
This is the **accepted version** of the journal article:

Oliva Zamora, Miguel Ángel. «Exploring the Potential Use of Easy-to-Understand Language in Video Games». *Popular Communication. The International Journal of Media and Culture*, Vol. 24, Num. 1 (2026), p. 104-118
DOI 10.1080/15405702.2025.2478281

This version is available at <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/336400>

under the terms of the  license.

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in
Popular Communication, 21 March 2025,

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/10.1080/15405702.2025.2478281>

Exploring the Potential Use of Easy-to-Understand Language in Video Games

Miguel Ángel Oliva Zamora

*Faculty of Translation and Interpreting, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona,
Barcelona, Spain*

MiguelAngel.Oliva@uab.cat, ORCID 0000-0002-4838-0757

Miguel Ángel Oliva Zamora holds a BA in Translation and Interpreting from the Universidad de Granada (UGR) and a MA in Audiovisual Translation from the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB). Thanks to the PhD grant he has been awarded with, he is now able to research video game accessibility and the implementation of easy-to-understand language. He is currently a member of the research group TransMedia Catalonia at the UAB and develops his work as part of the From written to oral texts in Easy Language: easy audios in cultural visits and video games (WEL) project.

Exploring the Potential Use of Easy-to-Understand Language in Video Games

Video games are becoming a major player in the entertainment industry. Their growth should be accompanied by measures that ensure they can be accessed by people with different preferences and needs. Among users that might find barriers in these audiovisual products, people with cognitive disabilities or learning difficulties might struggle to determine a response to the stimuli provided by the video game. One accessibility feature aimed at overcoming this particular barrier is easy-to-understand language, which involves using a particular textual structure, wording, and formatting in order to enhance comprehension. This study explores the application of this type of language in video games. A preliminary search confirmed that there is a lack of research on its implementation, prompting this narrative review. References to the simplicity of the language were looked for in academic and non-academic sources, resulting in the analysis of 12 documents. All of them allude to a simple and clear language, but fail to provide a concrete guide on how to implement a cognitively accessible language. The study discusses how existing guidelines for easy-to-understand language, currently applied to websites and printed materials, could potentially increase video game accessibility. This type of language could be offered as an optional feature that players can enable or disable at any time. However, reception studies evaluating easy-to-understand language in video games would be necessary to assess its effectiveness. If proven beneficial for players with cognitive disabilities or learning difficulties, this feature would represent a significant step toward making video games more accessible to everyone.

Keywords: game accessibility; cognitive disabilities; learning difficulties; literature review; easy-to-understand language

Introduction

Video games have grown to become an important sector in the entertainment industry, with its economic impact still increasing every year (Clement, 2024). Their prominence is accompanied by a rise in accessibility awareness, as reflected in international policies such as the Convention on the Rights for Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) (United

Nations General Assembly, 2007) and the significant increase of courses and training initiatives focused on accessibility (Kletenik & Adler, 2022). This has led to the creation of dedicated websites by players with disabilities (Straub & Marijn, n.d.), and the development of accessibility guidelines by companies (Microsoft, 2023), among other things. In this context, game accessibility is gaining more visibility, resulting in growing demands for video games to be accessible for everyone.

A number of accessibility options born in different media have been implemented in video games. Currently, subtitling and dubbing are common practices. They help people not only to overcome language barriers, but also obstacles that might arise from hearing or visual impairments. The implementation of other specific accessibility services, such as audio description, has been explored from a user perspective by researchers (Larreina-Morales & Mangiron, 2023; Larreina-Morales, 2024), and has been present in the industry since the remake of *The Last of Us Part I* (Naughty Dog, 2022). What all these practices have in common is that they fall under the umbrella of sensory accessibility, that is, they focus on barriers in perception.

However, there are other forms of accessibility, including cognitive accessibility—the main focus of this paper—which addresses obstacles that may emerge from executive dysfunction, memory loss, or other cognitive features (IGDA-GASIG, n.d.). This type of accessibility has been less explored than others (Mangiron, 2021a) and therefore deserves academic attention.

This article presents part of the research that is carried out within the project From written to oral texts in Easy Language: easy audios in cultural visits and video games (WEL, PID2022-137058NB-I0) (see section “The WEL project”). One of the objectives of the project is to explore the potential use of easy-to-understand language in video games as an accessibility enhancer. For this study, the initial hypothesis was

that this type of language has not been implemented in video games. After a preliminary search in Scopus, Web of science, SAGE journals, and ProQuest that confirmed it, the following exploratory research question was formulated:

- Research Question (RQ): could easy-to-understand language be applied in video games in order to improve cognitive accessibility?

To answer the question, this study examines cognitive accessibility guidelines to elucidate whether text is considered a key factor and how language should be implemented. After examining the use of easy-to-understand language in other types of software, a suggestion on how to apply it in video games will be presented. The paper has two main objectives:

- (1) Objective 1 (O1): analyzing what features language should have to foster cognitive accessibility in video games according to the literature.
- (2) Objective 2 (O2): suggesting a way to include easy-to-understand language in video games.

This paper is structured as follows: first, an overview of the concepts of *game accessibility* and *easy-to-understand language* in relation with video games is provided. Next, the goals of the WEL project and the methodology are explained. A literature review was conducted to explore how academic papers and current guidelines suggest making language accessible. Finally, after analyzing how easy-to-understand language could be integrated into video games, the main contributions of the study are summarized and future research avenues are proposed.

Game accessibility

To begin with, the social model of disability (Marks, 1997) is adopted as a basis for this

research. This model considers that society “disables” people and prevents them from using its cultural outcomes, be it products, services, or physical spaces. From that perspective, game accessibility, according to the Game Accessibility Special Interest Group of the International Game Developers Association (IGDA-GASIG) (2025), is conceived as a means of preventing situations in which a video game presents barriers because of a mismatch with someone’s abilities.

Considering that video games fall under the wider category of “electronic media”, their accessibility could be defined in terms of *usability* and *adaptability* (Mangiron, 2021b). The aforementioned “mismatch” between abilities and barriers might emerge by a lack of usability, because the challenges in the video game do not allow players with different needs to progress adequately, or by a lack of adaptability, that is, by the incompatibility of the software with different kinds of assistive technologies.

As regards the barriers players may encounter, Yuan et al. (2011) suggest that they emerge in three different steps, i.e.: receiving stimuli, determining a response and providing input. The first step, “receiving stimuli” (p. 83), might entail visual or hearing difficulties, the second step, “determining a response” (p. 83), might entail cognitive difficulties, and the third step, “providing input” (p. 84), might entail mobility difficulties.

When implementing accessibility, there are two approaches: addressing all barriers simultaneously or tackling them individually. The first approach would be *universal design*, which implies creating video games that try to avoid as many obstacles as possible. Grammenos et al. (2009) explain its advantages: this design would increase the availability of this form of entertaining, would allow a broader social interaction and would expand the potential market. However, Grammenos et al. (2009)

are aware it is impossible to make video games accessible for everyone; their idea is to make “games [that] can be played by all people who can potentially play them” (p. 27).

The same point is also stressed by Yuan et al. (2011): “Universal design does not indicate that all impairments are supported, but rather that multiple types of impairments are supported” (p. 94). All of the aforementioned authors are aware of the impossibility of having a design that can work for everyone at any moment. In fact, they assimilate that, as Mangiron (2021a) suggests, there is no “one-size fits all” (p. 2) approach to game accessibility, so the idea is to “make games available to the widest possible number of users” (p. 2).

As regards the second approach, there are video games designed with a specific group of people in mind, what Magnusson et al. (2018) call the *design for me*. Works dedicated exclusively to one kind of disability follow this design. After all, it seems necessary to know how to tackle each disability separately in order to then design a widely accessible video game.

Both approaches coexist in game accessibility at the moment. On the one hand, there are, for example, audio games, which are solely based on audio and specifically created for people with visual disabilities (Friberg & Gärdenfors, 2004). On the other hand, there are games such as the remake of the *The Last of Us Part I* (Naughty Dog, 2022) and *God of War: Ragnarök* (SIE Santa Monica Studio, 2022), each of them with more than 60 accessibility features, including audio description, captions, and different assist modes. In spite of their wide accessibility and pre-set configurations for visual, hearing, and motor accessibility, both games lack a pre-set for cognitive accessibility.

Cognitive accessibility in video games

Game developers may approach cognitive accessibility using one of the design approaches mentioned earlier. If they apply the *design for me*, they include accessibility

features to grant access to a certain group of people, often with the intention of improving cognitive functions. If they apply *universal design* principles, they implement them to make the game available to the widest audience possible.

On the one hand, games such as *Dino Island* (Child Neuropsychology Lab, n.d.), *MADRIGALE* (Di tore et al., 2014), *Junk-Food Destroyer* (Hatzigiannakoglou, 2015) or *MEBook* (Uzuegbunam et al., 2015) are serious games destined to improve cognitive functions and skills. *Dino Island* was developed by neuropsychologists in order to improve children's executive functions (e.g. resisting impulsive actions, adjusting to unexpected changes...). *Junk-Food Destroyer* is tailored to teenagers with Down syndrome, so that they can learn about healthy-style eating. *MEBook* aims to teach people with autism proper ways of greeting others. And *MADRIGALE* serves as a phonological training tool for children with dyslexia. All these games have an individualized design, targeting a specific group of users, thus focusing on helping people with a certain kind of disability or learning difficulty.

On the other hand, games such as *Skulls of the Shogun* (17-Bit, 2013), *Uncharted 4* (Naughty Dog, 2016), or *Overland* (Finji, 2019) include accessibility features for a variety of players, in some cases destined to aid people with cognitive disabilities or learning difficulties. *Uncharted 4* is a triple A¹ game that allows players to adjust the difficulty and to activate hints and tutorials. *Skulls of the Shogun* allows saving the progress at any point in the game, so that it can be easily restarted. And *Overland* provides a relatively easy to implement, but useful feature: a dyslexia-friendly font, an example followed by other games such as *Loop Hero* (Four Quarters, 2021) and

1. Term used to describe games developed by large studios with high budget.

Disco Elysium (ZA/UM, 2019). All these games were created with a *universal design* in mind, thus including features that can help as many players as possible.

In the end, different video games present different approaches to accessibility, and that is partly due to the fact that cognitive accessibility targets a heterogeneous group of users. In the examples above we find accessibility options that are useful both for cognitive disabilities (Down syndrome and autism) and learning difficulties (dyslexia), but some games even include accessibility options related to mental health issues, as happens in *Grounded* (Obsidian Entertainment, 2020) with its arachnophobia mode, which turns spiders into spheres.

Could easy-to-understand language be applied to video games?

In order to introduce the concept of *easy-to-understand language*, three simple questions will be answered with *what* is it exactly?, *who* is it for?, and *how* could it benefit players? First, *what* is easy-to-understand language? One of the first issues that emerge from the concept is the terminological inconsistency. Lindholm & Vanhatalo (2021) state that this can be explained due to its multidisciplinary nature and they gather a list of the different names it receives: “Easy Language, easy-to-read language, easy-to-understand language, easy read, easy-read, clear language, simplified language or simple language” (p. 17). In this paper, the term *easy-to-understand language* is used, partially following the terminology of the CRPD (United Nations General Assembly, 2007): “easy to read and understand.” The “read” is left aside, as done in the European project Easy Access for Social Inclusion Training (EASIT)² (2018-1-ES01-KA203-05275), to encompass all disciplines and assert the possibility of this language being used for audiovisual products, e.g., easy-to-understand audios.

2. <https://webs.uab.cat/easit/en/>

When using the term *easy-to-understand language* in this paper, its definition is shared with the EASIT project and refers to all language varieties that can be used to enhance comprehensibility, including easy-to-read and plain languages, which are later defined. By applying these “easy-to-understand features” to standard language, professionals would then develop what Lindholm & Vanhatalo (2021) call *easy languages*, which are specific to a culture or region. There exists, among others, an Easy English and an Easy Spanish. In order to implement easy-to-understand language, authors can consult the guidelines by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (Nomura et al., 2010), the association Inclusion Europe (2010), or the International Organization for Standardization (2021).

Second, *who* can benefit from easy-to-understand language? Its predecessor, easy-to-read language, is linked to disability (Ocampo, 2015), as it was designed to help people that may need a more comprehensible approach to a text. Miesenberger & Petz (2014, p. 319) make up a list of the cognitive functionalities that might be at stake when interacting with a multimedia product: memory, problem solving, attention, reading, visual perception, and comprehension, among others. Prior to that, plain language emerged as a simplified form of language designed to ensure that every user, regardless of their academic background, could understand important civic information, such as legal texts (Mazur, 2000).

Similarly, the concept of *easy-to-understand language* in this study is not confined to people with disabilities. This approach has already been adopted by authors such as Maaß (2020), who includes illiterate people or those with low reading skills as target users. Therefore, making content easy-to-understand is essentially a means of enhancing accessibility for a broader range of users.

Third, *how* could easy-to-understand language benefit players? Of the three barriers mentioned above that players may face in video games, “determining a response” is related to cognitive accessibility. Video games require significant cognitive effort, as players must not only process and understand the information, but also act on it (Mangiron, 2012, p. 46). In this sense, easy-to-understand language could help overcome cognitive difficulties by serving as an accessibility feature that enhances the comprehension of players.

The WEL project

From written to oral texts in Easy Language: easy audios in cultural visits and video games (WEL) is a project funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities, the Spanish Agency for National Innovation, and the European Regional Development Fund (PID2022-137058NB-I00). Its main objective is to research the application of easy-to-understand language in cultural contexts, such as museums, and in video games. It entails a combination of both quantitative and qualitative research methods to gather data from users.

With regards to video games, the project WEL aims to analyze how language is currently dealt with from a development perspective, concretely, whether the concept of *easy-to-understand language* is applied or mentioned in any way in academic literature or non-academic guidelines. The results of this analysis are presented in this paper, laying the foundations for the future steps of the project, which entail the assessment of users’ needs and the validation of easy-to-understand language in video games by means of reception studies.

Methodology

In order to determine if easy-to-understand language could be applied to improve

cognitive accessibility in video games (RQ), a literature review was performed. As mentioned in the Introduction, our initial hypothesis was that easy-to-understand language was not currently used in video games. Accordingly, a preliminary search using keywords for *easy-to-understand language* (*easy-to-understand*, *easy to understand*, *easy-to-read*, *easy to read...*) and *video game* in Scopus and Web of Science—the major research databases in the U.S. and Europe—resulted in only two documents. This outcome led to confirm that there are insufficient works to perform a systematic review. Therefore, the narrative review method was chosen to align with the open question and the two exploratory objectives that ultimately guide this study.

This research method consists of describing a certain topic from a wide angle, considering different theoretical and contextual aspects (Bryman, 2012). The fundamental difference with other kinds of reviews is that it does not strictly address the criteria behind the choice of the information sources, since it is not focused on providing a process that can be traced back (Ferrari, 2015). This might hinder the objectivity of the selection and the replicability of the search, but it also allows summarizing key and usable findings that might be otherwise overlooked (Sarkar & Bhatia, 2021). In fact, one of the goals of implementing this method is being able to analyze data from sources that are not research-related and that have been specifically chosen because of their relevance (Porter & Kientz, 2013), such as developers and users' guidelines for accessible video games. These documents can provide valuable insights into what developers can actually do and how these recommendations might be integrated into their workflow when designing a game with cognitive accessibility options.

Thus, the analysis of how language is dealt with in video games to ensure cognitive accessibility starts by gathering and examining documents from several

sources. On the one hand, academic papers were looked for in four databases: Web of Science, Scopus, ProQuest, and SAGE Journals. The following string was applied: *(language OR format OR text) AND “cognitive accessibility” AND “video game”*. For the first part of the string, terms that could refer both to the content and the style of the text were included, as all aspects are of interest. Then the search was restricted by specifying the type of accessibility and the type of audiovisual product.

The search yielded 124 documents. From those, nine were excluded because they were duplicates and seven because they could not be accessed. Next, the documents were examined to confirm whether they dealt with cognitive accessibility and video games. It is worth noting that most databases yielded few results: Web of Science (1), Scopus (14), and SAGE Journals (5), except for ProQuest, which returned a significantly larger number of results (104). This database generated considerable noise, as many of the retrieved documents pertained to the area of sociolinguistics, such as studies related to gender, identity, and various cognitive features. Ultimately, 39 documents were excluded after reviewing their abstracts, and 66 after scanning their content, thus only three documents were accepted. Four more documents were added as per the knowledge of the author, since they did not appear as a result of the search, but they mentioned language in the context of accessibility.

In addition to academic documents, industry and community guidelines were examined for references to language. A list of 85 development guidelines (IGEA, 2022) gathered by the Inclusion, Diversity, Equality and Accessibility (IDEA) working group was scanned and five game accessibility guidelines were found to include a reference to language in their cognitive accessibility sections, all of them already examined in a previous work (Oliva-Zamora & Mangiron, forthcoming). In total, 12 documents were

accepted and examined to gather information on how language is addressed in video games.

Results and discussion

The following tables list the accepted documents, categorized by origin (academic or non-academic) and arranged by date.

[Table 1 near here]

[Table 2 near here]

The analysis revealed that, on the one hand, documents extracted solely from academic sources either approach cognitive accessibility broadly (D1, D2, and D6) or include serious games (D3, D4, D5, and D7). Below are the main methods and results of the accepted papers and guidelines:

- D1 explores game accessibility from a usability perspective, addressing visual, hearing, motor, and cognitive barriers.
- D2 surveys designers to gather data on the time needed to implement cognitive accessibility and compares it with the number of potential players, concluding that there could be economic benefits from incorporating this type of accessibility in video games.
- D3 examines reception studies focused on adolescents with depression to elucidate design elements that are important to them.
- D4 investigates how community efforts can help to find effective ways to simplify the texts of a learning game.
- D5 develops a video game and tests it with users in order to gather feedback on its accessibility features.

- D6 examines issues that might arise when designing accessible IT artifacts of any kind, including websites and video games.
- D7 extrapolates strategies from commercial video games to advise language teachers on designing accessible learning experiences.

Documents from non-academic sources, however, differ significantly in their creation and dissemination processes:

- The GAG (D8), made by academics and game developers of the IGDA-GASIG, includes more than 100 requirements that would ensure playability for anyone who might find difficulties with motor, visual, hearing, or cognitive barriers.
- The APX model (D9), created by academics, is divided into two steps: it posits that players need to first be able to access the game and then find a way to overcome its challenges.
- The CAG (D10) is one of the several guides available on the website Can I Play That?³, created by players to review the accessibility of video games.
- The guide (D11) by Mark Brown, a game designer with over 15 years of experience in the industry, includes reflections on different game features concerning cognitive accessibility.
- The XAG (D12) is written by developers from Microsoft and includes over 20 accessibility features for all types of disabilities with concrete examples from their video games.

All these documents address how text and language should be managed when creating a cognitively accessible video game. D1, D2, and D5 suggest using simple

3. <https://caniplaythat.com/>

language; D2 emphasizes the need for clarity, and D1 also highlights the importance of easy-to-understand instructions, similar to D3, which advises that instructions be “understandable.” D4 cites various definitions of *text simplification* and concludes that the common denominator is lowering barriers for the reader while maintaining the meaning. D6 recommends the use of consistent terminology and short sentences. Finally, D7 advocates for clear, precise instructions and objectives by referencing game accessibility guidelines.

With regards to the non-academic documents, D8 and D11 suggest using a simple clear language, to what D5 adds avoiding length and complexity. D9 and D12, however, mention the aspect of the text: they suggest fonts, sizes, colors, and other formatting features, such as background, that might impact the readability. And D10 mentions clear and short instructions.

In summary, for a text in a video game to be cognitively accessible, the language appearing in instructions or objectives could be defined as follows (O1): simple (D1, D2, D5, D8, and D11), clear (D2, D7, D8, D10, and D11), easy (D1 and D8), precise (D7), understandable (D3) and in short sentences (D6, D8, and D10), but with consistent terminology (D6) and always maintaining the original meaning intended (D4). When in written form, its aspect should be customizable (D9 and D12).

This definition, however, is not without ambiguity. Many components of language contribute to clarity and simplicity: structure, syntax, vocabulary, and content, among others. The documents fail to provide a comprehensive framework to determine if a text is, for example, too short or too long, or if it can be easily understood. Consequently, the characteristics of this “simple” or “clear” language are not specified. A more exhaustive approach would be useful for developers to know how such language could be applied.

The concept of *easy-to-understand language*, as previously defined, might fill this gap, since there are documents with concrete descriptions about how to implement this simplified language. The guide by Inclusion Europe (2010) is very complete, including 40 pages of information for designing easy-to-understand texts. In order to pinpoint an overview of how easy-to-understand language could be created (O2), the main points of the guide might be summarized as follows.

Easy-to-understand features regarding the content:

- new line for each sentence
- no splitting words
- short sentences with only one idea
- 1 or 2 lines per sentence
- lists of bullet points
- easy words
- explanations for difficult words
- clear reference for pronouns
- no footnotes
- simple punctuation
- no abbreviations

Easy-to-understand features regarding the aspect:

- font without serif
- adequate space between letters
- no italics
- size of 14 or bigger
- no colors

- numbers in pages
- bold for important information
- left alignment
- space between paragraphs

However, when considering the implementation of easy-to-understand language in video games, several factors must be taken into account due to the interactive and audiovisual nature of these products. Interestingly, the guidelines by Inclusion Europe (2010) include sections devoted to multimedia information, which could be applied to video games. For example, they recommend using subtitles with a large font, a dark background, and extended display duration. Additionally, there is an entire section about websites that references the Web Accessibility Initiative (W3C, n.d.). Websites and video games share a core characteristic: interactivity. Since much of the research on easy-to-understand language pertains to websites (Fărcașiu, 2023), understanding its implementation in this context could provide valuable insights for adapting similar strategies to video games.

In this regard, several studies have used easy-to-understand language on websites and tested its effectiveness with users. Karreman et al. (2007) and Fajardo et al. (2013) demonstrated that disabled users preferred and comprehended the easy-to-read version of a website better than the standard one. However, Karreman et al. (2007) also raised the question of stigmatization, as their control group of non-disabled people preferred the version of the website with conventional language. This negative predisposition towards easy-to-read language has been identified as a general drawback. Matausch and Peböck (2010) noted that its acceptance in websites among the general public was low, while Hansen-Schirra and Maaß (2020) explain that this type of

language can emphasize the existence of a disability, stressing the communication impairment of the users that need it and making them “different.”

Schmutz et al. (2019) explored this issue further, noting that Karreman et al. (2007) did not consider factors such as the design or the layout of the website. They conducted an experiment with non-disabled users, incorporating these new criteria, but their results were similar: subjective reactions were predominantly negative. Vollenwyder et al. (2018) advanced this line of research by testing different approaches to the implementation of easy-to-read language, and by analyzing the reaction and preferences of non-disabled users. They found that “combining Easy-to-Read Language with conventional language did not result in the unintended side-effects on text liking reported in previous studies” (p. 520). Bohman (2010) had already suggested an alternative web-room with all texts in easy-to-read language, but Vollenwyder et al. (2018) implemented a toggle to switch between versions more immediately, and this option was the most used.

The scarcity of recommendations for language in video games and the lack of specificity of existing ones could explain the gap between the application and the research of easy-to-understand language in websites compared to video games. As seen above, there have been many advances in the former, partly due to the fact that simplicity and comprehension are included in the most recognized set of guidelines so as to ascertain that a web is accessible: the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2 (W3C, 2023). These web accessibility guidelines suggest including definitions of certain unusual words and complete versions of abbreviations in order to understand what they mean. They also suggest including a simplified or more easily understood version of complex information by following the guidelines by Inclusion Europe (2010).

All these results can serve as guidance in order to initiate a research effort addressed at including easy-to-understand language in video games. Reception studies carried out for websites could be redesigned to fit the particularities of a video game, considering both that easy-to-understand language does work as a comprehension enhancer in multimedia content and that it should be implemented in a way that avoids stigmatization.

However, the present study is not without limitations. First, the use of a narrative review without strict search criteria reduces replicability. Second, the fact that four of the academic documents were selected by the author while only three were retrieved from the search may indicate potential biases in the search design, thus making the proposed view of language in game accessibility not universally applicable. Third, the assertion that no game implements easy-to-understand language based on an analysis of accessibility guidelines rather than actual video games, may have led to overlooking certain aspects of the current landscape. Fourth, the exploratory nature of the second objective requires empirical studies to complement the results.

In spite of these limitations, it is believed that the study's insights into language and its recommendations for future directions can assist developers in creating video games with texts that are better understood by people with cognitive disabilities and learning difficulties, as well as young and elderly players.

Conclusion

Video games are a major source of entertainment for many people and its accessibility is becoming increasingly important. Game accessibility is flourishing with video games such as the remake of *The Last of Us I* (Naughty Dog, 2022) and *God of War: Ragnarök* (SIE Santa Monica Studio, 2022), which set example for good practices in triple A games.

Among the main approaches to overcoming barriers in video games, cognitive accessibility has received less attention, partly due to the wide array of potential users. After all, cognitive disabilities and learning difficulties compose a wide spectrum in which a person with dyslexia, for example, finds barriers that are essentially different to those found by a person with a neurodevelopmental disorder.

With regards to video games developed having cognitive accessibility in mind, they either target a particular group of people with the intention of being educational or therapeutic, or they include cognitive accessibility as part of a wide effort to make a video game accessible to as many players as possible, whether they have visual, hearing, motor, or any other kind of disability.

Using video games as an educational tool is both important and innovative, but developing commercial games that are free from barriers, thereby making the impairments inconsequential, is crucial for ensuring successful inclusion. After all, achieving social inclusion for players who encounter barriers would mean enabling them to engage with mainstream products.

While video games are increasingly including accessibility options that can help to overcome cognitive barriers—such as a dyslexic-friendly font and the ability to save progress at all times—there is still significant room for improvement. One notable accessibility feature that is yet to be included is easy-to-understand language. The consulted accessibility guidelines make no mention of this option, and they generally do not focus much on comprehension. Although they reference language, they lack explicit definitions or detailed guidance on how to implement it. In relation to the first objective—analyzing what features language should have to foster cognitive accessibility in video games—current literature suggests that cognitively accessible

language should be simple, clear, easy, precise, understandable, consistent, concise, and customizable in formatting.

In contrast, websites do include easy-to-understand language, with tests showing promising results. Designed not only for people with cognitive disabilities or learning difficulties, but also for illiterate users and others who may encounter comprehension challenges, this simplified form of a language appears to improve comprehension for many users, but also tends to increase stigmatization. To address this concern, and in line with the second objective—suggesting a way to include easy-to-understand language in video games—such language could be offered in video games as one of several options in the settings, allowing users to easily switch between conventional and easy-to-understand language at any time.

Therefore, the next step in this project should involve conducting reception studies to explore the effectiveness of easy-to-understand language in video games, assessing players' preferences and needs, and determining whether this accessibility feature enhances their comprehension and gameplay experience. Implementing easy-to-understand language could grant access to a variety of players, allowing a more diverse range of people to enjoy video games.

This research is supported by the WEL project, with grant PID2022-137058NB-I00, funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by “ERDF, EU.” The author is a member of the TransMedia Catalonia research group funded by Secretaria d'Universitats i Recerca del Departament d'Empresa i Coneixement de la Generalitat de Catalunya, under the SGR funding scheme (ref. code 2021SGR00077), and has been awarded a PhD grant from the Catalan Government (2022FI_B 00308).

References:

AbleGamers (2018). *Accessible Player Experiences (APX)*.

<https://accessible.games/accessible-player-experiences/>

- Bohman, U. (2010). The Need for Easy-to-Read Information on Web Sites. *Computers Helping People with Special Needs*, 634–640. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14097-6_101
- Brown, M. (2019, February 7). *Improving Games for Those with Cognitive Disabilities | Designing for Disability*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ObhvacfIOg0>
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Cassidy, R. (2019). Cognitive accessibility guide. *Can I Play That?* <https://caniplaythat.com/workshops/basic-accessibility-options-for-cognitive-accessibility>
- Cheek, C., Fleming, T., Lucassen, M. F. G., Bridgman, H., Stasiak, K., Shepherd, M., & Orpin, P. (2015). Integrating health behavior theory and design elements in serious games. *JMIR Mental Health*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.2196/mental.4133>
- Child Neuropsychology lab (n.d.). *Dino Island*. <https://cnuvic.com/dinoisland/>
- Clement, J. (2024, May 16). *Video game industry - Statistics & Facts*. Statista. <https://www.statista.com/topics/868/video-games/#topicOverview>
- Di Tore, P., Di Tore, S., Mangione, G. R., & Ludovico, L. (2014). MADRIGALE: A Multimedia Application for Dyslexia and Reading Improvement GAMifying Learning Experience. *International Conference on Intelligent Networking and Collaborative Systems IEEE INCoS*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INCoS.2014.48>
- Ellis, B., Ford-Williams, G., Graham, L., Grammenos, D., Hamilton, I., Headstrong Games, Lee, E., Manion, J., & Westin, T. (2017). *Game accessibility guidelines*. <https://gameaccessibilityguidelines.com/>
- Fajardo, I., Ávila, V., Ferrer, A., Tavares, G., Gómez, M., & Hernández, A. (2014). Easy-to-read Texts for Students with Intellectual Disability: Linguistic Factors Affecting Comprehension. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 27(3), 212–225. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12065>
- Fărcașiu, M. A., Gherheș, V., Șimon, S., Dejica-Carțiș, D., Cădăriu, L., & Kilyeni, A. (2023). Easy-to-Read: Evolution and Perspectives-A Bibliometric Analysis of Research, 1978–2021. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20043359>
- Ferrari, R. (2015) Writing narrative style literature reviews. *Medical Writing*, 24(4), 230–235. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2047480615Z.000000000329>

- Friberg, J., & Gärdenfors, D. (2004). Audio Games: New Perspectives on game audio. *Proceedings of the 2004 ACM SIGCHI International Conference on Advances in computer entertainment technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1067343.1067361>
- Grammenos, D., Savidis, A., & Stephanidis, C. (2009). Designing Universally Accessible Games. *Computers in Entertainment*, 7(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1486508.1486516>
- Hansen-Schirra, S., & Maaß, C. (2020). Easy Language, Plain Language, Easy Language Plus: Perspectives on Comprehensibility and Stigmatisation. In S. Hansen-Schirra & C. Maaß (Eds.), *Easy language research: text and user perspectives* (pp. 17–38). Frank & Timme.
- Hatzigiannakoglou, P. (2015). Junk-Food Destroyer: Helping Adolescents with Down Syndrome to Understand Healthy Eating through Serious Game. *7th International Conference on Games and Virtual Worlds for Serious Applications (VS-Games)*, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VS-GAMES.2015.7295778>
- IGDA-GASIG (2025, January 28). *The IGDA Game Accessibility Special Interest Group*. <https://igda-gasig.org/>
- IGDA-GASIG. (n.d.). *On cognitive accessibility guidelines*. <https://igda-gasig.org/get-involved/sig-initiatives/resources-for-game-developers/sig-guidelines/on-cognitive-disabilities/>
- IGEA. (2022). *Game development accessibility resources and guides*. Inclusion, Diversity, Equality and Accessibility (IDEA) working group. <https://igea.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/IDEA-Working-Group-Accessibility-Pack-March-2022.pdf>
- Inclusion Europe (2010). *Information for all: European standards for making information easy to read and understand*. European Commission. https://www.inclusion-europe.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/EN_Information_for_all.pdf
- International Organization for Standardization (2021). *ISO/IEC DIS 23859-1:2021(E): Information technology — User interfaces — Requirements and recommendations on making written text easy to read and understand, 2021–09–13*. Geneva.
- Jaramillo-Alcázar, A., Cortez-Silva, P., Galarza-Castillo, M., & Luján-Mora, S. (2020). A Method to Develop Accessible Online Serious Games for People with

Disabilities: A Case Study. *Sustainability*, 12(22).

<https://doi.org/10.3390/su12229584>

Karreman, J., Van Der Geest, T., & Buursink, E. (2007). Accessible Website Content Guidelines for Users with Intellectual Disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 20(6), 510–518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-3148.2006.00353.x>

Kletenik, D., & Adler, R. F. (2022). Let's Play: Increasing Accessibility Awareness and Empathy Through Games. *SIGCSE 2022: Proceedings of the 53rd ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*, 1, 182–188. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3478431.3499277>

Larreina-Morales, M. E., & Mangiron, C. (2023). Audio description in video games? Persons with visual disabilities weigh in. *Universal Access in the Information Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-023-01036-4>

Larreina-Morales, M. E. (2024). *La accesibilidad a los videojuegos: Estado actual y potencial de la audiodescripción para mejorar la experiencia de las personas con discapacidad visual*. [Doctoral dissertation, Autonomous University of Barcelona]. DDD Dipòsit Digital de Documents de la UAB. <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/299812>

Lindholm, C., & Vanhatalo, U. (2021). Introduction. In C. Lindholm & U. Vanhatalo (Eds.), *Handbook of Easy Languages in Europe* (pp. 493–525). Berlin.

Maaß, C. (2020). *Easy Language – Plain Language – Easy Language Plus: Balancing Comprehensibility and Acceptability*. Frank & Timme.

Magnusson, C., Hedvall, P. O., & Breidegard, B. (2018). Design for me? In K. Miesenberger & G. Kouroupetroglou (Eds.), *Computers Helping People with Special Needs. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 7383 (pp. 93–99). Springer.

Mäkipää, J. P., Norrgård, J., & Vartiainen, T. (2022). Factors Affecting the Accessibility of IT Artifacts: A Systematic Review. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 51, 666–702. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.05129>

Mangiron, C. (2012). Exploring New Paths towards Game Accessibility. In A. Remael, P. Orero & M. Carroll (Eds.), *Audiovisual Translation and Media Accessibility at the Crossroads: Media for all 3*, 36, (pp. 43–59). https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401207812_005

- Mangiron, C. (2021a). Game Accessibility: Taking Inclusion to the Next Level. In M. Antona & C. Stephanidis (Eds.), *Universal Access in Human-Computer Interaction. Design Methods and User Experience - 15th International Conference, UAHCI 2021, Held as Part of the 23rd HCI International 2021 Conference, HCII 2021, Proceedings. Lectures Notes in Computer Science*, 12768, (pp. 269–279). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-78092-0_17
- Mangiron, C. (2021b). Panorama actual de la accesibilidad a los videojuegos. In B. Reverter Oliver, J.J. Martínez Sierra, D. González Pastor & J. Fernando Carrero (Eds.). *Modalidades de traducción audiovisual: Completando el espectro* (pp. 85–94). Comares.
- Marks, D. (1997). Models of disability. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 19(3), 85–91. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09638289709166831>
- Matausch, K., & Peböck, B. (2010). EasyWeb – A Study How People with Specific Learning Difficulties Can Be Supported on Using the Internet. *Computers Helping People with Special Needs*, 641–648. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14097-6_102
- Mazur, B. (2000). Revisiting Plain Language. *Technical Communication*, 47(2). <https://www.plainlanguage.gov/resources/articles/revisiting-plain-language/>
- Microsoft (2023). *Xbox Accessibility Guidelines*. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/gaming/accessibility/guidelines>
- Miesenberger, K., & Petza, K. (2014). Easy to Read on the Web - State of the Art and Research Directions. *Procedia Computer Science*, 27, 318–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2014.02.035>
- Nomura, M., Nielsen, G., & Tronbacke, B. (2010) *Guidelines for easy-to-read materials*. IFLA, The Hague.
- Ocampo, A. (2015). *Lectura para todos. El aporte de la fácil lectura como vida para la equiparación de oportunidades*. Asociación Española de Comprensión Lectora. <https://www.upla.cl/inclusion/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/LECTURA-PARA-TODOS.pdf>
- Oliva-Zamora, M., & Mangiron, C. (forthcoming). *How to create video games with cognitive accessibility features: A literature review of recommendations*. [Manuscript submitted for publication]. Department of Translation, Interpreting and East Asian Studies, Autonomous University of Barcelona.

- Porter, J., & Kientz, J. (2013). An empirical study of issues and barriers to mainstream video game accessibility. *ASSETS '13: Proceedings of the 15th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/2513383.2513444>
- Sarkar, S., & Bhatia, G. (2021). Writing and appraising narrative reviews. *Journal of Clinical and Scientific Research*, 10(3), 169–172.
https://doi.org/10.4103/jcsr.jcsr_1_21
- Schmutz, S., Sonderegger, A., & Sauer, J. (2019). Easy-to-read language in disability-friendly web sites: Effects on nondisabled users. *Applied Ergonomics*, 74, 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2018.08.013>
- Straub, J., & Marijn (n.d.). *Can I Play That?* <https://caniplaythat.com/>
- United Nations General Assembly. (2007). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. <https://www.refworld.org/docid/45f973632.html>
- Uzuegbunam, N., Wong, W. H., Cheung, S., & Ruble, L. (2015). MEBook: Kinect-based self-modeling intervention for children with autism. *IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/ICME.2015.7177518>
- Vollenwyder, B., Schneider, A., Krueger, E., Brühlmann, F., Opwis, K., & Mekler, E. D. (2018). How to Use Plain and Easy-to-Read Language for a Positive User Experience on Websites. *Computers Helping People with Special Needs*, 10896, 514–522. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94277-3_80
- von Gillern, S., & Nash, B.L. (2023). Accessibility in video gaming: An overview and implications for English language arts education. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 66(6), 382–390. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1284>
- Westin, T. (2016). Community driven adaptation of game based learning content for cognitive accessibility. In T. Connolly & L. Boyle (Eds.), *Proceedings of The 10th European Conference on Games Based Learning* (pp. 781–787). Academic Conferences International Limited.
- Westin, T., & Wiklund, M. (2013). Return on Investment in Game Accessibility for Cognition Impairments. *Assistive Technology*, 33, 577–582.
<https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-304-9-577>
- World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) (2023). *Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2*. <https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG22/>

World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) (n.d.). *Web Accessibility Initiative WAI*.

<https://www.w3.org/WAI/>

Yuan, B., Folmer, E., & Harris, F.C. (2011). Game accessibility: A survey. *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 10(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-010-0189-5>

Video Games:

17-Bit. (2013). *Skulls of the Shogun*. [Video game].

Finji. (2019). *Overland*. [Video game].

Four Quarters. (2021). *Loop Hero*. [Video game].

Naughty Dog. (2016). *Uncharted 4*. [Video game].

Naughty Dog. (2022). *The Last of Us Part I*. [Video game].

Obsidian Entertainment. (2020). *Grounded*. [Video game].

SIE Santa Monica Studio. (2022). *God of War: Ragnarök*. [Video game].

ZA/UM. (2019). *Disco Elysium*. [Video game].