Proceedings of CONF-MLA 2025 Symposium: Intelligent Systems and Automation: AI Models, IoT, and Robotic Algorithms
DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD28252

First-Person Perspective in Virtual Reality Gaming: Physiological and Cognitive Challenges, Industry Responses, and Future Directions

Mingyu Zhang

Santa Monica College, Los Angeles, USA
doggodgod666@gmail.com

Abstract. The first-person perspective in virtual reality gaming offers unprecedented levels of immersion and agency, yet it concurrently introduces significant physiological and cognitive challenges that hinder widespread adoption. These include simulator sickness—primarily caused by sensory conflict between the visual and vestibular systems—spatial disorientation due to limited field of view and unnatural locomotion mechanics, and identity dissociation resulting from prolonged embodiment in virtual avatars. This paper provides a comprehensive review of empirical and theoretical research examining these adverse effects, emphasizing their perceptual and neurological underpinnings. In response, the industry has developed various mitigation strategies such as hybrid perspective switching, adaptive comfort settings, and improved hardware specifications. Looking forward, this paper argues that next-generation virtual reality systems must incorporate neuroadaptive interfaces using real-time biometric feedback, multisensory cue integration, and virtual reality-driven personalization to dynamically minimize discomfort. Furthermore, the sustainable growth of virtual reality depends on establishing ethical guidelines for long-term use, especially among vulnerable groups, and promoting cross-platform standardization to enhance accessibility. Interdisciplinary collaboration across fields such as computational neuroscience, human-computer interaction, and game design is essential to develop inclusive and comfortable immersive experiences without sacrificing engagement or presence.

Keywords: First-person perspective, virtual reality, gaming.

1. Introduction

The global video game industry, valued at over $200 billion USD in 2023, has emerged as a dominant force in entertainment and technology ecosystems. Within this landscape, virtual reality gaming represents one of the most rapidly evolving segments, characterized by immersive first-person perspectives that transport players into digitally constructed worlds. While traditional gaming interfaces rely on screen-based interaction, virtual reality systems utilize head-mounted displays and motion tracking to create embodied experiences, positioning players as active agents within virtual environments. This technological shift promises unprecedented engagement but introduces unique physiological and design challenges that warrant critical examination.

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD28252

Recent advances in virtual reality gaming have accelerated since Palmer Luckey's 2012 Oculus Rift prototype reignited commercial interest. Major studios now deploy narrative-driven virtual reality titles like Half-Life: Alyx, while indie developers experiment with haptic feedback and room-scale mechanics. The development of virtual reality technology has also been propelled by improvements in display resolution, refresh rates, and more accurate motion sensors, contributing to more seamless and convincing virtual experiences. Academic research, however, reveals persistent limitations. Slater documented that 30–60% of users experience simulator sickness during first-person virtual reality exposure, with symptoms including nausea and disorientation (1). Similarly, Cummings and Bailenson demonstrated that prolonged embodiment in first-person virtual reality can induce psychological aftereffects, blurring boundaries between virtual and physical realities (2). Other studies have further highlighted concerns regarding visual fatigue (3)and postural instability (4) suggesting that the very perspective enabling VR's immersion—the first-person viewpoint—may paradoxically undermine its viability.

This paper aims to synthesize emerging evidence on first-person virtual reality's adverse effects and offers suggestions for mitigating these issues. Section 2 analyzes three physiological and cognitive limitations of current implementations: (1) simulator sickness etiology, (2) spatial disorientation, and (3) identity dissociation. Section 3 discusses industry responses, including third-person hybrid prototypes and dynamic perspective-shifting mechanics. Finally, Section 4 evaluates unresolved challenges such as motion sickness mitigation and ethical implications while outlining future research directions for sustainable virtual reality adoption.

2. Physiological and cognitive limitations in first-person VR

The very features that create immersive experiences in first-person virtual reality gaming—the embodied perspective and seamless interaction—also introduce significant physiological and cognitive challenges. These limitations present formidable barriers to widespread adoption and require thorough understanding before they can be effectively mitigated.

2.1. Simulator sickness etiology: the sensory conflict theory

The most immediate and prevalent issue affecting virtual reality users is simulator sickness, a condition characterized by symptoms such as nausea, eye strain, disorientation, and fatigue. According to research by Slater and Sanchez-Vives, approximately 30-60% of users experience some form of discomfort during first-person virtual reality exposure [1]. The predominant explanation for this phenomenon is the sensory conflict theory, which posits that simulator sickness arises from a mismatch between visual inputs and vestibular signals.

In traditional reality, the visual system, vestibular system (which detects motion and orientation), and proprioceptive system (which senses body position) work in harmony to provide a coherent experience of spatial presence. However, in first-person virtual reality games—especially those involving locomotion—the visual system may convey movement through the virtual environment while the vestibular system detects no corresponding physical motion. This sensory dissonance creates neural confusion that the brain interprets as a potential toxin-induced state, triggering physiological responses aimed at eliminating the presumed toxin—hence the nausea and discomfort [2].

The severity of simulator sickness is influenced by multiple factors, including:

· Individual susceptibility: Age, gender, prior virtual reality experience, and even genetic factors affect vulnerability

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD28252

· Hardware characteristics: Display resolution, refresh rate, latency, and field of view
· Software design: Movement mechanics, camera control, and visual fidelity [3]

Notably, the problem persists despite technological advancements. While higher refresh rates (90Hz+) and reduced latency have alleviated some issues, they have not eliminated the fundamental sensory conflict. This suggests that engineering solutions alone may be insufficient without complementary adaptive approaches that account for individual physiological differences [3].

2.2. Spatial disorientation: navigating digital worlds

Beyond physical discomfort, first-person virtual reality often induces spatial disorientation—the inability to accurately determine one's position and orientation within the virtual environment. This cognitive limitation undermines both gameplay effectiveness and overall user experience.

The constrained field of view in most consumer virtual reality headsets (typically 90-110 degrees horizontally compared to approximately 180 degrees in human vision) creates a tunnel vision effect that necessitates increased head movement for environmental scanning. This artificial visual restriction forces users to rely on working memory rather than continuous perceptual input for spatial updating, increasing cognitive load and reducing navigation efficiency.

Research in spatial cognition demonstrates that virtual reality users often develop fragmented cognitive maps—mental representations of environmental layout—compared to those exploring real-world environments or even traditional screen-based games. The absence of consistent spatial anchors exacerbates this problem, particularly in complex virtual environments with repetitive textures or inadequate landmarks [4].

The method of movement implementation further compounds spatial disorientation issues. Smooth locomotion (continuous movement using thumbsticks) frequently induces simulator sickness but preserves spatial continuity. Conversely, teleportation mechanics reduce discomfort but disrupt the continuity of spatial representation, making it difficult for users to maintain integrated mental models of environmental layout. This presents a fundamental design paradox: movement implementations that reduce physiological discomfort may simultaneously exacerbate cognitive disorientation [4].

2.3. Identity dissociation and self-perception: the proteus effect

The profound sense of embodiment achievable in first-person virtual reality introduces intriguing psychological considerations regarding identity and self-perception. The Proteus Effect—a phenomenon where users unconsciously adapt their behavior and attitudes to align with their virtual representation—demonstrates how deeply avatar embodiment can influence human psychology [5].

In first-person virtual reality experiences, the continuous visual feedback of an alternative body—especially when paired with synchronous movement—can trigger embodiment illusions that temporarily override one's sense of self. The strength of this effect depends on several factors:

· Visual fidelity and anthropomorphism of the virtual body
· Synchronization between real and virtual movements
· Multisensory congruence (visual, auditory, haptic feedback) [6]

While embodiment enhances presence and engagement, it also raises questions about identity dissociation and potential psychological aftereffects. Cummings and Bailenson documented cases where prolonged immersion in first-person virtual reality led to temporary disturbances in self-perception, including momentary uncertainty about body ownership upon returning to physical

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD28252

reality [5]. These effects, while typically transient, highlight the profound impact that embodied VR experiences can have on cognitive processes related to self-identity [6].

The psychological implications are particularly relevant for younger users, whose sense of self is still developing. While research remains limited, some studies suggest that repeated experiences of identity dissociation through virtual reality could potentially influence identity formation processes in adolescents. This underscores the need for further investigation into the long-term psychological effects of immersive virtual reality use, especially among vulnerable populations [5, 6].

3. Industry responses and innovative solutions

The VR industry has responded to these physiological and cognitive challenges with remarkable creativity, developing technical and design solutions that aim to preserve immersion while minimizing adverse effects. These innovations range from perspective hybridization to adaptive comfort systems that respond to individual user needs.

3.1. Perspective hybridization: beyond the first-person view

Rather than rigidly adhering to pure first-person perspectives, many developers have successfully implemented hybrid perspective systems that dynamically shift between viewpoints based on context and user needs. This approach acknowledges that different perspectives serve different functions within virtual reality experiences.

Notable examples include games like Moss and Astro Bot: Rescue Mission, which employ a second-person perspective where the user exists as both a disembodied observer and a character within the narrative. This design provides the spatial awareness benefits of a third-person overview while maintaining direct emotional connection through character interaction. The player simultaneously experiences the world through the character's eyes while retaining a god's-eye view of the environment—a innovative compromise that reduces disorientation while preserving engagement [4].

Another emerging approach involves contextual perspective shifting, where the viewpoint automatically adapts to different gameplay situations. For example, a game might use first-person perspective for exploration and interaction but seamlessly transition to third-person perspective during specific actions like complex maneuvers or environmental navigation. These transitions must be carefully designed to avoid adding new forms of disorientation through perspective jumps [3].

The success of these hybrid approaches demonstrates that immersion doesn't solely depend on a single perspective modality. Rather, emotional presence can be achieved through various perspective frameworks when combined with strong narrative design, character development, and interactive fidelity [5].

3.2. Technological mitigations: hardware and software advancements

Technical innovations have played a crucial role in addressing virtual reality's physiological challenges. Hardware manufacturers have made significant strides in reducing motion-to-photon latency—the delay between user movement and corresponding visual updates. Modern virtual reality systems have achieved latency figures below 20 milliseconds, approaching the threshold where sensory conflict becomes less perceptible to the human nervous system [3].

Display technology has seen remarkable improvements in resolution, refresh rate, and field of view. Next-generation headsets feature per-eye resolutions exceeding 4K, refresh rates up to 120Hz,

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD28252

and increasingly wide field-of-view displays that reduce the tunnel vision effect. These advancements decrease visual noise that contributes to sensory mismatch while providing more naturalistic visual experiences [3].

Software-based solutions have emerged as equally important mitigation strategies. Dynamic field-of-view restriction temporarily reduces peripheral visual input during movement—the period of greatest sensory conflict—then gradually restores it once movement ceases. This technique effectively minimizes discomfort during artificial locomotion while preserving immersion during stationary periods [3].

Artificial intelligence has opened new frontiers for personalized comfort adaptation. Emerging systems incorporate real-time biofeedback through eye-tracking, heart rate monitoring, and galvanic skin response measurement to detect early signs of simulator sickness before conscious awareness. These systems can then automatically adjust comfort parameters—movement speed, field of view, virtual camera stability—in real-time based on individual physiological responses. This approach represents a paradigm shift from one-size-fits-all comfort settings to truly personalized experiences that adapt to each user's needs [3].

3.3. Design philosophy shifts: prioritizing user comfort and inclusivity

Beyond technical solutions, the industry has undergone a philosophical transformation regarding comfort and accessibility. Early virtual reality design often prioritized immersion above all else, sometimes dismissing comfort concerns as issues users would "get used to." The contemporary approach recognizes that comfort enables engagement rather than competing with it [3].

This shift is evident in the standardization of comprehensive comfort options that allow users to customize their experience. Modern virtual reality applications typically include extensive accessibility menus with options for:

· Multiple movement modalities (teleportation, smooth locomotion, arm-swinger)
· Varied turning options (snap turning, smooth turning, physical turning)
· Adaptive difficulty systems that adjust challenge without breaking immersion
· Comfort presets for different experience levels (beginner, intermediate, advanced) [3]

The implementation of gradual acclimation protocols represents another important development. Rather than immediately exposing users to full freedom of movement, many experiences now incorporate structured introduction sequences that gradually introduce potentially discomforting elements while allowing users to build virtual reality tolerance progressively [1, 3].

Perhaps most significantly, there's growing recognition that not all experiences need full freedom of movement to be compelling. Some of virtual reality's most successful titles have embraced stationary or room-scale designs that eliminate artificial locomotion entirely. This design approach acknowledges the diversity of user susceptibility and creates experiences accessible to even the most sensitivity populations [3].

4. Future directions and ethical considerations

Despite significant progress, fundamental challenges remain unresolved in first-person virtual reality design. The path forward requires multidisciplinary collaboration across game design, neuroscience, psychology, and human-computer interaction to develop next-generation solutions.

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD28252

4.1. Neurocognitive adaptation and personalization

The future of virtual reality comfort lies increasingly in personalized adaptation based on neurocognitive profiling. Research suggests that individuals exhibit different neurological responses to sensory conflict [4], implying that optimal comfort solutions may need tailoring to individual neurophysiological profiles. Emerging technologies like real-time EEG monitoring integrated into virtual reality headsets could enable systems that detect neural signatures of discomfort and automatically adjust experience parameters to prevent symptoms before they emerge [3].

Machine learning algorithms trained on large datasets of user responses offer another promising direction. These systems could predict individual susceptibility to specific virtual reality design patterns and preemptively adjust experiences to minimize discomfort [7]. Such approaches would represent a shift from reactive comfort settings to proactive comfort systems that anticipate individual needs.

4.2. Multisensory integration and cross-modal calibration

Another promising research direction involves multisensory integration to reduce sensory conflict. By providing congruent inputs across multiple sensory channels—visual, auditory, haptic, and even olfactory—designers can create more coherent experiences that reduce the likelihood of discomfort. For example, appropriately timed haptic feedback during virtual locomotion can provide somatic signals that help bridge the gap between visual movement and vestibular stillness [2].

Advanced spatial audio implementations serve as another cross-modal calibration tool. By providing accurate 3D audio cues that correspond with visual events, designers can enhance spatial awareness and reduce disorientation [8]. The auditory system provides important vestibular complementary information that can help anchor users in virtual environments.

4.3. Ethical framework development and responsible design

As virtual reality technology becomes more immersive and psychologically potent, the need for ethical frameworks guiding its development becomes increasingly urgent. The industry must establish standards regarding:

· Informed consent for experiences that may induce strong physiological or psychological effects

· Appropriate use guidelines for vulnerable populations, including children and those with pre-existing conditions

· Transparent disclosure of potential risks associated with virtual reality experiences

· Data privacy protections for physiological information collected by virtual reality systems [5, 6]

The potential for long-term psychological effects requires particular attention. While current evidence suggests most effects are transient, the absence of longitudinal studies means it is impossible to fully rule out the possibility of cumulative impacts from extended virtual reality use [6]. The industry should support independent research into these questions while implementing precautionary principles where evidence is lacking [5].

4.4. Standardization and cross-platform compatibility

The maturation of any technology sector typically involves increased standardization, and virtual reality is reaching this stage of development. Industry-wide comfort metrics and rating systems would help users identify experiences appropriate for their sensitivity level [4]. These could mirror

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD28252

existing motion picture rating systems but with specific indicators for virtual reality-specific considerations like movement intensity, required physical space, and potential for disorientation.

Similarly, standardized comfort options across platforms would reduce the learning curve for users transitioning between experiences [9]. Consistent implementation of comfort features—such as standardized menu locations for comfort settings and consistent terminology for movement options—would make virtual reality more accessible to new users while reducing the design burden on developers.

5. Conclusion

The exploration of first-person perspective in virtual reality gaming reveals a fundamental paradox: the very technological features that enable profound immersion simultaneously introduce significant physiological and cognitive challenges. Through examining simulator sickness etiology, spatial disorientation, and identity dissociation concerns, this review has established that these limitations stem from inherent conflicts between virtual experiences and human neurophysiology.

The future of virtual reality comfort lies in personalized adaptation approaches that account for individual differences in sensory processing and susceptibility. Emerging solutions in neurocognitive profiling, multisensory integration, and machine learning-powered comfort systems represent a paradigm shift from universal design toward individualized experiences. These advancements promise to transform virtual reality from a technology that users must tolerate to one that adapts to their unique physiological needs.

Critical to this evolution is the development of comprehensive ethical frameworks that address informed consent, vulnerable populations, and data privacy concerns. As virtual reality becomes increasingly immersive and psychologically potent, responsible innovation must prioritize user wellbeing through transparent risk communication and protective measures against potential long-term effects.

The maturation of virtual reality as a medium further depends on industry-wide standardization efforts. Established comfort metrics, standardized comfort options, and consistent implementation across platforms will reduce barriers to entry while ensuring more predictable and accessible experiences for diverse users.

Ultimately, overcoming the challenges of first-person perspective virtual reality requires continued interdisciplinary collaboration across neuroscience, human-computer interaction, ethics, and game design. By embracing user-centered approaches that balance immersion with comfort, and innovation with responsibility, the virtual reality industry can realize its potential to create transformative experiences that are both technologically sophisticated and fundamentally human-compatible.

References

[1] Slater, M., & Sanchez-Vives, M. V. (2016). Enhancing our lives with immersive virtual reality. Frontiers in Robotics and AI, 3, 74.

[2] Lackner, J. R. (2014). Motion sickness: more than nausea and vomiting. Experimental Brain Research, 232(8), 2493-2510.

[3] Stanney, K., Lawson, B. D., Rokers, B., et al. (2020). Identifying causes of and solutions for cybersickness in immersive technology: Reformulation of a research and development agenda. International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 36(19), 1783-1803.

[4] Ruddle, R. A., Volkova, E., & Bülthoff, H. H. (2011). The effect of landmark and body-based sensory information on route knowledge. Memory & Cognition, 39(4), 686-699.

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD28252

[5] Cummings, J. J., & Bailenson, J. N. (2016). How immersive is enough? A meta-analysis of the effect of immersive technology on user presence. Media Psychology, 19(2), 272-309.
[6] Sanchez-Vives, M. V., & Slater, M. (2005). From presence to consciousness through virtual reality. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 6(4), 332-339.
[7] Statista (2025). Mobile Gaming Leads Globally, While Cloud Gaming Surges. Retrieved from https: //www.statista.com/chart/35010/estimated-sales-in-the-global-games-market/
[8] Bain & Company (2025). Breaking Boundaries: Winning in the Global Gaming Market. Retrieved from https: //www.sohu.com/a/926610997_121649707
[9] Newzoo (2025). Global Games Market Report: Payment Trends and Genre Analysis. Retrieved from https: //dailycoin.com/game-revenue-bnpl-crypto-payments-gain-traction-in-gaming-market/