

# Emergent Narrative As A Novel Framework For Massively Collaborative Authoring

Michael Kriegel and Ruth Aylett

School of Mathematical and Computer Sciences,  
Heriot Watt University,  
Edinburgh, EH14 4AS, Scotland  
{michael, ruth}@macs.hw.ac.uk

**Abstract.** An emergent narrative is a narrative that is dynamically created through the interactions of autonomous intelligent virtual agents and the user. Authoring in such a system means programming characters rather than defining plot and can be a technically and conceptually challenging task. We are currently implementing a tool that helps the author in this task by training the characters through demonstration of example story lines (rehearsals), rather than explicit programming. In this paper we argue that this tool is best used by a group of authors, each providing an example story and that in order to achieve true emergence, collective authoring is required. We compare the rehearsal based authoring method of our authoring tool with other collaborative authoring efforts and underline why both the storytelling medium “emergent narrative” and our particular approach to authoring are better suited for massively collaborative authoring.


## 1 Introduction

An increasingly popular branch of AI research concerns itself with interactive narratives - computer based storytelling systems that dynamically respond to the audience and adapt the plot during its presentation. There is a strong argument for the interactive storytelling medium: it can be assumed that taking away the audience’s passivity and requiring them to make decisions will increase immersion and identification with a character and as a result amplify the emotional impact of a story. This makes interactive narratives an interesting medium for many applications from entertainment to education. Unfortunately, so far no existing system has yet been able to fully realize these keen ambitions and building such a system remains an open research problem. One of the main reasons for this situation is that the creation of interactive stories poses a big challenge for an author. There is both a lack of theoretic approaches to authoring interactive stories and concrete authoring tools, which results in the interactive narrative medium being very inaccessible to authors.

In previous work [1, 2] we have proposed the design of an authoring tool, which is currently being developed that might provide a solution to this problem by

allowing the author to provide content in the form of linear stories and thus working within a well studied story creation framework (that of the traditional linear story). It is the software's responsibility to construct an interactive story world out of those stories. Our assumption is that with an increasing number of linear stories the authors provide, the complexity of the story world and thus the quality of an interactive story within this story world increases. In this paper we will argue in favour of a collaborative authoring approach using this tool. After defining the authoring problem and giving an overview of the rehearsal based authoring method that is facilitated by our authoring tool, we will introduce a collaborative authoring methodology and explain its benefits compared to single authorship and previous attempts of collaborative authoring.

## 2 Authoring emergent narratives



**Fig. 1.** A conceptual visualisation of an emergent narrative as a 3 dimensional landscape. A particular story that is experienced equals a specific path through the landscape. In this illustration several possible story paths are shown that all initially start from the same point but diverge due to decisions of the user.

Emergent Narrative is a term that was first coined by Aylett[3] and refers to a form of interactive storytelling, where the narrative is built bottom-up from simple elements. In any emergent system many simple elements are working together to complex behaviour[4], in our example a narrative. Despite that, human authors are still needed, but their role is significantly different from authors of other forms of narrative. In an emergent narrative based system an author specifies a virtual world, characters, their goals, motivations, actions and emotions rather than defining specific plot segments. In other words, instead of describing

what will or could happen the author describes a universe and the elements of which it consists. Given that this universe is rich enough, many different narratives can emerge from the interaction of the characters with each other, their world and the user. A possible visualization of an emergent narrative can be seen in Figure 1. Within this framework, characters can be implemented as autonomous intelligent virtual agents. Authoring in this kind of environment poses two challenges that are described in the following sections.

## 2.1 Unpredictability: the conceptual authoring challenge

Not only are emergent narratives non-linear but they are also unpredictable at authoring time. Most authors can handle a certain amount of non-linearity, as long as they can still have direct control over the different story paths and the branching factor does not get too high. “Choose your own adventure” books, the whole genre of interactive fiction, and many video games with branching story lines or at least sub-story lines show that authoring this kind of media is, despite being different from traditional linear narrative forms, nevertheless a well understood process. The unpredictability is what makes authoring emergent narratives conceptually hard to grasp. The very nature of emergent narrative requires the author to “let go” of specific story lines altogether and to focus on creating the elements from which the story will emerge. The authors are not even intended to predict what stories will emerge, they are merely setting the boundaries of the story world. And yet our experience during the authoring process for the educational drama *FearNot!*[5], which was an early prototype of emergent narrative technology showed that instead of letting the story emerge naturally, authors constantly iterate between modifying story elements (character settings) and simulation, until the simulation results in the desired story lines. This approach to authoring is of course very tedious and frustrating and furthermore suppresses any emergence, as such defeating the purpose of emergent narrative. Since there is a striking similarity between emergent narrative authoring and role playing (pen & paper or live action) campaign authoring, we imagine that experienced role play game masters will probably have fewer difficulties with the presented conceptual authoring approach, but we did not yet have the opportunity to confirm this hypothesis.

## 2.2 Knowledge Representation: The technical authoring challenge


The other challenge is the form of authored content. As pointed out earlier, the author has to describe a world and characters living in that world. This has to be done in a form understandable to the computer. In 1991, Eileen Cornell Way stated[6]: “There is a basic although not often articulated assumption in AI that any system which is able to behave intelligently must consist, in part, of symbolic structures that in some way *represent* the knowledge and beliefs necessary for that behaviour.” This still holds true today, despite the progress that non-symbolic knowledge representation methods like neural networks have made since then. For intelligent behaviour, at a high enough level to result in something

like a narrative, symbolic knowledge encoding is still absolutely vital, as seen in all major interactive storytelling engines, e.g. *Storytron*[7], *I-Storytelling*[8], *IDtension*[9], the *Oz Project*[10], the *Tactical Language And Culture Training System*[11], *Façade*[12], *Fabulist*[13] or the aforementioned *FearNot!*[5]. All those systems differ in the specifics of the knowledge representation, but they all share a general problem of knowledge representation: a symbolic description of a world is always just a model and there are many different ways to model a world. Consequently it is the author's responsibility to ensure that the model is consistent and matches the need of the application. A lot of the confusion about how to model knowledge is concerned with its granularity, i.e. how high or low level it should be regarded. In *FearNot!*, a system based on autonomous agents with a continuous planner, most of the authored knowledge can be found inside the action and goal descriptions of the characters planning domains. According to Simpson *et al.*, knowledge representation in AI planning, i.e. the process of representing planning domains for a particular task is "*as important a research topic as the algorithmic aspects of abstract planning engines*" [14], especially when the planning algorithm is applied to real world problems. The granularity problem in the knowledge representation of planning domains seems to lie within the ambiguity between actions and goals - when designing *FearNot!*'s planning domain, we observed that it was hard for authors to decide whether some event should be modelled as an action or as a goal as conceptually often both is possible. Finally, another problem of knowledge representation in narrative AI systems in general is the amount of human common sense knowledge that needs to be transferred into the system in order to reach a certain level of intelligence. How daunting a task this can be even for a very simple story is effectively demonstrated by Ryan *et al.*[15].

### 3 Rehearsal based authoring

We are currently implementing an emergent narrative authoring system based on the *FAtiMA!* agent architecture (originally developed as part of the *FearNot!* software) that will facilitate the authoring process and help authors avoiding some of the aforementioned problems. The main requirement for the software is to make authoring as accessible and user friendly as possible. We intend to achieve this goal by equipping the software with a video game like interface, so that the process of authoring becomes very much like playing a game. With this playful interface the author can play out some story lines. Each of these story lines is called a rehearsal and during each rehearsal the author controls all characters, very much like a puppeteer would control puppets. In the background the software logs all events and learns new goals and action descriptions from the example rehearsals. This kind of indirect authoring of planning domains has been drawn from the idea of planning operator induction as described in[16]. We have chosen this rehearsal based approach to avoid the conceptual authoring challenge mentioned above and allow authors to continue thinking in terms of linear stories. In more general terms, we chose to create the elements of a bottom-

up system (emergent narrative) in a top-down way (rehearsals). In order for a rehearsal to be efficient it of course has to include some new events or at least a new order of events that add something to what was already covered by previous rehearsals. With the previously described features, our work shares many similarities with other research on learning by demonstration (e.g. [17, 18]). We have however added a mixed initiative planning feature that distinguishes our authoring method from most related work. Mixed initiative planning refers to a planning software that is supervised and assisted by a human being[19]. In our case the characters or puppets that the author is controlling are activated during the authoring process, that means they plan their own actions and create the story line together with the author. The authors can however override the character’s actions if they do not agree with them and as a result alter the character’s planning domain. In those cases author and character can also engage in a dialogue, in which the author motivates the orders given to the character. The software can use this additional feedback for further refinement of the planning domain. Figure 2 illustrates the main flow of the authoring procedure.



**Fig. 2.** One time-step in the rehearsal based authoring process

Adding the mixed initiative mode should provide two core benefits: First, it will provide authors with immediate feedback on a character’s authored personality so far and thus make it easier for them to “debug” a character and correct parts of its personality. Second, especially after multiple rehearsals authors will be relieved from the burden of giving the characters repeated instructions. With every rehearsal a character will become more active and autonomous and authors can focus on the input of new knowledge rather than repeating knowledge the character already has. Summarising, the main benefits of our rehearsal based authoring method are a user-friendly game-like interface, the fact that it allows authors to think linearly, while creating bottom-up emergence and the built-in feedback mechanism through mixed initiative planning. We will not focus further on these issues in this paper, as they are already discussed in more detail in [1] and [2]. Instead, in the remainder of this paper the possibilities of massively collaborative authoring using this method will be discussed, i.e. why it might be

beneficial if many different authors would provide the multiple rehearsals instead of a single one.

## 4 Massively Collaborative Authoring

User generated content is a buzz-word of the internet industry and the motor of the Web 2.0. Online communities like *MySpace* or *Facebook*, virtual worlds like *Second Life* or the on-line encyclopaedia *Wikipedia* are all well-known examples of how to successfully leverage internet users as content providers. We envisage that a similar collective authoring process could be applied to the creation of emergent narratives. Technically, this would be possible using the rehearsal based authoring mechanism described in the previous section. Different people can provide rehearsals at different times, so every author feeds a little bit into the system.

### 4.1 Other collaborative authoring projects

There are several examples of projects that try to leverage the collective power of the internet users for authoring purposes in a similar way to our goals. *Jabberwacky* [20] is a chat-bot that learns from millions of conversations with internet users. Every user that comes to the *Jabberwacky* website to chat is an indirect author and increases the chat-bot's repertoire of utterances. A quite similar approach can be found in *The Restaurant*[21], an MIT research project. In *The Restaurant*, two users play through a typical restaurant situation in a 3D graphical multi-player game. One takes the role of a customer while the other player is the waiter and both can move through the environment, manipulate objects and talk with each other in natural language. The whole play through is logged and analysed and the long term goal of the project is to use the logged data to produce AI characters that can take over one of the player's roles in a single-player game. In the video game industry, other examples of employing collective authoring can be found - *Spore*, the new game of *Sims* creator Will Wright, will allow players to design their own race and civilisation starting by manipulating simple DNA. The result is a unique civilisation for each player. In the later stages of the game, when the player's civilisation starts space exploration, the universe will be populated with races that other players have created, while the player's race will automatically be uploaded and become part of other players' games. This approach that Wright calls "Massively Single-player Game" allows the game creators to provide a rich universe full of interesting content without having to create the content themselves. Quite different from the previous examples are ontologies like *Cyc*[22] and *OpenMind Common Sense*[23]. Both try to create a library of symbolic representation of human common sense knowledge and both rely on growing through additions by many users. While *Cyc* users add the knowledge in a very concrete symbolic form in the language *CycL*, *OpenMind* uses natural language. This increases user friendliness but comes at the expense of a more inaccurate description of facts. Finally, it is worth mentioning

*a million penguins* [24], an attempt to collaboratively create a novel on the Web through a wiki. While there is no official academic publication about the lessons learned from this experiment yet, several blog posts<sup>1</sup> summarize the resulting narrative as incoherent and chaotic. Most participants enjoyed the project as an interesting experiment with the conclusion that the literary form of a novel and the collaborative approach of a wiki are too different to be combined.

Our work shares certain things with all of the projects above. It is similar to the ontologies mentioned, since we also try to learn symbolic knowledge representations, it differs however in that our goal is the creation of a narrative. That means we only need to capture the amount of common sense knowledge that is necessary for the agent to act believably in the given story context. We do not want to create real intelligence, the illusion of intelligence for a narrative purpose is enough and even if this intelligence sometimes fails and results in strange agent behaviour this might actually add to the experience, just like *Jabberwacky*'s fascination for a lot of users lies in the weird personality it exhibits by not always making sense. With *Spore* and even more *The Restaurant* our project shares the game-like user interface and the idea of using game play data for authoring. Similar to *a million penguins*, we try to get many authors to create a narrative experience together. The following sections will show how the problems that *a million penguins* ran into can be avoided in the case of emergent narrative.


## 4.2 Advantages of Collaboration

The collaboration of many users on the web can be seen as an emergent phenomenon itself, so it shares an important feature (emergence) with emergent narratives. Mapping the emergent processes of the web onto the creation of emergent narrative systems thus seems like a sensible step. As we have pointed out, an emergent narrative resembles a whole landscape full of possible stories. In order to create that landscape, a high quantity as well as quality of input is required - an enormous task for a single individual. As the previous literature review has shown, the internet community is both capable of providing vast amounts of data (quantity) and also possesses a great collective creativity (quality) that was ultimately too much to fit in a single novel and resulted in chaos in the case of *a million penguins*. However, the medium of emergent narrative is different. While collaboration in *a million penguins* meant extending the storyline further in length<sup>2</sup>, in an emergent narrative it means making the story world richer. Another author just adds more possibilities to what might happen when someone plays through an emergent narrative. Figure 3 illustrates this contrast.

---

<sup>1</sup> e.g. [http://www.futureofthebook.org/blog/archives/2007/02/a\\_million\\_penguins\\_a\\_wikinovel.html](http://www.futureofthebook.org/blog/archives/2007/02/a_million_penguins_a_wikinovel.html)

<sup>2</sup> ...or creating branches in a linear medium, where they are not desired. In *a million penguins* quite a few side novels split of the main plot line when authors did not agree with the development of the storyline.



**Fig. 3.** Conceptual diagram comparing collaborative authoring of an emergent and a linear narrative.

While the collaboration in an emergent narrative results in a reshaping and refinement of the story landscape, in a linear narrative the only way forward is to add to the already existing storyline. Doing that can result in undesired jumps in the story’s coherence (as seen in the Figure after the 3rd author’s input) and thus a disconnected narrative.

### 4.3 Avoiding Incoherence

One could argue that the same incoherence can also occur in an emergent narrative (e.g. characters acting inconsistently). How can we make sure that several authors do not contradict each other or in other words, how do we keep the story landscape smooth (or in mathematical terms continuously differentiable)? The potential answer lies within the previously described rehearsal based authoring and its mixed initiative feature. Since the characters are “alive” during the authoring process and give constant feedback on their so far authored personality, a second author cannot easily create a personality for a character that completely contradicts the one given to it by previous authors. Doing that will require the author to justify their decisions to the character and will as a result override the personality that was given to the character by previous authors. This might partly invalidate the previous authors’ work but at least it will ensure a smooth story landscape. However, the mixed initiative feature will hopefully help authors to fit in their rehearsal plots nicely with previous rehearsals, i.e. the author will let himself be guided by the characters and vice versa.

### 4.4 Ignorance is useful

There is another advantage of collaboration. Everything authors have done before will inevitably influence their continuing authoring. They cannot just simply forget what they have rehearsed before and will base their future rehearsal plots on that (consciously or subconsciously). If there is only one single author that

provides all the rehearsals this might thus decrease the resulting emergence. If the rehearsals are however distributed to many different authors, none of them will know the exact rehearsal story-lines that their predecessors have rehearsed. The only connection between their work that they are aware of comes through the mixed initiative feature, i.e. the character's feedback during authoring, but this feedback is limited to only the current plot situation. In a collaborative authoring situation every single author is to a certain extent unaware of the work of the other authors and that unawareness provides a very useful prerequisite for creativity. This is in fact a general truth for all emergent systems, as Steven Johnson states in his book *Emergence*[4], when talking about the requirements of emergent behaviour (using the example of an ant colony):

**“Ignorance is useful:** ... Having individual agents capable of directly assessing the overall state of the system can be a real liability in swarm logic, for the same reason that you don't want one of the neurons in your brain to suddenly become sentient.”

Exactly the same applies to emergent narratives (a character-centric system, with individual agents limited to their own world view) and as explained above to the emergent collaborative authoring process. It is hard for a single brain to design all the elements of an emergent system, as that brain will always try to predict what emerges from the system and thus suppress true emergence. Only multiple brains can achieve that task.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper we have described a rehearsal based approach to emergent narrative authoring and argued for a collaborative authoring process using this method. Emergent narrative seems to be a narrative medium that is well suited for collaboration and the rehearsal based approach that lets each author perform a number of rehearsal scales up much better than the more obvious solution of assigning one author to each character. Until a truly emergent narrative (that includes unpredictable things happening) has been built, it will remain unclear, whether this is a desirable and enjoyable experience, but in order to build one, collaboration seems inevitable.

### 5.1 Progress so far

In the last months we have started the implementation of the rehearsal based authoring tool. The development can be roughly separated into 3 distinct stages: 1. the framework for controlling characters, acting out rehearsals and playing / testing an emergent narrative, 2. the machine learning algorithms to analyse rehearsal data and create a planning domain and 3. the mixed initiative mode, where live feedback from the character helps to further improve authoring. We are currently at the point of having almost finished stage 1 and have started

some work on stage 2. Although our architecture is using the existing agent architecture *FAtiMA*, we had to add some additional features to it. The most notable addition is the use of an ontological knowledge base and world model. This change is also already in place.

## 5.2 Future work

After finishing the software development, we plan to perform a small-scale user study to verify the claims that have been made in this paper. For this experiment, we will provide authors with a small set of characters and a limited story domain and then investigate the effects of collaboration. Provided this yields a satisfying result, a long term goal would be a large scale study. To prepare that however, practicalities such as motivating a large number of authors to participate, preventing spamming and vandalism and the question of whether human editors should be involved need to be addressed.

## Acknowledgements

This paper is supported by the eCIRCUS (Contract no. IST-4-027656-STP) project carried out with the provision of the European Community in the Framework VI Programme. The authors are solely responsible for the content of this publication. It does not represent the opinion of the European Community, which is not responsible for any use that might be made of data appearing therein.

## References

- [1] Kriegel, M., Aylett, R.: A mixed initiative authoring environment for emergent narrative planning domains. In: Proceedings of the AISB Annual Convention. (2007) 453–456
- [2] Kriegel, M., Aylett, R., Dias, J., Paiva, A.: An authoring tool for an emergent narrative storytelling system. In: Papers from the AAAI Fall Symposium on Intelligent Narrative Technologies, Technical Report FS-07-05. (2007) 55–62
- [3] Aylett, R.: Narrative in virtual environments: Towards emergent narrative. In Press, A., ed.: Fall Symposium, Technical report FS-99-01. (1999) 83–86
- [4] Johnson, S.: Emergence. Penguin Books (2001)
- [5] Aylett, R., Dias, J., Paiva, A.: An affectively driven planner for synthetic characters. In: International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS), AAAI press (2006) 2–10
- [6] Way, E.C.: Knowledge Representation and Metaphor. Kluwer Academic Publishers (1991)
- [7] Crawford, C.: Chris Crawford on interactive storytelling. New Riders (2005)
- [8] Cavazza, M., Charles, F., Mead, S.: Character-based interactive storytelling. IEEE Intelligent Systems **17**(4) (2002) 17–24
- [9] Szilas, N.: Idtension: a narrative engine for interactive drama. In: 1st International Conference on Technologies for Interactive Digital Storytelling and Entertainment (TIDSE 2003). (2003)

- [10] Bates, J., Loyall, A.B., , Reilly, W.S.: An architecture for action, emotion, and social behavior. *Artificial Social Systems: Fourth European Workshop on Modeling Autonomous Agents in a Multi-Agent World* (1994)
- [11] Johnson, W.L., Beal, C., Fowles-Winkler, A., Lauper, U., Marsella, S., Narayanan, S., Papachristou, D., Vilhjalmsson, H.: Tactical language training system: An interim report. In: *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference On Intelligent Tutoring Systems, ITS 2004*. (2004)
- [12] Mateas, M., Stern, A.: Structuring content in the facade interactive drama architecture. In: *Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment (AIIDE)*, AAAI press (2005)
- [13] Riedl, M.: *Narrative Generation: Balancing Plot and Character*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, North Carolina State University (2004)
- [14] Simpson, R.M., McCluskey, T.L., Zhao, W., Aylett, R., Doniat, C.: An integrated graphical tool to support knowledge engineering in ai planning. In: *European Conference on Planning, Toledo, Spain*. (2001)
- [15] Ryan, M., Hannah, N., Lobb, J.: The tale of peter rabbit: A case study in story-sense reasoning. In: *Papers from the AAAI Fall Symposium on Intelligent Narrative Technologies, Technical Report FS-07-05*. (2007)
- [16] McCluskey, T.L., Richardson, N.E., Simpson, R.M.: An interactive method for inducing operator descriptions. In: *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on AI Planning and Scheduling (AIPS-2002)*, Toulouse, France. (2002)
- [17] Cypher, A., ed.: *Watch What I Do: Programming by Demonstration*. MIT Press (1993)
- [18] Lockerd, A.: *Thought streams: Simulating commonsense*. White paper: available at [web.media.mit.edu/~alockerd/research.html](http://web.media.mit.edu/~alockerd/research.html)
- [19] Burstein, M.H., McDermott, D.V.: Issues in the development of human-computer mixed-initiative planning systems. In Gorayska, B., J.L.Mey, eds.: *Cognitive Technology: In Search of a Humane Interface*. Elsevier Science B.V. (1996)
- [20] icogno: Jabberwacky - live chat bot. <http://www.jabberwacky.com> Retrieved 27th March 2008.
- [21] Orkin, J., Roy, D.: The restaurant game: Learning social behavior and language from thousands of players online. *Journal Of Game Development* **3**(1) (december 2007) 39–60
- [22] Cycorp: the cyc knowledge base. <http://www.cyc.com> Retrieved 14th March 2008.
- [23] Singh, P.: The open mind common sense project. Online Article at KurzweilAI.net (<http://www.kurzweilai.net/meme/frame.html?main=/articles/art0371.html?>) (2002) Retrieved 6th August 2007.
- [24] amillionpenguins: The penguin blog. <http://www.amillionpenguins.com> Retrieved 20th March 2008.