

Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments	iii
1 Introduction	8
1.1 Chapter Introduction	8
1.2 Background	8
1.3 Statement of Research Questions	10
1.4 Structure of The Thesis	10
2 Literature Review	14
2.1 Chapter Introduction	14
2.2 AI and Games	15
2.3 Fairness in Games	16
2.3.1 Three Masters Model	18
2.4 Economic Inequality and Its Indicators	20
2.4.1 Gini Coefficient	21
2.4.2 Theil Index	22
2.4.3 Atkinson Index	22
2.5 Uncertainty in Entertainment	23
2.5.1 Game Refinement Theory	23
2.5.2 Motion in Mind	24
2.6 Chapter Summary	27
3 Characterizing the Advantage of Initiative (AoI) and Notion of Fairness	29
3.1 Chapter Introduction	29

3.2	Related Works and Motivation	30
3.3	Test Bed for Fairness: Scrabble	31
3.3.1	Entertaining Aspect	33
3.3.2	Player Model	35
3.4	Defining Near-Dying Games	37
3.4.1	From the Perspective of AI	37
3.4.2	From the Perspective of the Game Attractiveness	38
3.5	Experimental Setup	39
3.6	Computational Results and Discussion	39
3.6.1	Experimental Result on keeping Advantage of Initiative over Dif- ferent Performance Levels	39
3.6.2	Experimental Result on AoI Measure and Changes in the Search Space	40
3.6.3	Experimental Result on AoI Measure and Incorporation of The Komi System	42
3.7	Chapter Summary	44
4	Finding the Critical Aspect of Fairness in Games	46
4.1	Chapter Introduction	46
4.2	Literature Review and Related Work	47
4.3	The Proposed Assessment Method	48
4.3.1	Game Refinement Theory	48
4.3.2	Gamified Experience and the Notion of Fairness	49
4.3.3	Evolution of Fair Komi in Go	53
4.4	Research Methodology	55
4.4.1	<i>Dynamic</i> versus <i>Static</i> Komi	55
4.4.2	Experimental Setup	56
4.5	Computational Results and Discussion	57
4.5.1	Analysis of <i>Dynamic</i> Komi in the Game of Go	57
4.5.2	Analysis of <i>Dynamic</i> Komi in the Game of Scrabble	59
4.5.3	Optimal Play Strategy in Scrabble	60
4.5.4	Link between Play Strategy and Fairness	62

4.6	Chapter Summary	64
5	Huizinga’s Homo Ludens Revisited:	
	A New Perspective from Motion in Mind Approach	65
5.1	Chapter Introduction	65
5.2	Early Works on Fairness	65
	5.2.1 Fairness in Two-Person Games	66
5.3	Research Methodology	67
	5.3.1 Game Refinement Theory	67
	5.3.2 Motion in Mind Model	68
	5.3.3 Gini Coefficient and Economic Inequality	71
5.4	The Proposed Assessment Method	75
	5.4.1 New Measure of Equality and Comfort	75
5.5	Computational Results and Discussion	79
	5.5.1 Huizinga’s Homo Ludens Revisited	79
	5.5.2 Identifying a link between Play, Culture, and Society	82
5.6	Chapter Summary	85
6	Conclusion	86
	Bibliography	89
	Publications	102

List of Figures

2-1	A model of three masters[56]	19
2-2	A logistic model of game-outcome uncertainty: from game to art	19
2-3	A model of noble uncertainty	20
2-4	Game refinement values of the most comfortable game points for table tennis is situated within the sophisticated “zone” of $GR \in [0.07, 0.08]$. $GR = 0.07$ and $GR = 0.08$ is the lower bound and upper bound of the game sophistication “zone”, respectively.	25
2-5	Illustrations of the physic analogy that outlined based on the zero-sum assumption where the motion in mind and energy conservation concepts were defined. The notion of motivational potential (E_p and E_q), in-game freedom (E), and player-game motions (\vec{p}_1 and \vec{p}_2) were introduced. Adopted from [58] and [70]	28
3-1	Comparison of two GR measures using perfect player level	35
3-2	Illustration of assumed advantage of initiative (AoI) over different performance levels of the players	37
3-3	The average number of possible moves B and game length D in chess and shogi: human experts and Alpha Zero compared	38
3-4	Win ratio for keeping the advantage of initiative over different performance levels for different sizes of dictionary.	41
3-5	13x13 variant of Scrabble board	41
3-6	Win ratio keeping the advantage of initiative over various performance levels on 13x13 board size	42
3-7	Win ratio keeping the advantage of initiative over different performance levels for three different board sizes.	43

3-8	Illustration of AoI Measure over different performance levels before and after Komi is proposed	44
4-1	A rough illustration of the game progression curves for a game with the advantage of initiative and for an ideal game.	52
4-2	Comparison of Komi 6.5 and Komi 7.5	54
4-3	Komi variation versus winning probability in Go.	58
4-4	The application of <i>dynamic</i> komi to different game phases, and the adopted endgame strategies. (a) Komi variation versus winning probability over different game phases in Scrabble. (b) Four variants of Scrabble AI's endgame strategies.	59
4-5	Relationship between end-game strategies and refinement measure.	62
4-6	Illustration of winning rate obtained using different strategies before and after <i>dynamic</i> komi was applied.	63
5-1	Illustrations of the physic analogy that outlined based on the zero-sum assumption where the motion in mind and energy conservation concepts were defined. The notion of motivational potential (E_p and E_q), in-game freedom (E), and player-game motions (\vec{p}_1 and \vec{p}_2) were introduced. Adopted from [58] and [70]	70
5-2	Graphical representation of the Gini coefficient (G): G coefficient is equal to the area marked A divided by the sum of the areas marked A and B, that is, $G = \frac{A}{A+B}$. It is also equal to $2A$ and to $1 - 2B$ due to the fact that $A + B = 0.5$ (since the axes scale from 0 to 1).	72
5-3	The world since 19 th Century as described by Gini coefficient for (a) level 1: European countries and Japan, (b) level 2: Developed countries, and (c) level 2: Asian countries	73
5-4	Measures of motion in mind for $k = 3$	77
5-5	Interpretation of play, social and fairness comfort	84

List of Tables

2.1	Analogical Link Between Motion in Mind and Motion in Physics.	25
3.1	The results of Alpha Zero in Chess and Shogi [105]	31
3.2	The statistical data of human players in Chess and Shogi [6]	32
3.3	MAVEN and human experts compared [97]	32
3.4	Correlative measures of legacy game refinement	35
3.5	The game length and the GR value of Chess and Shogi games played by human experts and AlphaZero	38
3.6	Winning ratio of keeping advantage of initiative over different performance levels	40
3.7	Win ratio keeping advantage of initiative over different performance levels .	43
4.1	Example Go game statistics with a komi of 5.5 (adopted from [107]). . . .	55
4.2	Winning rate analysis of Black Player based on <i>static</i> komi versus <i>dynamic</i> komi in the game of Go.	58
4.3	Correlative measures of legacy game refinement (GR) measures (ordered by game refinement value).	61
5.1	Analogical link between physics and game [58]	68
5.2	Social comfort and play comfort	76
5.3	Measures of fairness for Go evolutionary changes (original data adopted with permission from [124])	80
5.4	Measures of fairness for Chess evolutionary changes (original data adopted with permission from [31])	80
5.5	Measures of fairness for Soccer games development variants	81

5.6 Interpretation of Gini Coefficient g with its relative to various physics in
mind measures for various countries 82

5.7 Generalized interpretation of play comfort and social comfort 83