connection to the Ripper. After Walken's convincing and powerful cinematic performances in movies such as *The Deer Hunter* and *The Dead Zone,* this largely amateurish portrayal makes you wonder what could have led to such a debacle. Did he know his lines before he stepped in front of the camera? Was the budget so tight that there was only one take of each scene? Did the director misread the script as much as Walken did? Does Walken consider acting in an interactive project a small-time gig with an unimportant audience?" Jeffrey Adam Young, "Ripper," *Gamespot.com* (January 5, 1996). Available online at <http://www.gamespot.com>.

8. Celia Pearce, "Story as Play Space: Narrative in Games," in *Game On: The History and Culture of Videogames,* ed. Lucien King (New York: Universe, 2002), 115.

9. *Computer Games Magazine* 120, November 2000, 70.

10. Lev Manovich, *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001), 40.

11. Thomas Elsaesser, "Digital Cinema: Delivery, Event, Time," in *Cinema Futures: Cain, Abel or Cable?,* eds. Thomas Elsaesser and Kay Hoffmann (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998), 217.

12. Daniel Ichbiah, *La saga des jeux vidéo* (Paris: Éditions Générales First–Pocket, 1997), 287. Freely translated.

13. Gonzalo Frasca, "Ludology Meets Narratology: Similitudes and Differences between (Video) Games and Narrative" (1999). Available online at <http://www.jacaranda.org/frasca/ludology.htm>.

14. Jacques Henriot, *Le jeu* (Paris: Synonyme—S.O.R., [1969] 1983), 89. Freely Translated.

15. Since I first wrote the present essay, I have used the same theoretical framework to study the interactive movie, hypervideo, "wovie" (an combination of "web" and "movie") and movie game in a more general perspective. Therefore, while making now a revision, I would like to note that some passages found here have been reused and rewritten to fit in this French essay. See Bernard Perron, "Jouabilité, bipolarité et cinéma interactif," in *Hypertextes. Espaces virtuels de lecture et d'écriture,* eds. Denis Bachand and Christian Vandendorpe (Québec: Nota Bene, 2002).

16. Johan Huizinga, *Homo Ludens. A Study of the Play-Element in Culture* (Boston: Beacon Press, [1938] 1955), 3.

17. Johan Huizinga, *Homo Ludens,* 3.

18. Roger Caillois, *Man, Play, and Games,* trans. Meyer Barash (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, [1958] 1961), 12. Original french edition: *Les jeux et les hommes* (Paris: Nrf Gallimard, 1958).

19. Roger Caillois, *Man, Play, and Games,* 12–13.

20. Michel Picard, "La lecture comme jeu," *Poétique* 58 (March 1984): 253–263. Freely Translated.

21. Bernard Perron, *La Spectature prise au jeu. La narration, la cognition et le jeu dans le cinéma narratif* (Ph.D. thesis, Université de Montréal, 1997).

22. Andrew Darley, *Visual Digital Culture: Surface Play and Spectacle in New Media Genres* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).

23. Authors like Donald Woods Winicott or Henri Atlan are preferring to use the term "playing" to emphasize the creativity of this mode. See Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971) and Henri Atlan, "L'homme-jeu (Winnicott, Fink, Wittgenstein)," in *À tort et à raison* (Paris: Seuil, 1986), 261–293.

24. Frasca, "Ludology Meets Narratology. Similitudes and Differences Between (Video)Games and Narrative."
25. Henriot, *Le jeu,* 79. Freely Translated.
26. Henriot, *Le jeu,* 83. Freely Translated.
27. Janet Murray, *Hamlet on the Holodeck. The Future of Narrative in Cyberspace,* 110.
28. Marshall McLuhan, "Games: The Extensions of Man," in *Understanding Media: The Extension of Man* (New York: McGraw-Hill Books Company, 1964), 238.
29. Indeed, this is indicative of the secondary status accorded to video games, as this makes them sound as though they are aspiring to be movies.
30. Among others, Frank Beau made the distinction in "Joueur versus spectateur," *Cahiers du cinéma* 502 (May 1996): 14.
31. Callois, *Man, Play, and Games,* 29.
32. It is not my subject, and this certainly asks for deeper thoughts, but the shoot-'em-up experience gives the impression that it fits in Caillois's fundamental relationship *mimicry-ilinx.* Even though *mimcry* and *ilinx* presume a world without rules, like the forbidden relationship *agôn-ilinx* since the blind fury the vertigo can cause is a negation of controlled effort and of any ruled environment, the latter description given by Caillois answers the vision and fear people have about this type of game: "The alliance of *mimicry* and *ilinx* leads to an inexorable, total frenzy which in its most obvious forms appears to be the opposite of play, an indescribable metamorphosis in the conditions of existence. The fit so provoked, being uninhibited, seems to remove the player . . . far from the authority, values, and influence of the real world . . ." (In Callois, *Man, Play, and Games,* 75–76.) In our complex and advanced society, the fear of this *mimicry-ilinx* relationship would also be explained by the fact that it's a remainder of more primitive societies. "May it be asserted that the transition to civilization as such implies the gradual elimination of the primacy of *ilinx* and *mimicry* in combination, and the substitution and predominance of the *agôn-alea* pairing of competition and chance? Whether it be cause or effect, each time that an advanced culture succeeds in emerging from the chaotic original, a palpable repression of the powers of vertigo and simulation is verified. They lose their traditional dominance, are pushed to the periphery of public life, reduced to roles that become more and more modern and intermittent, if not clandestine and guilty, or are relegated to the limited and regulated domain of games and fiction where they afford men the same eternal satisfactions, but in sublimated form, serving merely as an escape from boredom or work and entailing neither madness nor delirium." (In Callois, *Man, Play, and Games,* 97.)
33. Callois, *Man, Play, and Games,* 29.
34. It is also available on CD-ROM or DVD-ROM.
35. The failure of the NUON-enhanced DVD player (2000) that wanted to become an alternative gaming platform demonstrates that the technological convergence goes more in one-way: DVD movie playback toward game consoles (as the PS2 and Xbox can play DVDs).
36. Gloria Stern, "What Interactive Media Needs Is TLC: Gloria Stern Talks to Rob Landeros and David Wheeler," *Hollywood Interactive Network* (1997). Available online at <http://hollywoodnet.com/Stern/cyberflicks10.html>.
37. As a matter of fact, the gameplay opportunities being limited to the ends of chapters, the number of questions are as numerous in the first sections as they are in the last. And, yet, beyond the fact that it kept alive the interactivity, it stands to reason that the number should have been less numerous while the suspense was intensifying toward the end.
38. He'll also be able to explore Dr. Turner's office on two occasions. This option has not been repeated in *Point of View: An Interactive Movie,* in which there is no chance to navigate in the apartment of Jane, the main protagonist. However, at the end of each chapter, if he wants, the player will be able to explore some private belongings and other relevant things (around five each time), and/or to encounter the characters that give their thoughts at the given point in the movie (around five each time). Those explorations and encounters that wish to change the player's point of view on the action are really limited and without great repercussions.
39. That is the case in the first exploration if the player visits Kathryn's room. Kathryn speaks into a microcassette recorder, her back to the viewer. She then turns and looks at the camera startled: "Who . . . who are you? . . . And what are you doing in my room? . . . Oh. Oh wait a minute I see . . . You're the . . . uh . . . viewer, right? . . . Huh . . . I didn't realize you could just

sneak up on me like that. I'll have to be more careful, (she grins). . . . Never know what I might be doing . . . Well, I have to meet my patient now. You're probably going to snoop around my room aren't you? Guess there's nothing I can do about it. Oh well, you probably won't find anything too incriminating (she flashes another grin) . . . I hope." She leaves.

40. Steve Ramsey, "*Tender Loving Care,*" *Quandary Computer Game Reviews* (February 2001). Available online at <http://www.quandaryland.com/2001/tlc.htm>.

41. *I'm Your Man* is, with the already mentioned *Mr. Payback,* a production of Interfilm. It was released in few theaters with a three-button joystick that let the audience collectively but, with a "majority rule," decide directions the movie would take. Marketing itself as "the first interactive movie on DVD," it is available since 1998 for home playing.

42. Ernest Adams takes the problem of amnesia as one of the three very serious problems of interactive storytelling. In "Three Problems for Interactive Storytellers," *Gamasutra.com* (December 29, 1999). Available online at <http://www.gamasutra.com/features/designers_notebook/19991229.htm>.

43. Randy Sluganski and Tom Houston, "Interview with Rob Landeros et David Wheeler," *JustAventure.com* (1999). Available online at <http://www.justadventure.com/Interviews/Landeros_and_Wheeler/Landeros_and_Wheeler_Interview.shtm>.

44. For instance, François Taddei describes this phase this way: "Then you will be able to explore freely the surroundings (the house of the couple, the psychiatric clinic) so as to accumulate clues allowing to better understand the emotions lived out the characters." In "Tender Loving Care," *Les Productions 640Kb inc* (May 1999). Available online at <http://micro.info/chronique/chronique.php?Id=123>. Freely Translated.

45. It is, depending on which version is played, the CD-ROM or the DVD-ROM or the DVD video. Because computers can store a great deal of data, the former version provides a much more detailed analysis.

46. For instance, demonstrating that he played the movie only once, Tim Belehrad wrote: "The path of the film, along with plot and character development and even the ending, *are said* to be affected by your answers," in "*Tender Loving Care* is first look at interactive cinema," *The Advocate Online* (September 17, 1999). Available online at <http://www.theadvocate.com/enter/story.asp?StoryID=1613>, my emphasis. This reviewer's example speaks for itself: "It's fascinating and hard to put this thing down—and depending on your responses scenes may unfold differently. For example, there's a scene near the beginning in which Kathryn is undressing in her room, in view of Michael. On the DVD, she appeared naked briefly, while on a subsequent trip through the CD-ROM version she kept her bra on during that scene (which made us wonder which questions we'd answered wrong!)." In "Tender Loving Care and I'm Your Man on DVD: Empowering Movies Put You in the Action," *Technofile.com.* Available online at <http://www.technofile.com/dvds/tlc_yourman.html>. Steve Ramsey went further and wrote: "Unfortunately, there was no cause and effect that was immediately discernible between my answers and the action, and as I watched each scene of the movie I had to take it on faith that my answers were affecting what was happening. In other games, if I use an inventory item to open a door and then tell my character to enter, there is a simple and apparent connection between what I have done and what happens on the screen; in this game the connection is invisible, and whilst it may be far more sophisticated, I felt somewhat detached from the whole thing. You are not asked questions like 'should Michael enter Katherine's room,' nor can you reload a scene and answer the questions differently to see the immediate effect (the game automatically saves when you exit and picks up where you left off next time you play). Only by playing the game again can you observe any differences." In Steve Ramsey, "*Tender Loving Care.*"

47. Randy Sluganski and Tom Houston, "Interview with Rob Landeros et David Wheeler."

48. Marie-Laure Ryan, *Narrative as Virtual Reality. Immersion and Interactivity in Literature and Electronic Media* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 205.

49. Grahame Weinbren, "In the Ocean of Streams of Story," (Interactive Cinema) *Millennium Film Journal* 28 (1995), 19.

50. Andrew Darley, *Visual Digital Culture,* 172.

51. Andrew Darley, *Visual Digital Culture,* 173.

52. However, the player who wishes to quit during playing on DVD Video is given a Session code of eighteen digits that he will have to use to continue the story from the point he left off.

53. Grahame Weinbren, "In the Ocean of Streams of Story."
54. Frasca, "Ludology Meets Narratology: Similitudes and Differences between (Video)Games and Narrative."
55. Henriot, *Le jeu,* 51. Freely Translated.
56. Angela Ndalianis, ""Evil Will Walk Once More": *Phantasmagoria*—The Stalker Film as Interactive Movie?," in *On a Silver Platter. CD-ROMs and the Promises of a New Technology,* ed. Greg M. Smith (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 106–107.
57. Stuart Moulthrop and Sean Cohen, "About the Color of Television" (October 1996). Available online at <http://raven.ubalt.edu/features/media_ecology/lab/96/cotv/cotv_about.html>.
58. Frasca, "Ludology Meets Narratology: Similitudes and Differences between (Video)Games and Narrative."
59. See info at <http://www.rockstargames.com/grandtheftauto3/flash/main.html>.
60. Murray, *Hamlet on the Holodeck. The Future of Narrative in Cyberspace,* 71.
61. "(A)s soon as the *paidia* player determines a goal with winning and losing rules, the activity may becomes a *ludus.*" In Frasca, "Ludology Meets Narratology: Similitudes and Differences between (Video)Games and Narrative."
62. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality,* 50.
63. Espen Aarseth, *Cybertext: Perspectives on Ergodic Literature* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 105.
64. "Authorship in electronic media is procedural. Procedural authorship means writing the rules by which the texts appear as well as writing the texts themselves. It means writing the rules for the interactor's involvement, that is, the conditions under which things will happen in response to the participant's actions. It means establishing the properties of the objects and potential objects in the virtual world and the formulas for how they will relate to one another. The procedural author creates not just a set of scenes but a world of narrative possibilities." In Janet H. Murray, *Hamlet on the Holodeck: The Future of Narrative in Cyberspace,* 152–153.
65. See, among others, <http://halo.bungie.org/tipsntricks/tricks.html>. Thanks to Carl Therrien for the references.
66. "*The Bottom of Halo* with FrogBlast. This took me two weeks to figure out and pull off, after I had the initial idea of turning on the light bridge AFTER getting the banshee. Hopefully, other people can complete this in a single day, following the instructions below. It's probably the most complicated trick to set up, and the easiest to actually perform (you don't even have to move while going down.) Skip to the bottom if you want to see the videos of getting to the bottom of Halo, and exploring the bottom. Continue reading if you would like a detailed description of how to do it. Click on the link directly below if you need help, and would like to see movies of the steps listed below. Enjoy!:)." See <http://yuan.ecom.cmu.edu/utfoo/mission/bottomhalo.htm>.
67. Seymour Chatman, *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 1990), 1.
68. *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).
69. Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of English Language (1755)* (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1968).
70. For instance, the word "gamer" is not to be found in Celia Pearce's long interview with Wright. See "Sims, BattleBots, Cellular Automata, God and Go: A Conversation with Will Wright by Celia Pearce," *Game Studies* 2, no 1 (July 2002). Available online at <http://www.gamestudies.org/0102/pearce/>.
71. Research for this essay was funded by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and one from le Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la société et la culture.