

Our group of three people used Debus' (2017) classification system for the MAGAW workshop. Consisting of five levels of classification, the model soon showed to be of little use for the analysis of the given title *Lego Worlds*.

The game showed only one type of navigation, following the aforementioned model, namely spatial movement in geometrical space (and time). This kind of movement was further described as different "modi of movement". Due to the uninteresting results of the initial model, the group set out to analyze how these modi differ in matters of ontology and representation.

The initial approach was to list the modi of movement in the game (changing vehicle, climbing, diving, driving, falling, flying, gliding, jumping, riding, running, sailing, swimming, walking) and to critically analyze how they differ. As a basis for discussion the group chose 'walking' as the 'standard modus', which all others were compared to first. This was a pragmatic decision, as the analyses of all modi and their differences would not have been possible in the MAGAW timeframe. The primary result of the analysis and the placement of each of the available modes of movement in the comparative model, was the possibility to identify the similarities and differences between the various modes of movement on both an ontological and a representational level. Our analysis showed, for example, that in *Lego Worlds* flying, that was only possible in a spaceship in the part of the game that was analyzed, actually was beyond the player's control. The movement was represented in the game but the possible player interactions was limited to boarding the plane upon take off and leaving it upon landing.

While the model produced some interesting insights in the differences of common language understandings of terms, such as flying, and their representation in the game, its development caused more problems than it solved. One methodological problem was that our analysis was based on the common language understanding of words such as "flying". Without a specific definition of such terms, the results are rather subjective and relative. The model is also not able to account for the transformation of the avatar from *Lego man* (m/f) to *Lego man* (m/f) united with a horse, a dolphin or a car.

Overall we experienced it as difficult to come up with one consistent result in the workshop's given time frame. As a group consisting of three people, not only the uninteresting results of the mere model application, but also the increased time needed for discussion among the team members showed to be complicating the production of results.

This does not mean that we think participating as a group is a bad idea in general, but rather that, if such a system is considered, these complications should be taken into consideration. Especially the focus on one game from various perspectives was very useful for the whole group.

## References

Debus, M. S. (2017, forthcoming). "Video game navigation: A Classification System for Navigational Acts". In *Replay: The Polish Journal of Game Studies*.