Limited Freedom: The Illusion and Reality of "Empowering" Audiences in Interactive Cinema

Chenxi Gao
Xi'an Peihua University, Xi'an 710065, Shaanxi, China

Abstract: The rise of interactive cinema in the digital age has ushered in a profound transformation toward the democratization of film art. By analyzing representative works such as Black Mirror: Bandersnatch and Detroit: Become Human, this paper examines how the shift of audiences from "viewers" to "participants" in interactive cinema reconstructs the discursive space of film. However, such empowerment is inherently dual in nature: on the surface, audiences gain freedom of choice and experience personalized narratives; in essence, all choices are tightly guided and disciplined by pre-designed narrative frameworks, technological logics, and procedural rhetoric. Therefore, the reconstruction of discursive space in interactive cinema is not a simple transfer of power, but a dynamic process of ongoing negotiation and contestation between audience choice and authorial design. Ultimately, while expanding the discursive space of cinema, interactive film also becomes a new disciplinary apparatus that produces cultural subjects adapted to digital society.
***Keywords*:** interactive cinema; audience studies; discursive power; media criticism

1. Introduction

When Netflix opens Black Mirror: Bandersnatch with the prompt "Now you decide how the story unfolds," and when Detroit: Become Human places the fate of an android revolution in the hands of a controller, a techno-utopian discourse of "cinematic democratization" quietly takes shape. Mainstream narratives portray interactive cinema as a media revolution: audiences are said to have finally shifted from passive spectators to active participants, with technology breaking the director's monopoly over narrative control and allowing film art to move toward genuine interactivity and democracy. However, this rhetoric of "empowerment" itself demands critical scrutiny, as it obscures more complex mechanisms of power and the cultural politics at work. Taking Black Mirror: Bandersnatch, Detroit: Become Human, and Late Shift as its primary texts, this paper conducts close readings of their interactive mechanisms and narrative structures to reveal the multiple ways in which "limited freedom" operates within interactive cinema.

2. The Reconfiguration of Discursive Power in Cinema in the Interactive Era

Since Netflix released Black Mirror: Bandersnatch in 2018 and sparked global discussion, interactive cinema has rapidly entered the mainstream. This form has given rise to works such as Detroit: Become Human, which combine cinematic aesthetics with the depth of video games, as well as a series of domestic explorations including The Invisible Guardian and Master, all of which have brought about significant transformations in film art. To grasp the depth of this transformation, it is essential to place the discursive spaces of traditional cinema and interactive cinema in a comparative framework[1].

The discursive space of traditional cinema is a highly centralized, closed, and stable field of meaning. The director's will constitutes the sole center of authority, exercising near-total control over the visual and auditory dimensions of the film so as to guide—and even shape—the audience's perception and emotions. In Full River Red, for example, through meticulously orchestrated camera movement, musical amplification, and the repeated implantation of symbolic motifs (such as the three appearances of the phrase "Serve the country with utmost loyalty"), the director successfully weaves patriotic values into the audience's collective psychological experience, accomplishing a forceful construction that moves from individual narrative to public interpretation. Similarly, the closed-loop narrative structure of The Stage ensures that, regardless of how internal character relations are overturned, they ultimately serve a predetermined thematic core centered on fatalism in times of chaos and the steadfast preservation of moral integrity. The audience is firmly anchored in a position of observation and emotional identification. At the heart of this discursive space lies an authoritative mode of "telling," within which audiences engage primarily in inward-facing "flow interactions" and meaning-making based on personal experience. Moreover, the site in which audiences receive the director's value construction—the cinema as an architectural space—is itself a mechanism for disciplining the body: darkness suppresses social interaction, fixed seating restricts bodily movement, and norms of collective viewing regulate emotional expression. Together, these design elements produce a "contemplative subject." This

mode of subject formation corresponds to the demands of modernity, constructing individuals as focused consumers and private emotional experiencers. Ideology is not directly imposed; rather, it is unconsciously "experienced" and internalized through the pleasures of cinematic viewing[2].

By contrast, interactive cinema seeks to construct a decentralized, open, and dynamic network of meaning. Its discursive space is no longer monopolized by a single authoritative voice, but is instead transformed into a "database" or "story map" that audiences can navigate. In his theory of "participatory culture," Henry Jenkins argues that in digital media environments, audiences are no longer mere consumers but become appropriators, remixers, and redistributors of texts. Interactive cinema appears to internalize this mode of participation within its textual structure: from the very first encounter, audiences are able to directly influence the narrative trajectory. Through interactive interfaces—ranging from simple touchscreens to complex controller-based inputs—they intervene physically, with their choices translated directly into narrative commands. In Detroit: Become Human, players alternately control three android protagonists, making decisions at key junctures that shape the course of the story. For instance, in Connor's investigative sequences, players must actively search for clues and interrogate witnesses; these actions are not optional embellishments but necessary conditions for understanding the narrative. When players spend several minutes meticulously examining every detail of a crime scene, they are no longer spectators watching a detective at work, but psychologically "become" the detective themselves. The establishment of this sense of "psychological ownership" produces a level of identification with characters that far exceeds that of traditional film viewing: characters are no longer Others, but extensions of the player's will within a virtual world. This shift in identity brings about a reconfiguration of discursive space. The linear arrow of narrative time is broken, replaced by a multidimensional space of possibilities. Although interaction in Black Mirror: Bandersnatch is relatively simple, its five major endings and dozens of branching nodes nonetheless construct a complex narrative network. As audiences traverse this network, they develop a powerful illusion of "my story"; even when arriving at the same ending, different narrative paths produce radically different meanings for different viewers. Discursive space thus shifts from the public and shared to the private and individualized. At its core is a negotiatory mode of "operation": the audience moves from the "gazing eye" to the "operating hand," and the cinematic experience shifts from contemplation to exploration[3].

However, Jenkins also cautions that participatory culture is often co-opted by commercial forces, and that "empowerment" may be little more than an illusion. This insight suggests that the fundamental transformation brought about by interactive cinema is not a straightforward transfer of power, but rather a complex reconfiguration and reproduction of discursive power.

Table 1. Comparison of Core Dimensions of Discursive Space in Traditional vs. Interactive Cinema

Dimension	Traditional Cinema	Interactive Cinema
Discursive Core	Director's authoritative "telling"	Systemic and audience's negotiated "operation"
Narrative Structure	Linear, closed-loop, determinate	Branching, networked, potential
Audience Role	Passive viewer, meaning interpreter	Active participant, narrative co-constructor
Power Relations	One-directional infusion, centralized	Two-way interaction, decentralized (programmatically preset)
Text Nature	Closed, completed "work"	Open, to-be-completed "database" or "script"
Aesthetic Experience	Contemplation, immersion, flow interaction	Intervention, exploration, action interaction
Subject Construction	Interpellated, relatively unified ideological subject	Empowered, yet also algorithmically tutored "user-playworker" subject

3. Manufacturing the Illusion of Freedom: The Design of Choice Mechanisms in Interactive Cinema

The primary way interactive cinema produces an experience of "freedom" lies in its carefully designed choice interfaces and interactive mechanisms. While these designs grant audiences a sense of operational control, they simultaneously—and often invisibly—define the boundaries and directions of that freedom. Black Mirror: Bandersnatch offers a paradigmatic example of such a choice mechanism. At key narrative junctures, two or more option icons appear at the bottom of the screen, requiring viewers to make a selection within a limited time frame (usually 10–15 seconds). This design generates multiple psychological effects: the appearance of the choice frame signals a temporary transfer of narrative authority; the countdown creates a sense of urgency in decision-making; and the clicking action endows the choice with a bodily sense of materiality[4].

Upon closer examination, however, this "freedom" is deeply constrained. The number of options is always limited (most often binary or ternary choices); the phrasing of options already embeds value orientations (for example, the opposition between "accept the test" and "refuse the test"); and the pressure of the countdown deprives viewers of the space for careful deliberation, forcing them to rely on intuition

and habit. More importantly, all choices ultimately lead to pre-scripted narrative paths—viewers are never able to create a third possibility beyond the given options.

Detroit: Become Human represents a more complex mode of producing the illusion of freedom. The game grants players a sense of control through three main forms of interaction: first, dialogue wheels, which allow players to choose different tones and topics in conversation; second, environmental investigation, in which players can freely explore spaces and collect clues; and third, quick-time events, which require precise inputs at critical moments. Together, these forms create the impression of "high freedom," yet each is structured by implicit constraints. Dialogue wheels appear to offer multiple choices, but these options often share the same narrative function; environmental exploration permits free movement, but the placement of key clues subtly guides the direction of investigation; and quick-time events reduce freedom to conditioned reflexes, where success or failure depends on reaction speed rather than reflective decision-making[5].

From the perspective of interface design, the choice mechanisms of interactive cinema extend and intensify the operational logic of the digital age. Gestures such as clicking, swiping, and dragging—naturalized through decades of personal computer and smartphone use—have become the embodied language of digital natives. Interactive films "dramatize" these everyday operations by endowing them with narrative significance, allowing audiences to experience a sense of "freedom" through familiar bodily practices. Time-pressure mechanisms further compress the space for discursive reflection. Late Shift pushes this logic to its extreme: nearly all choices are governed by a ten-second countdown, with failure to respond resulting in random decisions or negative consequences. Such design not only generates tension but also trains bodies and minds to adapt to the accelerated rhythms of contemporary society.

The choice mechanisms of interactive cinema thus concern more than narrative technique; they are deeply implicated in the production and shaping of subjectivity in the digital age. Through branching narratives, interactive films guide value judgments; through feedback on choices, they cultivate decision-making habits; and through interface operations, they train patterns of reaction. In this sense, the "freedom" experienced by audiences in interactive cinema is in fact a carefully designed freedom — a form of limited autonomy permitted within the bounds of the system[6].

4. The Substance of Discipline: Frameworks and Strategies Behind Choice

If the choice mechanisms of interactive cinema are likened to a game, then its rules, board, and conditions for victory have already been set by the designers; the audience's freedom consists only of limited movement within a predetermined framework.

First, no matter how complex the branching structure of an interactive film may be, the total range of possibilities is always finite and entirely pre-programmed by the creators. Although Black Mirror: Bandersnatch contains more than five hours of potential footage, all of its scenes are stored in a database, waiting to be activated by the viewer's choices. Audiences cannot generate scenes beyond this database, nor can they assemble sequences not permitted by the program. This inherent finitude determines that the "freedom" of interactive cinema is, at its core, a matter of selecting from a limited menu rather than engaging in genuinely creative participation[7].

Interactive cinema also produces a new form of narrative authority. In traditional cinema, directorial authority is explicit and centralized; in interactive cinema, the "author" retreats behind system design, becoming a "world architect" or a "rule-maker." Power is no longer manifested through direct control over every detail, but through the design of a framework of possibilities. Audiences are granted the right to choose, yet the scope of choice, the meaning of each option, and the relative weighting between different choices are all determined by this invisible author. This constitutes a form of "decentralized centralization": power appears to be distributed to audiences, but in reality is exercised through system design in a more precise and concealed manner. An even more subtle framework lies in the value encoding and guidance embedded within the options themselves. In Detroit: Become Human, when Markus leads the android movement, the options of "peaceful protest" and "violent revolution" are not positioned as equivalent alternatives. Through narrative consequences, character reactions, and visual presentation, the game implicitly communicates value judgments: choosing the peaceful path may allow players to witness slow yet positive change and gain broader recognition from allies, whereas choosing the violent path may result in greater casualties and moral condemnation. This is not merely a matter of narrative branching, but a典型 instance of "procedural rhetoric." Players are not told outright that "violence is wrong"; instead, they experience the negative consequences of violence through their actions—character deaths, failed objectives, and emotional trauma. This form of experiential per-

suasion is more effective than overt didacticism, because it allows players to "discover" the truth through their own "free choices," while remaining largely unaware that the path to this "discovery" has been carefully designed in advance[8].

The fragmentation of narrative coherence in interactive cinema undermines the possibility of constructing deep discursive meaning. The frequent appearance of interactive nodes repeatedly pulls audiences out of narrative "flow," forcing a shift from the "immersed spectator" to the "alert operator." This form of "disruption" interrupts the accumulation of character emotion, the continuity of character development, and the layered progression of thematic meaning. In traditional cinema, characters reveal the difficulty of their choices and the autonomy of their growth through coherent narrative arcs, enabling audiences to develop profound identification and empathy. In interactive cinema, by contrast, characters often devolve into "puppets" awaiting audience commands, their destinies reduced to a collage of selectable options, thereby losing the sense of personal agency and autonomous action. As a result, although the discursive space may appear more complex due to branching structures, the depth of meaning production and the intensity of emotional impact are frequently weakened by this fragmented and discontinuous mode of experience. Audiences become preoccupied with "traversing" branching maps and "collecting endings," rendering their engagement closer to the processing of database information than to aesthetic immersion in a work of art[9].

The frameworks of choice in interactive cinema embody the operation of normative power. The aim of discipline is not repression but the production of individuals who conform to specific norms. Through their choice mechanisms, interactive films produce "normalized" decision-makers: players learn to make the "correct" choices within limited time frames, to judge according to values subtly signaled by the system, and to accept the standardized consequences that follow from those choices. The reality of this disciplinary process is often obscured by the promise of "personalized narratives." Interactive cinema frequently claims to offer each viewer a "unique story experience," yet this "uniqueness" refers only to differences in path combinations rather than to any substantive divergence. Such "limited personalization" is, in fact, a classic strategy of consumer culture.

5. The Production of Digital Subjects: Interactive Cinema as a New Disciplinary Apparatus

The discursive space reconstructed by interactive cinema is not a genuinely democratized field of meaning, but a highly refined site of discipline. Rather than conveying meaning through an external and authoritative voice that directly "tells," interactive cinema invites audiences to "experience" how meaning is guided and generated through their own operations. The former represents an explicit ideological interpellation, whereas the latter functions as an implicit form of procedural rhetoric realized through interactivity. While enjoying a sense of control, audiences simultaneously enact and reinforce the system's underlying logic. Ultimately, the supposedly "empowered" audience becomes a new type of cultural subject of the digital age. Through this process of subject formation, interactive cinema is transformed from a form of entertainment into an important apparatus of contemporary cultural discipline[10].

In his discussion of disciplinary society, Michel Foucault argues that modern power operates through a series of "micro-technologies" that act upon the body, shaping it into something "docile and useful." The interactive design of interactive cinema constitutes precisely such micro-disciplinary technologies in the digital age. Interface operations train finger dexterity; time pressure trains decision-making speed; and choice feedback trains value orientations. Players who repeatedly engage with Detroit: Become Human not only remember the story, but also store specific patterns of operation in their muscle memory—when to press buttons quickly, when to explore carefully, and how to navigate among different dialogue options. The cultivation of such bodily habits forms the material foundation of subjectivity production[11].

Second, interactive cinema trains a mode of thinking adapted to digital environments. Traditional linear narratives encourage sustained, coherent attention and deep reflection, whereas the branching narratives of interactive cinema reinforce fragmented and jump-like patterns of attention. Audiences must constantly switch between different clues, options, and time pressures. The subject produced through this form of cognitive training corresponds to the so-called "digital native"—adept at multitasking, capable of coping with information overload, and accustomed to non-linear thinking. The potential cost of this adaptation, however, is a loss of reflective depth and the erosion of critical distance[12].

Interactive cinema also plays a key disciplinary role in the shaping of emotion. Late Shift, for instance, modulates players' emotional experiences through time pressure and the consequences of choice: anticipation and anxiety when facing decisions, release after making a choice, satisfaction when receiving positive feedback, or regret when confronted with negative outcomes. This form of emotional training not only enhances the appeal of the experience, but also contributes to the production of emotional subjects suited to the demands of the digital age. As sociologist Eva Illouz has noted, contemporary society increasingly relies on the management of emotions, requiring individuals to become "flexible subjects" capable of

rapidly regulating their feelings and responding positively to challenges. The emotional modulation at work in interactive cinema constitutes a cultural practice through which such flexible subjects are produced[13].

6. Conclusion: Interactive Cinema as a Negotiated Discursive Space

The reconstruction of discursive space in interactive cinema reveals a complex and dynamic field of power relations. In this space, the centralized authority of the traditional author is indeed weakened, and audiences do gain an unprecedented capacity for intervention. Yet this empowerment is not an unconditional liberation, but a carefully engineered form of "limited freedom." Audience discursive power is always engaged in ongoing negotiation and contestation with the creator's framework design. From the time-pressured choices of Black Mirror: Bandersnatch, to the operationalized moral dilemmas of Detroit: Become Human, and the rapid decision-making training of Late Shift, interactive cinema employs sophisticated interface design to grant audiences a sense of control while simultaneously—and imperceptibly—training new forms of subjectivity adapted to the demands of digital capitalism. This subject is adept at rapid response, accustomed to constrained choices, and willing to accept operationalized ethics, yet may lose the capacity for deep reflection, critical interrogation, and creative imagination. The purpose of critique, however, is not to deny the cultural value of interactive cinema, but to pierce the rhetoric of empowerment and expose the power mechanisms beneath it, thereby opening space for a more substantive form of freedom. The potential of interactive cinema may lie less in fulfilling the democratic promises of a technological utopia than in revealing the limits of freedom in the digital age—and in provoking renewed imagination and pursuit of a more expansive freedom.

Acknowledgments

This paper was supported by Xi'an Peihua University 2025 University-level Scientific Research Project "A Study on the Reconstruction and Expansion of Discursive Space in Interactive Cinema from the Perspective of Technological Innovation" (Project No.: PHKT2557).

References

[1] Qi Wei, Xu Yanping. Research on Interactive Cinema: Centered on the Media Archaeology of the Interactive Interface [J]. Film Art, 2021(5): 45-52.
[2] Lai Lijie, Zhao Rukun. The Immersive Communication of Local Culture in Digital Games: A Case Study of Shaanbei Storytelling in Black Myth: Wukong [J/OL]. Journal of Changsha University, 1-12[2025-12-15]. (in Chinese)
[3] Jenkins, H. (2006). Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide. New York University Press.
[4] Wu Qiulin. Research on Henry Jenkins' Theory of Participatory Culture [D]. Southwest University, 2025.
[5] Zhang Shuduan, Sun Xingyu. Reflections on the Aesthetics of Interactive Cinema from the Perspective of Intermediality: An Investigation Centered on Black Mirror: Bandersnatch [J]. New Films, 2021,(04):46-53.
[6] Bogost, I. (2007). Persuasive games: The expressive power of videogames. MIT Press.
[7] Wen Jing, Yang Kai. Interactive Immersive Experience: The Possibilities of Interactive Film and Television [J]. Youth Journalist, 2025(3).
[8] Han Byung-Chul. The Burnout Society [M]. Translated by Wang Yili. Beijing: CITIC Press Group, 2019: 12-30.
[9] Hu Hongyi, Wang Meng. A Brief Analysis of the Immersive Experience in Interactive Films: A Case Study of Detroit: Become Human [J]. Film Literature, 2020(15): 99-102.
[10] Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control. October, 59, 3-7.
[11] Chai Dongdong, Wang Zhicheng. Cinematic Experience as "World": Re-examining the Significance of Interactive Cinema for Film Studies [J]. Film Literature, 2025,(18):67-74.
[12] Foucault, Michel. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison [M]. Translated by Liu Beicheng, Yang Yuanying. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 2019.
[13] Illouz, Eva. Cold Intimacies: The Making of Emotional Capitalism [M]. Hunan People's Publishing House, 2023.