A GAME DESIGN VOCABULARY

Anna ANTHROPY
Naomi CLARK

FREE SAMPLE CHAPTER

SHARE WITH OTHERS

Praise for *A Game Design Vocabulary*

"*A Game Design Vocabulary* succeeds where many have failed—to provide a broad-strokes overview of videogame design. Utilizing analytic smarts, an encyclopedic knowledge of games, and subcultural attitude, Naomi Clark and Anna Anthropy get to the heart of how games work.

"Why is this book important? Videogames are the defining mass medium of our time, yet even those who make games lack a clear language for understanding their fundamental mechanics. *A Game Design Vocabulary* is essential reading for game creators, students, critics, scholars, and fans who crave insight into how game play becomes meaningful."

—**Eric Zimmerman**, Independent Game Designer and Arts Professor, NYU Game Center

"*A Game Design Vocabulary* marks an important step forward for our discipline. Anna Anthropy and Naomi Clark's extraordinarily lucid explanations give us new ways to unpick the complexities of digital game design. Grounded in practical examples and bursting with original thinking, you need this book in your game design library."

—**Richard Lemarchand**, Associate Professor, USC, Lead Designer, *Uncharted*

"Anthropy and Clark have done it! Created an intuitive vocabulary and introduction to game design in a concise, clear, and fun-to-read package. The exercises alone are a great set of limbering-up tools for those new to making games and seasoned designers, both."

—**Colleen Macklin**, Game Designer and Professor, Parsons The New School for Design

"Two of my favorite game design minds sharing a powerful set of tools for designing meaningful games? I'm so excited for this book. *A Game Design Vocabulary* may very well be the best thing to happen to game design education in more than a decade. I can't wait to put this book in the hands of my students and dev friends alike."

—**John Sharp**, Associate Professor of Games and Learning, Parsons The New School for Design

"Some of the greatest challenges to the intelligent advancement of game-making can be found in the ways we conceptualize and discuss them. This simple yet profound new vocabulary is long-overdue and accessible enough to help new creators work within a meaningful framework for games."

—**Leigh Alexander**, Game Journalist and Critic

This page intentionally left blank

A Game Design Vocabulary

This page intentionally left blank

A Game Design Vocabulary

Exploring the Foundational Principles Behind Good Game Design

Anna Anthropy

Naomi Clark

Addison-Wesley

Upper Saddle River, NJ • Boston • Indianapolis • San Francisco
New York • Toronto • Montreal • London • Munich • Paris • Madrid
Capetown • Sydney • Tokyo • Singapore • Mexico City

All terms mentioned in this book that are known to be trademarks or service marks have been appropriately capitalized. The publisher cannot attest to the accuracy of this information. Use of a term in this book should not be regarded as affecting the validity of any trademark or service mark.

Every effort has been made to make this book as complete and as accurate as possible, but no warranty or fitness is implied. The information provided is on an "as is" basis. The authors and the publisher shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damages arising from the information contained in this book.

For information about buying this title in bulk quantities, or for special sales opportunities (which may include electronic versions; custom cover designs; and content particular to your business, training goals, marketing focus, or branding interests), please contact our corporate sales department at corpsales@pearsoned.com or (800) 382-3419.

For government sales inquiries, please contact governmentsales@pearsoned.com.

For questions about sales outside the U.S., please contact international@pearsoned.com.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013956696

Copyright © 2014 Pearson Education, Inc.

All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. This publication is protected by copyright, and permission must be obtained from the publisher prior to any prohibited reproduction, storage in a retrieval system, or transmission in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or likewise. To obtain permission to use material from this work, please submit a written request to Pearson Education, Inc., Permissions Department, One Lake Street, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458, or you may fax your request to (201) 236-3290.

ISBN-13: 978-0-321-88692-7
ISBN-10: 0-321-88692-5

Text printed in the United States on recycled paper at RR Donnelley in Crawfordsville, Indiana.

First printing, March 2014

Animal Crossing, New Super Mario Bros., Nintendo, Wii, and Super Mario Bros. are either trademarks or registered trademarks of either Nintendo of America Inc. or Nintendo in the United States and/or other countries.

Axis & Allies, Monopoly, and Risk are registered trademarks of Hasbro, Inc.

Bioshock and X-Com are registered trademarks of Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc.

Breakout and Pong are registered trademarks of Atari Interactive, Inc.

Castlevania, Dance Dance Revolution, and Track & Field are registered trademarks of Konami Digital Entertainment Co., Ltd.

Chip's Challenge is a registered trademark of Glynlyon, Inc.

Choose Your Own Adventure is a registered trademark of Chooseco LLC.

Cityville and Farmville are registered trademarks of Zynga, Inc.

Consumer Reports is a registered trademark of Consumers Union of United States, Inc., a non-profit organization.

Dig Dug, Pac-Man, and Tekken are registered trademarks of Namco Bandai Games, Inc.

Diner Dash, Egg vs. Chicken, and Plantasia are registered trademarks of PlayFirst, Inc.

Disney is a registered trademark of Disney Enterprises, Inc.

Dungeons & Dragons is a registered trademark of Wizards of the Coast LLC.

Dwarf Fortress is a registered trademark of Tarn Adams.

Fallout: New Vegas is a registered trademark of Bethesda Softworks LLC.

Final Fantasy is a registered trademark of either Kabushiki Kaisha Square Enix Holdings or Square Enix Holdings Co., Ltd in the United States and/or other countries.

Gamepro is a registered trademark of International Data Group, Inc.

Gone Home is a registered trademark of the Fullbright Company LLC.

Guildhall is a registered trademark of Southern Methodist University.

Half-Life and Portal are registered trademarks of Valve Corporation.

Harry Potter is a registered trademark of Warner Bros. Entertainment, Inc.

Hero's Journey is a registered trademark of Joseph Campbell Foundation.

iPad is a registered trademark of Apple, Inc.

Joust and Wizard of Wor are registered trademarks of Warner Bros. Entertainment, Inc.

King's Quest, Spyro, and Zork are trademarks of Activision Publishing, Inc.

Lode Runner is a registered trademark of Tozai, Inc.

Mass Effect is a registered trademark of EA International (Studio and Publishing) Ltd.

Minecraft is a registered trademark of Notch Development AB.

Mr. Do! is a registered trademark of Universal Entertainment Corporation.

Ms. Pac-Man is a registered trademark of Namco Limited Corporation Assignee of Japan.

Penny Arcade Expo is a registered trademark of Penny Arcade, Inc.

Plants vs. Zombies and The Sims are registered trademarks of Electronic Arts, Inc.

Playstation and Uncharted are registered trademarks of either Sony Computer Entertainment, Inc., or Kabushiki Kaisha Sony Computer Entertainment in the United States and/or other countries.

Resident Evil is a registered trademark of Capcom Co., Ltd.

Shadow of the Colossus is a registered trademark of Sony Computer Entertainment America LLC.

Shadowrun is a registered trademark of The Topps Company, Inc.

Space Giraffe is a trademark of Llamasoft.

Space Invaders and Bubble Bobble are registered trademarks of Kabushiki Kaisha Taito.

Spelunky is a registered trademark of Derek Yu.

Tetris is a registered trademark of Tetris Holding, LLC.

The Secret of Monkey Island is a registered trademark of LucasArts Entertainment Company.

The Walking Dead is a registered trademark of AMC Film Holdings LLC.

Triple Town is a registered trademark of Spry Fox.

Warcraft and World of Warcraft are registered trademarks of Blizzard Entertainment, Inc.

Xbox Live is either a trademark or a registered trademark of Microsoft Corporation in the United States and/or other countries.

Editor-in-Chief
Mark Taub

Executive Editor
Laura Lewin

Development Editor
Michael Thurston

Managing Editor
Kristy Hart

Project Editor
Elaine Wiley

Copy Editor
Gill Editorial Services

Indexer
Erika Millen

Proofreader
Anne Goebel

Technical Reviewers
Colleen Macklin
Sarah Schoemann
John Sharp

Publishing Coordinator
Olivia Basegio

Cover Designer
Chuti Prasersith

Book Designer
Bumpy Design

Compositor
Nonie Ratcliff

To Brenda Romero, whose first game project was the first digital game Naomi ever played, and who has always stood up for better design and community in games;

and to Greg Costikyan, whose bold words on independent development and finding vocabulary to design with have been an inspiration to a generation.

Contents at a Glance

Part I Elements of Vocabulary 1
By Anna Anthropy

1 Language 3

2 Verbs and Objects 13

3 Scenes 39

4 Context 77

Part II Conversations 107
By Naomi Clark

5 Creating Dialogue 109

6 Resistance 117

7 Storytelling 155

Appendix A Further Playing 191

Index 203

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Part I Elements of Vocabulary 1
By Anna Anthropy

1 Language 3
Signs Versus Design 4
Failures of Language 7
A Voice Needs Words 9
A Beginning 10

2 Verbs and Objects 13
Rules 14
Creating Choices 16
Explaining with Context 21
Objects 22
The Physical Layer 25
Character Development 30
Elegance 32
Real Talk 34
Review 36
Discussion Activities 37
Group Activity 38

3 Scenes 39
Rules in Scenes 40
Shaping and Pacing 50
Layering Objects 56
Moments of Inversion 60
Chance 61
Real Talk 64
Review 71
Discussion Activities 71
Group Activity 73

4 Context 77
First Impressions 78
Recurring Motifs 82
Character Design 83
Animation 86

Scene Composition . . . 89
Camera . . . 94
Sound . . . 96
Real Talk . . . 99
Review . . . 103
Discussion Activities . . . 104
Group Activity . . . 104

Part II Conversations . . . 107
By Naomi Clark

5 Creating Dialogue . . . 109
Players . . . 110
Creating Conversation . . . 111
Iterating to Fun and Beyond . . . 113
Your Conversation . . . 115

6 Resistance . . . 117
Push and Pull . . . 118
Flow . . . 119
Alternatives to Flow . . . 129
Opening Up Space . . . 132
Opening Up Purpose . . . 134
The Pull of Rewards . . . 137
Time and Punishment . . . 141
Scoring and Reflection . . . 147
Review . . . 150
Discussion Activities . . . 152
Group Activity . . . 153

7 Storytelling . . . 155
Pattern Recognition . . . 156
Authored Stories . . . 159
Interpreted Stories . . . 172
Open Stories . . . 181
Review . . . 187
Discussion Activities . . . 188
Group Activity . . . 189

A Further Playing . . . 191
Achievement Unlocked (John Cooney, 2008) . . . 192
American Dream (Stephen Lavelle, Terry Cavanagh, Tom Morgan-Jones, and Jasper Byrne, 2011) . . . 192
Analogue: A Hate Story (Christine Love, 2012) . . . 193
The Banner Saga (Stoic, 2014) . . . 193
Candy Box (aniwey, 2013) . . . 194
Consensual Torture Simulator (Merritt Kopas, 2013) . . . 194
Corrypt (Michael Brough, 2012) . . . 195
Crypt of the Necrodancer (Ryan Clark, 2013) . . . 196
Dwarf Fortress (Tarn Adams, 2006) . . . 196
English Country Tune (Stephen Lavelle, 2011) . . . 197
Even Cowgirls Bleed (Christine Love, 2013) . . . 197
Gone Home (The Fullbright Company, 2013) . . . 198
Mighty Jill Off (Anna Anthropy, 2008) . . . 198
NetHack (NetHack Dev Team, 1987) . . . 199
Papers, Please (Lucas Pope, 2013) . . . 199
Persist (AdventureIslands, 2013) . . . 200
QWOP (Bennett Foddy, 2008) and *GIRP* (Bennett Foddy, 2011) . . . 201
Spelunky (Derek Yu, 2008) . . . 201
Triple Town (Spry Fox, 2011) . . . 202

Index . . . 203

FOREWORD

In case you haven't noticed, something is happening in the world of video games, something that is changing the way we think about how they're made, how they're played, and what they mean. The authors of this book are part of a new generation of game creators for whom video games interface fully with all the complex machinery of contemporary culture. For Anna and Naomi, video games are not merely sleek consumer appliances dispensing entertaining power fantasies, they are fragments of shattered machines out of which new identities can be constructed; sites where disorderly crowds can assemble for subversive purposes; platforms from which to examine the status quo; windows into the turbulent flow of power and progress; unruly machines that call into question their own means of production; smart machines that allow us to say new things; and, when correctly operated, beautiful machines that kill fascists.

We are used to other kinds of culture interfacing with all of these dimensions—music, film, literature; these things have long been understood as a domain of identity construction and political struggle. But it's still something of a novelty to understand video games the same way, to pay close attention to not just their form and content, but to their context, to think about the personal voices of the individual creators, the communities that gather around them, and the deeper currents they illuminate.

Having earned a reputation for conservatism, for doggedly clinging to the safety blanket of childishness, for being unwilling or unable to confront the ambiguous complexities of all the meanings they generate, video games are suddenly shocked to find themselves holding a live wire. Coiling, sparking, hazardous, yes, but it's also more than a little bit exciting to discover that what we thought was just a bit of old rope is in fact writhing with dangerous energy. And it is people like the authors of this book, the most progressive members of this new generation, who are plugging it in.

Which is exactly what makes it so important that this is a book about the fundamentals of game design as a craft. This is not a wild-eyed manifesto about the political meaning of video games; it is a patient explanation of how they work—breaking them down to their essential elements and carefully demonstrating how those elements fit together. This is a book about moving and jumping, about pressing and releasing buttons, about color and shape, enemies and hit points, challenges and goals.

The book is organized in two parts. In Part One Anna lays out the basic building blocks of video game design, and in Part Two Naomi shows the different ways these ingredients can be

combined to express an infinite variety of game ideas. But throughout the book there is a careful attention to the most fundamental aspects of game design.

This focus on the fundamentals makes *A Game Design Vocabulary* a very good book for new designers. Basic concepts are illustrated with concrete examples, demystifying what can be a very complex and intimidating process. And this demystification reveals the radical agenda beneath the sober surface of this book, because it's about lowering the barrier of entry into this world, welcoming new hands, new eyes, new voices, and showing them that video games are not mysterious cultural objects to be consumed, they are mysterious cultural objects *you make yourself*. They belong to you, and the first step of owing them is to look at them carefully and understand how they function.

At the same time, I believe this book will be equally valuable for experienced designers. There is no better way for a veteran developer to sharpen the blade of her creative practice than by meditating on the design fundamentals outlined in this book.

Ultimately, I think *A Game Design Vocabulary*'s commitment to the fundamentals of form is itself the book's most radical idea. Some people see a conflict between the revolutionary power of games as a means of expression and a more traditional focus on their formal details, but Anna and Naomi refuse to recognize this division. For them it is obvious that the expressive power of video games flows *through* their formal qualities, that attention to the nuts and bolts of video game design is not a way to avoid confronting all the subtleties of their layered meanings, but a way to trace them, highlight them, and illuminate them.

This most radical idea could simply be put: *the aesthetic is political*. Video games matter and they matter not just in what they are, but in what they say, and not just in what they say, but how they say it.

—Frank Lantz, Director, NYU Game Center

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to Phoebe Elefante, Colleen Macklin, John Sharp, Laura Lewin, Michael Thurston, Olivia Basegio, Sarah Schoemann, and Toni Pizza for assistance in editing and writing; to Emily Short, Eric Zimmerman, Frank Lantz, Ian Bogost, Mattie Brice, Steve Swink, and Mary Flanagan for inspiration on design and the shape of games; and to Keith Burgun for sparring partnership and sword-sharpening.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Anna Anthropy is an artist, author, and game creatrix working in the East Bay area. As an ambassador for game creation, she works to empower marginalized voices to gain access to game creation. Her first book, *Rise of the Videogame Zinesters*, is an autobiography/manifesto/DIY guide. She's radical.

Naomi Clark has been designing and producing games for more than two decades, ever since she started creating text-based virtual worlds as a teenager. She has worked on multiplayer web games (*Sissyfight 2000*), casual downloadable games (*Miss Management*), Flash games for kids (*LEGO Junkbot*), and Facebook games (*Dreamland*) while working with companies like Gamelab, LEGO, Rebel Monkey, and Fresh Planet. Naomi has also taught classes and workshops at Parsons School of Design, the NYU Game Center, and the New York Film Academy, and she has written game analysis and feminist critique for *Feministe*. She is currently developing an independent game with the Brooklyn Game Ensemble.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 1

LANGUAGE

This is a book about game design—videogame design, specifically. In 2014? Why? We've been making digital games for more than 50 years, if you take *Tennis For Two* (1958) as an arbitrary starting point. You'd think 50 years would give game creators a solid foundation to draw from. You'd think in 50 years there'd be a significant body of writing on not just games, but the craft of design. You'd think so, but you'd be disappointed. Every day, playing contemporary videogames or reading about them, I see evidence that what both creators and critics desperately need is a basic vocabulary of game design.

Signs Versus Design

New Super Mario Bros. Wii, released by Nintendo in 2009 (see Figure 1.1), is a sequel or a remake of *Super Mario Bros.* from 1985. Though the newer game diverges pretty quickly in design from its progenitor, the first few screens of the first level of *New* are arranged in deliberate mimicry of the same screens from the 1985 version. The player (or players, in the case of *New Super Mario*) starts on the left side of the screen; to the right, there's an enticing, flashing block with a question mark on it, floating just above the ground. Then the game's most basic enemy trundles toward the player to the left. After that, you see two parallel platforms made of hovering blocks, some breakable, some that contain rewards, one of which contains power-up items for the players. After that, there's a tall obstacle that the player has to jump over to progress further: a big green pipe in the 1985 game, the side of a cliff in the 2009 one.



Figure 1.1 *New Super Mario Bros. Wii* starts with an arrow pointing to the right.

Super Mario Bros. was many people's first videogame; there were almost no games similar to it at the time. *New Super Mario Bros*., in contrast, has almost twenty years of related games as precedent. Despite that, the 1985 game leaves one thing out that's present in the 2009 game: a big sign with an arrow telling the player which direction to go.

What happened between 1985 and 2009 to cause game creators to lose that much trust in the player? The player of *New Super Mario Bros. Wii* gets off easy, in fact, as far as "tutorials" go. Lots of contemporary games feel the need to explain to the player, via game-interrupting exposition and big stupid dumps of instruction text, how they are played. Many games even keep the player from starting the game until she's proven she knows how the buttons work, making her jump in place, in a contextless situation, like a trained pet.

This is shockingly popular. I see it not just in the big-budget commercial games that have the economic incentive to keep as few players from getting confused as possible, but also in smaller games, in freeware games, in games created by one or two people working out of their bedrooms. When I met Pietro Righi Riva, one of the creators of the downloadable game *Fotonica*, at the 2012 Game Developers Conference (GDC), the first thing he said to me referred to my take on *New Super Mario Bros. Wii:* "You were right. That game didn't need a tutorial." This kind of blunt instruction speaks not just to a disrespect for the player's intelligence—and one that influences how she feels about the game, make no mistake—but also to a lack of confidence on the part of the creator.

Super Mario Bros., 1985, didn't need a tutorial. It used design, a communicative visual vocabulary, and an understanding of player psychology—gained from watching players play the game, changing it, and watching them again—to guide the player to understanding the basics of the game. Those first screens teach everything the player needs to know: Mario starts on the left of an empty screen, facing right. The floating, shining reward object and the slow but menacing monster—set in opposition to Mario by walking in the opposite direction—give the player an incentive to jump. The platforms are a kind of jungle gym where the player can experiment with jumping, discover the properties of various kinds of blocks, and encounter her first power-up. Even if the player's not sure whether the power-up is dangerous, it moves too quickly and in too confined a space to be avoided. When the power-up turns out to benefit Mario by making him grow, the player has learned something about how monsters and power-ups look and behave in this game. Then the final pipe barring access to the rest of the game makes sure she knows that the height of her jump is dependent on how long she holds down the button.

You can argue that coding a game in 8605 Assembly for the Nintendo Entertainment System in 1985 was much more demanding, and building a dedicated "tutorial" into the game would have been harder. People like to point to technological justifications for things in digital games because most videogame fans are sold on the idea that the history of games is a history of technology. If there were technological reasons that dissuaded the designers of *Super Mario*—Shigeru Miyamoto and Takashi Tezuka—from training the player through instruction text and encouraged them to use design to teach the player, then God bless the limitations of 1980s game machines. Design is not technology. The printed manual packaged with the game contained more information about how to play, but perhaps keeping in mind how often manuals go unread or get lost far before the software they accompany, Miyamoto and Tezuka made sure that the game itself could convey understanding through playing.

Someone in 2009 looked at the opening screens of the original *Super Mario Bros.*—someone had to, to copy these screens note for note into the first level of *New Super Mario Bros. Wii*—but didn't understand what they meant or why they were so effective. Why are game creators unable to understand and learn from their own history? Why are they bumbling over problems that were solved almost 30 years ago?

Digital games have exploded commercially since 1985—in fact, *Super Mario Bros.* was proceeded by more than a decade of successful videogames—and we've consequently learned a lot of new words with which to talk about and describe videogames. Unfortunately, those words come from marketers, brand-loyalty Internet arguments, and magazines that exist as extensions of publishers' PR departments. The language that exists to describe videogames is facile when applied to the very real problem of discussing design.

Most designers, lacking the vocabulary with which to discuss, analyze, and criticize game design, operate largely by intuition and instinct. And there's a lot to be said for intuition and instinct: A lot of radical decisions are made by instinct and then only understood in hindsight. But what if a designer is working in a team? What if someone else is drawing the characters that will appear in a game? What do they need to convey, and what does the designer need to tell them? What if a designer is working with another designer? How will the two communicate about the needs and direction of the game?

I'm not the first person to notice this problem. Back in 1994, game designer Greg Costikyan wrote an essay all about it, called "I Have No Words & I Must Design." At the beginning, he says, "We need a critical language. And since this is basically a new form, despite its tremendous growth and staggering diversity, we need to invent one." He was right then, and he still is.

Consider that we're all in a team—difficult in light of the practices of most contemporary publishers, I know—and that we all have access to this tremendous, growing resource of game design solutions: every videogame that has ever been made. By understanding those games—how they work or don't work, what they're doing and why—we get better at making our own games. We don't repeat problems that were long ago solved, like how to convince the player to go right. But how can we understand those games if we don't have a language with which to talk about them? How can we have a discussion?

Once upon a time, I studied creative writing. Someone would submit a story, everyone else would read it, and then we'd sit in a circle and people would offer their critiques, with the goal of allowing the author to improve the story and, in the process, improve her own writing ability. This was called "workshopping" a story. We would talk about things like how a story was paced, how certain passages or phrases helped—or failed—to characterize the characters of the story, which parts were weak, and which succeeded.

No game creator wants to put a tutorial into her game, to make the player press the jump button five times before being allowed to press the shoot button five times. A game creator puts a tutorial into a game because she lacks confidence in her ability to teach the player the rules of her game without explicitly stating them upfront. In a board or card game, it makes sense that the players should be aware of the rules upfront because they're the ones keeping the rules. But the great strength of digital games is that, because the computer is performing the task of enforcing the rules and tracking the numbers, the game can withhold some of the complexities

of the rules from the player. When the player discovers those complexities later, it feels like a story is developing.

How do we lead the player to those discoveries? That's called "design." And, frankly, I don't think we, as designers, are doing enough of it.

What game designers need is a workshop—the means to design, have their design critiqued, and improve their craft. We need to be able to discuss design as a craft. And if we're going to discuss game design, the first thing we need is a vocabulary.

Failures of Language

We're not lacking for words to use to describe videogames. But those words were created to sell videogames, not to describe the process of creating and understanding them. Our games vocabulary is peppered with buzzwords, invented by someone in marketing for a press release and regurgitated into a games magazine. Next the words are on the Internet, slung back and forth by forum posters, and then, finally, I hear an otherwise intelligent game developer use a meaningless word to describe a game.

Here's a brief glossary of some of the words I hear a lot and what they might mean:

- **Immersive**—Game takes place underwater
- **Fluid**—Game is actually made of water
- **Flow**—Current of the liquefied game

These words don't have to be nonsensical. In fact, we'll be talking about meaningful ways to talk about "flow" later in this book. When buzzwords are used without context or nuance to promote a game, as part of a press release or blurb, they might as well be meaningless.

When we use meaningless words to talk about games, our ability to describe them becomes more confused; our language for describing them becomes less concrete. But we've bought into this sort of thing in a big way, the same way we've bought into the idea that a game is composed of "graphics," "audio," and "replayability." We're used to thinking of games in those terms, but who gave us those terms?

It was the games press. The terms we think about videogames in are taken from *Consumer Reports*–style reviews of games. *GamePro* magazine would divide games into "graphics," "sound," "control," "fun factor," and "challenge" and then give the game a score of one to five in each of these categories. Doesn't the way a game looks have a relationship to how it plays, though? Don't the way things move in a game tell you a lot about how the game controls? Don't sounds characterize the interactions that they accompany? Doesn't the challenge of the game affect what the experience of the game is—the "fun factor"?

The fact is that although these categories may seem dated, we nonetheless allow them to inform the way we think about games. Instead of considering a game holistically, we mentally divide games into categories. It's especially easy to do within a bigger group or studio, where all these categories may be separate jobs performed by separate people. But what something in a game looks like, for example, tells the player what to think about it, what expectations to have. "Graphics" are part of design. So is sound, and how the game controls, and every part of the experience of a game. We're trained to think of all these parts of a game in isolation.

Our language limits us in other ways. We've bought into the established "genres" of videogames: the shooter! The strategy game! The platformer! These categories make it hard to describe, to pitch, to even imagine games outside of the ideas that are already established. When I created *dys4ia* in March 2012, an autobiographical game about my own experiences with hormone therapy, many players and critics, though they admired the game, questioned whether it actually was a game after all, because it didn't fit their genre-influenced preconceptions of how games should work and what "ought to" happen when you play them.

The language that we use to talk about games constrains the way we think about them. We don't have a vocabulary that can fit games that are as diverse as, say, a game about hormone replacement therapy that relates events that really happened to me and isn't a struggle for victory or dominance. And so the language of games is a language of exclusion. Game culture's vocabulary frames discussions in such a way as to perpetuate the existing values and ideas of that culture, which is problematic when that culture is so insular to begin with.

dys4ia is a traditional game in many ways. It borrows a lot of established game vocabulary to tell its story. Most scenes involve guiding some player-controlled character around the screen to perform a given task. The reason both players and creators fail to recognize it as a game is superficial—we lack the design vocabulary to connect a game about hormone replacement with related games that have more traditional themes.

When I mention "story" in a game to most players and developers, what they think of is cutscenes: an interruption of a game to show a five-minute movie, directed in obvious imitation of a Hollywood production. Or they think of a wall of expository text that the player has to stop and read or, more likely, skip annoyedly past. This is just another symptom of designers' fear of design. The truth is that we already have all the tools we need to tell stories in games—to tell real stories, not exposition—but we don't understand those tools.

Until we learn how to tell real stories in games, "story" is always going to mean "cutscene." Until we learn how to design holistically, games are always going to be broken into "graphics" and "sound" and "control." Until we have a language that can describe games in all their diversity, we will only design "shooters," "strategy games," and "platformers."

By equipping ourselves with a language for talking about design, we are giving ourselves the ability to design.

A Voice Needs Words

When I was little, game development was mystifying to me. I couldn't imagine how any human being could create a game and had no idea where one would even start. By creating a real discourse on game design, we're not only helping existing game creators become sharper, but empowering new game makers with a vocabulary with which to start thinking about and planning design. We're actually giving established creators a means of communicating ideas about design to a newer generation. We're enabling all creators to communicate with and improve each other.

And though people who create games naturally have the most to gain from a real conversation about design, they're not the only ones who would benefit. I'm thinking of critics of games, but not just journalists. We would all become better critics of games—better able to understand them, to analyze them, to communicate about them—if we could cultivate an environment where real talk about games and what they're doing and why was commonplace.

We could have a culture that better appreciates and values games. It may seem ridiculous to suggest that games are undervalued in a culture where tens of thousands of fans flock to conventions like the Penny Arcade Expo to reinforce the great myth that developers and publishers are greater than human. But this isn't appreciation; it's fetishization. Because the myth that game developers are something other than human is just that: a falsehood. But it was this falsehood that kept me, as a child, from realizing that game design was something that I could do and even earn a living doing.

Imagine an audience of players equipped with the understanding to follow and appreciate what game developers are doing rather than merely idolizing them. Certainly there's a "magician's bag of secret tricks" brand of appeal to designing games. After all, we're designing experiences that manipulate players' mental and emotional states (consensually and nondestructively, I would hope). There might be a fear that once players can see the smoke and mirrors, they'll lose a sense of wonder at the trick.

Discussing pacing and expository and characterization techniques in writing has not diminished my appreciation for the written word and admiration for those who can use it well. In contrast, my respect for writing has only deepened with my understanding of technique. I think the average reader is more literate than the average player—not "literate" in the dumb, obvious sense of having read more books, but in the sense of having a wider understanding of the craft that goes into the form they enjoy. It's not surprising that readers might have a better understanding of what they're reading than players have of what they're playing. Not only have the novel and short story been around longer, but writers, being writers, are much better equipped to write *about* the craft of writing and have done so at length.

A "literate" player wouldn't necessarily be a more jaded and dismissive one (we have plenty of those already) but could be a more attentive one, one who was more receptive to weirder ideas.

In my experience as a designer and creator of games, I've had only a precious few experiences where a critic really impressed me with her insight into and attention to one of my creations. Those experiences remind me why I create—to have someone connect with and understand the thing I have designed.

They were also experiences that gave me a better understanding of my own work. What a critic does is articulate an idea that's at work in a game, puts it in a context with other games, with other schools. They help explain the work to others; they start a discussion.

That's what we do when we talk about design and our design decisions: we start a discussion. And we allow others to join in that discussion, to participate in the dialogue, to contribute. Why is this subject important enough to warrant a book? It's not just so that a handful of industry developers can consider themselves a little more savvy. It's because shattering the silence around game design creates a conversation that everyone can learn from, whether they want to become game creators, whether they didn't realize they wanted to make games until they learned that developers are just as human as they are, whether they want to be informed critics, or whether they're content just to be better-educated players. An open conversation about game design demystifies this form that we care about and empowers us with the means to better understand, think about, and, if we wish, to make digital games.

A Beginning

What is this book? It's my attempt at furthering the discussion of design that we need so badly. We need more books that can kick off this conversation and give it places to start. For a while I was attending a game school called The Guildhall at Southern Methodist University, majoring in level design (I got kicked out after a few months), and it was pretty clear to me that my instructors didn't know where to begin teaching design. We watched videos about parallax scrolling in Disney movies, and we took a test on *The Hero's Journey*.

Now, I'd be the first to admit that game design is "interdisciplinary"—that game designers benefit from having a lot of different skills, from understanding things like how to animate depth to what kind of stories players expect—but I still saw this wild grasping for subjects as a symptom of the lack of a foundation from which to teach game and level design.

I also vaguely remember the level design textbook we had to read, which was biased toward a single kind of game. Remember what I said about games discourse reproducing the same kinds of games over and over? The book was clearly written with first-person shooters in mind; I remember a whole chapter on lighting. And while the principles of using lighting to create a mood are interesting and definitely of use to a level designer, we should save the specifics for after we have a grasp of the basics.

Since Greg Costikyan pointed out how badly we needed a vocabulary, many books on game design and development have been written. Some revolve around a particular kind of game; others talk about how to work on big teams with programmers, artists, and project managers, which is great if you're going to work at a huge company, but it's not quite as useful if you're part of the growing number of game creators working in really small groups. We've got game design books that focus on theoretical questions about games and fun, or on how to study games like the cultural artifacts they are. There are even books that have made strides toward establishing a new vocabulary to talk about games. We still have very few books that are meant to serve as a beginner text for game design—especially books that are applicable to games in all their dazzling diversity.

It's my hope that this book can be as universal as possible, that the framework described within can fit as wide a body of games as my perspective can manage. But I'm not unbiased. This book began life as a guide to designing platform games like *Super Mario Bros.*—or my own *Mighty Jill Off* (2008) and *REDDER* (2010)—before it became something else. If my tendency toward a certain kind of game in this text shows, I apologize.

This book is also specifically about digital games, or videogames. This isn't because board games, card games, folk games, or other nondigital games aren't worthy of interest or design. In fact, videogames share a history with this vast continuum of games, and we have a lot to learn from them. (In fact, many design ideas in digital games are borrowed from nondigital ones.) Because the human players of nondigital games are the ones required to keep, and internalize, the rules, there's a stronger existing discourse about design among board game players and authors than digital games have ever possessed.

What makes videogames so worthy of discussion is their capacity for ambiguity and, hence, storytelling. The computer keeps the rules in a digital game, so a player on level one might not know what level three looks like, that her character is going to lose her legs before the end, or that there's some playing technique she will have to become aware of and master in time but is unaware of this early. The ability to withhold information from the player, and to give her the liberty to discover rules and complexities of those rules on her own, makes the design of digital games so interesting. Plus, their capacity for using visual art, animation, and sound, while not completely unique to digital games, is a facet of design that warrants more discussion.

What *isn't* this book? It's not a guide to any single tool or technology. This book won't help you learn how to edit *Unreal* maps. There are resources for that and for any other game-making tool or editor you're called upon to use. To write this book with any one technology in mind would be to write a more limited book. This book is about design. Design is not technology.

This book can't be the perfect tome that covers all games and all aspects of design. It can't be the ultimate book on game design—the last and only book you'll ever need on your

shelf—because it's one of the first. So this book will have a few holes. If this book has the intended effect, readers like you will step forward and write the words that are missing.

This book is intended above all to start a discussion, to be a starting place for a necessary talk about design that hopefully will continue long after. Once you break a silence, it's impossible to get folks to shut up. Criticize this book and tear it apart—as long as we keep talking about what design is.

Here is a book on digital game design. May many more follow.

INDEX

A

Achievement Unlocked, 192
achievements as rewards, 140
Acme Novelty Library, 156
Adams, Tarn, 196
adjusting difficulty, 125-129
Adventure, 162
adventure games, 162
AdventureIslands' *Persist*, 200
American Dream, 192-193
Analogue: A Hate Story, 193
Andreani, Christophe, 28
Animal Crossing, 183
animation, 86-89
aniway's *Candy Box*, 194
Arnot, Leon, 83
audio. *See* sound
authored stories
  explained, 158-159
  story as choice, 165-170
  story as exertion, 162-164
  story as exploration, 164-165
  story as intermission, 160-162
  story as system, 170-171
authorship, shared, 182-183

B

The Banner Saga, 193-194
BaraBariBall, 125
Bee, 175-177
Berzerk, 88-89
Best Amendment, 171
Bioshock, 48
boredom, 120
branching story structure, 165-170
Breakout, 40
Brice, Mattie, 131
Brough, Michael, 62, 82, 195
Bubble Bobble, 92-93
Bubble Ghost, 28
Burkinshaw, Robin, 129
Byrne, Jasper, 192

C

Calamity Annie, 48-50
camera, 94-96
Candy Box, 194
Case of the Vanishing Entree, 166
cast, 43-44
casual games, 126
Cat Cat Watermelon, 138
Cavanagh, Terry, 122, 192
chance, 61-64
character design, 83-86
character development, 30-32
cheevos, 140
Chen, Jenova, 128-129
chess, 170
Chip's Challenge, 93-94
Choice of Romance, 177
choices
  creating, 16-17
    robust verbs, 18-20
    verb relationships, 17-18

reflective choices, 179-181
story as choice, 165-170
Choose Your Own Adventure series, 166
Cityville, 162
Clark, Ryan, 196
complexity
multiplayer complexity, 185-186
system complexity, 184-185
composition of scenes, 89-91
visual shape, 92-94
Condensity, 53-54
Consensual Torture Simulator, 194-195
context, 77
animation, 86-89
camera, 94-96
character design, 83-86
explaining rules with, 21-22
first impressions, 78-81
Knytt Stories case study, 99-102
recurring motifs, 82-83
scene composition
examples, 89-91
visual shape, 92-94
sound, 96
as emphasis, 97
as texture, 98-99
control, degrees of, 27-30
conversations
creating, 111-112
dialogue
creating, 111-112
overview, 109
players, 110-111
playtesting and iterations, 113-115
shaping, 115
telling and listening, 115
need for, 9-12
resistance, 117
adjusting difficulty, 125-129
alternatives to flow, 129-131
flow, 119-129
opening up purpose, 134-137
opening up space, 132-134
pull of reward, 137-141
punishments, 141-147
push and pull, 118-119
reflection, 147-149
scoring, 147-149
storytelling, 155
authored stories, 158-171
emergent stories, 158
interpretation, 173-177
interpreted stories, 172-181
multiplayer complexity, 185-186
open stories, 181-186
pattern recognition, 156-159
reflective choices, 177-181
shared authorship, 182-183
story as choice, 165-170
story as exploration, 164-165
story as intermission, 160-164
story as system, 170-171
system complexity, 184-185
Cooney, John, 192
Corrypt, 195
Costikyan, Greg, 6
Crosstown, 62
Crypt of the Necrodancer, 196
Csíkszentmihályi, Mihály, 119
currency rewards, 139-140
cutscene, 160

D

Dance Dance Revolution, 29
DDA (Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment), 126-129
dead end rewards, 140-141
degrees of control, 27-30
Depression Quest, 166
Desktop Dungeons, 94
dialogue
  creating, 111-112
  overview, 109
  players, 110-111
  playtesting and iterations, 113-115
  shaping, 115
  telling and listening, 115
difficulty
  adjusting, 125-129
  push and pull, 118-119
Dig-Dug, 98
Diner Dash, 179
donkey space, 186
DOOM, 59
Ducks, 43-44
Dungeons & Dragons, 183
Dwarf Fortress, 183, 196
Dyad, 99
Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment (DDA), 126-129
dys4ia, 8, 170, 172

E

Egg vs. Chicken, 161
elegant design, 32-34
emergent stories, 158
emotional resonance, 179-181
emphasis, sound as, 97
Encyclopedia Fuckme, 166
English Country Tune, 197
Even Cowgirls Bleed, 197-198
"Examination of the Work of Herbert Quain" (Borges), 166
experience points, 139
exploration, story as, 164-165
expression and performance, 48-50

F

failures of language, 7-8
Fallout: New Vegas, 134
Farmville, 145-147, 162
first impressions, 78-81
Floatpoint, 169
flow
  alternatives to, 129-131
  explained, 119-124
  Super Hexagon case study, 122-124
flOw, 128-129
Foddy, Bennett, 201
Fortugno, Nick, 179
Fotonica, 5, 94, 98-99
frustration, 120
The Fullbright Company, 198

G

Gamelab's *Diner Dash*, 179
GIRP, 201
Glitch Tank, 62-64
Gone Home, 130-131, 198
grinding, 145-147

H

Half-Life 2: Episode 1, 96, 126
Hokra, 125
Home, 165, 174
Horse vs Planes, 97

I

intermission, story as, 160-164
interpretation, 173-177
interpreted stories
  emotional resonance, 179-181
  explained, 172-173
  interpretation, 173-177
  reflective choices, 177-179
introductions, 45-48
inversion, moments of, 60-61
iterations, 113-115

J-K

Jansen, Alexis, 89
Joust, 14

Kanaga, David, 99
King's Quest, 162
Knytt, 98
Knytt Stories, 99-102
Kopas, Merritt, 194
Kuleshov, Lev, 156

L

l'Abbey des Mortes, 89
Labyrinth of Zeux, 89
language
  failures of, 7-8
  need for, 4-7, 9-12
Lantz, Frank, 186
Lavelle, Stephen, 192, 197
layering objects, 56-59
Lesbian Spider-Queens of Mars
  animation, 86-87
  character design, 83-86
  layering objects, 57-58
  sound as emphasis, 97
  sound as texture, 98
level design, 32
Lexaloffle Games' *Cat Cat Watermelon*, 138
listening, 115
Lode Runner, 110-111, 183
lore, 165-170
Love, Christine, 193, 197
Luis Borges, Jorge, 166

M

Mainichi, 131
mancala, 170
Mass Effect series, 179
massively multiplayer online role-playing games (MMORPG), 162
McGrath, Shaun, 99
Meyer, Mike, 97
Mighty Jill Off, 143-144, 198-199
Minecraft, 136-137, 173
Mini Mix Mayhem, 27
Minter, Jeff, 97
Miss Management, 179-180
Mitsuji, Fukio, 92
Miyamoto, Shigeru, 5
MMORPG (massively multiplayer online role-playing games), 162
moments of inversion, 60-61
Monuments of Mars, 90-91
Morgan-Jones, Tom, 192
motifs (recurring), 82-83

Mouse, Mickey Alexander, 91
Mr. Do!, 50-52
Ms. Pac-Man, 160
multiplayer complexity, 185-186
Murder Simulator, 91

N

NetHack, 128, 199
New Super Mario Bros. Wii, 4-5
Newcomer, John, 14
Nintendo *New Super Mario Bros. Wii*, 4-5
Nygren, Nicklas, 99

O

objects
  explained, 22-24
  layering, 56-59
  reinforcing verbs with, 34-36
open stories
  explained, 181-182
  multiplayer complexity, 185-186
  shared authorship, 182-183
  system complexity, 184-185
opening up
  purpose, 134-137
  space of resistance, 132-134
orphaned verbs, 17-18

P

pacing scenes, 50-56
Pac-Man, 160
Papers, Please, 113-114, 199-200
pattern recognition, 156-159
Pedercini, Paolo, 171
Peggle, 137
performance and expression, 48-50
Persist, 200
Pfutzenreuter, Bill, 14
physical layer
  degrees of control, 27-30
  explained, 25-27
Pipe Trouble, 174-175
Plantasia, 169
Plants vs. Zombies, 80
players, 110-111
playtesting, 113-115
Pond Squid, 56-57
Pong, 40
Pope, Lucas, 113-114, 199
Portal, 33
pull of reward
  dead end rewards, 140-141
  explained, 137-139
  resources, 139-140
punishments, 141-147
purpose
  opening up, 134-137
  of scenes, 53-56
push and pull, 118-119

Q-R

Quinn, Zoe, 166
QWOP, 201

Ragione, Santa, 94
recurring motifs, 82-83
REDDER, 64-70, 132, 134, 141
reflection, 147-149
reflective choices, 177-179
relationship between verbs, 17-18
repetition as punishment, 143
Replogle, Todd, 90
Resident Evil 5, 164

resistance
- adjusting difficulty, 125-129
- examples
  - *Achievement Unlocked, 192*
  - *American Dream, 192-193*
  - *The Banner Saga, 193-194*
  - *Candy Box, 194*
  - *Consensual Torture Simulator, 194-195*
  - *Corrypt, 195*
  - *Crypt of the Necrodancer, 196*
  - *Dwarf Fortress, 196*
  - *English Country Tune, 197*
  - *GIRP, 201*
  - *Mighty Jill Off, 198-199*
  - *NetHack, 199*
  - *Papers, Please, 199-200*
  - *Persist, 200*
  - *QWOP, 201*
  - *Spelunky, 201-202*
  - *Triple Town, 202*
- flow
  - *alternatives to, 129-131*
  - *explained, 119-124*
  - *Super Hexagon case study, 122-124*
- opening up purpose, 134-137
- opening up space, 132-134
- overview, 117
- pull of reward
  - *dead end rewards, 140-141*
  - *explained, 137-139*
  - *resources, 139-140*
- punishments, 141-147
- push and pull, 118-119
- reflection, 147-149
- scoring, 147-149

resources, 139-140

reward, pull of
- explained, 137-139
- resources, 139-140

Riva, Pietro Righi, 5

Rivers, Benjamin, 165, 174

robust verbs, 18-20

rote activity, 145-147

roulette, 185

rules
- choices, creating, 16-20
- explained, 14-15
- explaining with context, 21-22
- *Joust*, 14
- objects, 22-24
- in scenes
  - *cast, 43-44*
  - *explained, 40-43*
  - *introductions, 45-48*
  - *performance and expression, 48-50*
- verbs
  - *explained, 15*
  - *robust verbs, 17-18*
  - *verb relationships, 17-18*

S

sandbox games, 134-137

save (verb), 139-140

Scalzi, Nick, 43

scenes, 39
- chance, 61-64
- examples
  - *American Dream, 192-193*
  - *The Banner Saga, 193-194*
  - *Candy Box, 194*
  - *Corrypt, 195*
  - *English Country Tune, 197*

Gone Home, 198
Mighty Jill Off, 198-199
NetHack, 199
REDDER, 64-70
layering objects, 56-59
moments of inversion, 60-61
pacing, 50-56
rules in
cast, 43-44
explained, 40-43
introductions, 45-48
performance and expression, 48-50
scene composition
examples, 89-91
visual shape, 92-94
scenes with purpose, 53-56
shaping, 50-56
Schmidt, Loren, 34, 91
scoring, 147-149
Secret of Monkey IslandSecret of Monkey Island, 32
Shadow of the Colossus, 133-134
Shadowrun Returns, 183
shaping
conversations, 115
difficulty, 125-129
scenes, 50-56
shared authorship, 182-183
Short, Emily, 169, 175
signs versus design, 4-7
Silhouette Mario Bros., 83
The Sims, 134-136, 173, 183
simulation games, 134-137
Skyrim, 159
sound, 96
as emphasis, 97
as texture, 98-99
Space Giraffe, 97
Space Invaders, 16
space of resistance, opening up, 132-134
Spelunky, 201-202
spend (verb), 139-140
Spry Fox's *Triple Town*, 202
Spyro the Dragon, 82
Stoic's *The Banner Saga*, 193-194
stories
authored stories
explained, 158-159
story as choice, 165-170
story as exertion, 162-164
story as exploration, 164-165
story as intermission, 160-162
story as system, 170-171
emergent stories, 158
examples
Analogue: A Hate Story, 193
The Banner Saga, 193-194
Candy Box, 194
Consensual Torture Simulator, 194-195
Dwarf Fortress, 196
Even Cowgirls Bleed, 197-198
Gone Home, 198
Papers, Please, 199-200
Persist, 200
Spelunky, 201-202
interpreted stories
emotional resonance, 179-181
explained, 172-173
interpretation, 173-177
reflective choices, 177-179
open stories
explained, 181-182
multiplayer complexity, 185-186
shared authorship, 182-183
system complexity, 184-185

as rewards, 140
storytelling, 155
authored stories, 158-171
emergent stories, 158
emotional resonance, 179-181
interpretation, 173-177
interpreted stories, 172-181
multiplayer complexity, 185-186
open stories, 181-186
reflective choices, 177-179
shared authorship, 182-183
story as choice, 165-170
story as exploration, 164-165
story as intermission, 160-164
story as system, 170-171
system complexity, 184-185
storytelling, 155
authored stories
explained, 158-159
story as choice, 165-170
story as exploration, 164-165
story as intermission, 160-162-164
story as system, 170-171
emergent stories, 158
interpreted stories
emotional resonance, 179-181
explained, 172-173
interpretation, 173-177
reflective choices, 177-179
open stories
explained, 181-182
multiplayer complexity, 185-186
shared authorship, 182-183
system complexity, 184-185
pattern recognition, 156-159
Street Fighter series, 26
Super Crate Box, 78-80
Super Hexagon, 122-124
Super Mario Bros., 4-5, 40
first impressions, 80-81
opening up space, 133
recurring motifs, 82
scene shaping, 52-53
sound as emphasis, 97
verb relationships, 17-18
system, story as, 170-171
system complexity, 184-185

T

Tekken, 186
telling and listening, 115
Tennis For Two, 3
testing, 113-115
Tetris, 28
texture, sound as, 98-99
Tezuka, Takashi, 5
Three Body Problem, 129-130
tic-tac-toe, 185
time and punishment, 141-147
Tombed
animation, 86-88
objects, 22-24
punishments, 141
purpose, 134
push and pull, 118-119
robust verbs, 18-20
scenes with purpose, 54-56
Track & Field, 25
Triple Town, 202
tutorials, 4-7

U-V

Uncharted, 161

verbs
- designing, 34-36
- examples
  - *Analogue: A Hate Story, 193*
  - *The Banner Saga, 193-194*
  - *Consensual Torture Simulator, 194-195*
  - *Corrypt, 195*
  - *Crypt of the Necrodancer, 196*
  - *English Country Tune, 197*
  - *Even Cowgirls Bleed, 197-198*
  - *GIRP, 201*
  - *Mighty Jill Off, 198-199*
  - *NetHack, 199*
  - *Papers, Please, 199-200*
  - *Persist, 200*
  - *QWOP, 201*
  - *REDDER, 64-70*
  - *Spelunky, 201-202*
  - *Triple Town, 202*
- explained, 15
- orphaned verbs, 17-18
- reinforcing with objects, 34-36
- robust verbs, 18-20
- spend and save, 139-140
- verb relationships, 17-18

visual shape, 92-94

W

The Walking Dead, 178
Ware, Chris, 156
Wizard of Wor, 60-61, 62
Wonder City, 148-149
World of Warcraft, 162

X-Y-Z

X-Com: Enemy Unknown, 181

yomi, 186
Yu, Derek, 201

Zaga-33, 82-83
Zork, 32, 162