Chapter 11
A Review of Virtual Classroom Environments for Neuropsychological Assessment

Thomas D. Parsons and Albert "Skip" Rizzo

Introduction

Although traditional neuropsychological assessment approaches provide highly systematic control and delivery of performance challenges, they have also been criticized as limited in the area of ecological validity (Parsons 2015; Rizzo et al. 2004). By ecological validity, neuropsychologists mean the degree of relevance or similarity that a test or training system has relative to the real world, and in its value for predicting or improving daily functioning (Wilson et al. 1998; Chaytor et al. 2006). Adherents of this view challenge the usefulness of constrained paper-and-pencil tests and analog tasks for addressing the complex integrated functioning that is required for successful performance in the real world. Computer-based neuropsychological assessments offer a number of advantages over traditional paper-and-pencil testing: increased standardization of administration; increased accuracy of timing presentation and response latencies; ease of administration and data collection; and reliable and randomized presentation of stimuli for repeat administrations (Parsey and Schmitter-Edgecombe 2013; Parsons et al. 2018; Schatz and Browndyke 2002). However, these assessments usually take place in a highly controlled laboratory setting that does little to mimic the real world, and therefore have also been criticized as lacking ecological validity. This problem may be particularly salient in

T. D. Parsons (✉)
Computational Neuropsychology and Simulation (CNS) Laboratory, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, USA

Department of Psychology, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, USA
e-mail: thomas.parsons@unt.edu

A. Rizzo
Institute for Creative Technologies, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

A. Rizzo, S. Bouchard (eds.), *Virtual Reality for Psychological and Neurocognitive Interventions*, Virtual Reality Technologies for Health and Clinical Applications, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-9482-3_11

the assessment of individuals with neurodevelopmental disorders impacting fronto-striatal function, particularly attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).

Currently approaches to assessment of ADHD rely on converging lines of evidence from behavioral rating scales, paper-and-pencil cognitive assessments, and computerized measures of attention (e.g., continuous performance tasks). An unfortunate limitation to this approach is the dearth of generalizability to activities of daily living. A possible answer to the problems of ecological validity in assessment of ADHD is to immerse the participant in a virtual classroom environment. Work has been done to develop a virtual classroom that assesses executive functioning (Rizzo et al. 2006). These virtual environments have been found to offer significant advantages to more traditional methods of diagnosis and observation.

The plan of this chapter will be as follows: In Sect. 11.1, current approaches to the assessment of ADHD will be discussed. Section 11.2 will describe the use of virtual environments for the assessment of neurodevelopmental disorders. Next, in Sect. 11.3, the Virtual Classroom will be introduced. Finally, in Sect. 11.4, research conducted using the Virtual Classroom will be presented.

Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

The neurodevelopmental disorder known as ADHD is a heterogeneous disorder of unknown etiology, which is comprised of difficulties with sustained attention, distractibility, impulse control, and hyperactivity (Biederman 2005). Researchers have proposed that ADHD arises from a core deficit in inhibitory control, resulting in multidimensional deficits in executive functioning (Barkley 1997, 2000; Scheres et al. 2004). Individuals with ADHD may have difficulty organizing behaviors, solving problems, and shifting mental sets (Schachar et al. 2000). Due to the heterogeneity of his disorder, reaching a consensus on diagnosis has proven to be challenging.

Traditional assessment of ADHD utilizes clinician-administered and self-report rating scales, including the Conner's Adult ADHD Rating Scales (Conners et al. 1999) and ADHD Rating Scale-IV (DuPaul et al. 1998). These scales, though psychometrically sound, have limited predictive validity (Lahey et al. 2006) and treatment utility (Scotti et al. 1996). Although these scales may provide insight into an individual's behavior in one or more domain, malingering and reporter bias is always a concern (Abikoff et al. 1993; Sayal and Taylor 2005). Further, structured interviews are time-consuming for both the parent and the clinician, yielding them less practical and cost-effective. Additionally, when assessing behavior changes over time, structured interviews may lose validity after the initial interview.

More recently, research has examined the assessment of executive functions in children with ADHD. The hypothesis of executive dysfunction in children with ADHD has been supported in a number of studies (Barkley et al. 1992; Grodzinsky and Barkley 1999; Schachar et al. 2000; Scheres et al. 2004). Measures that have been shown to differentiate children with ADHD from typically developing children include: the Stroop task (Barkley et al. 1992; Nigg 1999), Controlled Oral Word Association Test (Grodzinsky and Diamond 1992), and Picture Arrangement from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-III (Pineda et al. 1998). While these tests are highly validated and provide adequate predictive validity, they have also been criticized as limited in the area of ecological validity (Chaytor et al. 2006; Farias et al. 2003; Gioia and Isquith 2004; Odhuba et al. 2005; Plehn et al. 2004; Ready et al. 2001; Silver 2000). Testing usually takes place in a quiet, well-controlled environment with little if any of the distractions that are common in the real world. This lack of ecological validity may weaken predictions about real-world functioning.

Assessment of executive functioning is a principal objective of neuropsychological evaluations. These executive functions are accomplished by the supervisory attentional system and accomplish functions such as: selective attention, inhibitory control, planning, problem solving, and some aspects of short-term memory (Baddeley 1996; Baddeley and Hitch 1974; Norman and Shallice 1986; Burgess and Simons 2005; Diamond 2013). Some theories of executive functions and attentional processing consider executive functioning to be unitary construct, while others consider attentional processing to be a system of independent networks (Raz and Buhle 2006). Given that attention deficits are the basis of many pathological disorders in children and adults, it is important to understand the different facets of attentional processes as well as the anatomical sites at which they are carried out. Because deficits in executive functioning underlie many disorders, including ADHD (Rothbart and Bates 2006), it is essential to understand all aspects of executive functions as well as the underlying anatomical sites at which they are accomplished. Because different disorders result in different patterns of attentional deficits, it is imperative to be able to differentiate different attentional processes (Posner and Rothbart 2007). Novel assessments of attention are needed that can enhance ability to differentiate specific attentional processes, because different pathologies show different patterns of attentional deficits (Chaytor and Schmitter-Edgecombe 2007; Posner and Rothbart 2007).

Posner and Rothbart (2007) proposed an attention network theory, in which the human attentional system is subdivided into three functionally and anatomically independent networks: alerting, orienting, and executive attention (see also Fan et al. 2012; Posner and Petersen 1990). The Attention Network Task (ANT) is a computerized assessment of attention that was developed by Posner and colleagues to measure the three aspects of the attention network (Fan et al. 2002). The ANT combines cued detection (Posner 1980) with a flanker-type paradigm (Eriksen and Eriksen 1974) and allows for the behavioral assessment of attentional dimensions of alerting, orienting, and executive function via specific reaction time (RT) patterns (Fan et al. 2002). The ANT has been argued to hold particular promise for assessment of attention deficits in ADHD. A number of studies using the ANT have shown specific deficiencies in the alerting and executive control substystems (Johnson et al. 2008; Abbes et al. 2009). It is important to note that Adólfsdóttir et al. (2008) have argued that the ANT's main contribution to ADHD assessment is its accuracy and variability measures rather than measures of the three attention subsystems.

The ANT is also purported to be useful in distinguishing between subtypes of ADHD (Lundervold et al. 2007; Oberlin et al. 2005).

Other computer-based measures of ADHD have been developed that offer a number of advantages over traditional comprehensive self-report measures, including: enhanced cost and time effectiveness and improved usability for administrators (Nichols and Waschbusch 2004). One of the most used computerized assessments of ADHD is the Continuous Performance Test (CPT). CPT tests require participants to remain vigilant to a specific stimulus in a continuous stream of distractors (Eliason and Richman 1987). Individuals with ADHD find this protocol long and tedious, and thus it has been shown to differentiate between typically developing children and children with ADHD by assessing arousal, activation and effort (Rapport et al. 2000; Nichols and Waschbusch 2004; Corkum and Siegel 1993).

While computer-based measures are more advanced in the area of stimulus presentation and response measurement, responding to continuously presented symbols on an otherwise blank computer screen lacks the complexity individuals face in the real world. Although these neuropsychological measures have been found to have adequate predictive value, their ecological validity may diminish predictions about real-world functioning. Traditional neurocognitive measures may not replicate the diverse environment in which persons with ADHD and other neurodevelopmental disorders live. Additionally, standard neurocognitive batteries tend to examine isolated components of neuropsychological ability, which may not accurately reflect the distinct cognitive domains found in neurocognitive disorders (Dodrill 1999; Wilson 1993). Although today's neuropsychological assessment procedures are widely used, neuropsychologists have been slow to adjust to the impact of technology on their profession. While there are some computer-based neuropsychological measures (see discussion above) that offer a number of advantages over the traditional paper-and-pencil testing, the ecological validity of these computer-based neuropsychological measures is less emphasized. Only a handful of neuropsychological measures have been developed with the specific intention of tapping into everyday behaviors like interacting with a teacher and peers in a virtual school setting, navigating one's community, grocery shopping, and other activities of daily living. Of those that have been developed, even fewer make use of advances in computer technology. In summary, current diagnosis of ADHD relies on an accumulation of clinical interviews, behavior rating scales, and computerized neuropsychological tests. These instruments each lack the essential component of ecological validity necessary to make predictions about real-world functioning. Additionally, because of the heterogeneity and different presentations of this disorder, comprehensive assessment is necessary for a diagnosis of ADHD.

Assessment of Neurodevelopmental Disorders using Virtual Environments

One viable approach is to capitalize on advances in virtual reality (VR) technology. Virtual environments can provide platforms for child attention assessment and intervention that are sufficiently rich in terms of ecologically validity, while also providing scientifically rigorous control, manipulation and bio-behavioral data recording options (Rizzo et al. 1998a, b; Rizzo and Schultheis 2002; Rizzo et al. 2012, 2006). Virtual Reality is a form of human–computer interface that allows the user to "interact" with and become "immersed" in a computer-generated environment (Bohil et al. 2011; Parsons 2015; Schultheis et al. 2002). VR paradigms also allow for the sophisticated, objective, real-time measure of participants' behaviors (e.g. visual attention) and training outcomes (Rizzo and Kim 2005). Recent cost reductions in VR technologies have led to the development of more accessible, usable and clinically relevant VR applications that can be used to address a wide range of physical and cognitive ailments and conditions (Parsons et al. 2009; Rizzo et al. 1997; Rizzo and Buckwalter 1997a, b; Rizzo 2005; Schultheis and Rizzo 2001).

Virtual environment applications that focus on treatment of cognitive (Rose et al. 2005) and affective disorders (Parsons and Rizzo 2008a; Powers and Emmelkamp 2008) as well as assessment of component cognitive processes (see Neguţ et al. 2016a, b for recent meta-analyses) are now being developed and tested. Examples of recent (past 10 years) virtual reality assessments used in neuropsychological studies include: attention (Law et al. 2006; Parsons et al. 2007; Rizzo et al. 2006) spatial abilities (Beck et al. 2010; Foerster et al. 2016), episodic memory (Parsons and Rizzo 2008b; Plancher et al. 2010, 2012, 2013), prospective memory (Knight and Titov 2009), spatial memory (Goodrich-Hunsaker and Hopkins 2010; Zakzanis et al. 2009), executive functions (Armstrong et al. 2013; Denmark et al. 2017; Jovanovski et al. 2012a, b; Parsons et al. 2013; Parsons and Courtney 2014; Renison et al. 2012); and activities of daily living (Besnard et al. 2016). The increased ecological validity of neurocognitive batteries that include assessment using virtual scenarios may aid differential diagnosis and treatment planning. Within a virtual world, it is possible to systematically present cognitive tasks targeting neuropsychological performance beyond what are currently available using traditional methods (Parsons and Phillips 2016; Rizzo and Kim 2005). Reliability of neuropsychological assessment can be enhanced in virtual worlds by better control of the perceptual environment, more consistent stimulus presentation, and more precise and accurate scoring. Virtual environments may also improve the validity of neurocognitive measurements via the increased quantification of discrete behavioral responses, allowing for the identification of more specific cognitive domains (Gaggioli et al. 2009). Virtual environments could allow for neurocognition to be tested in situations that are more ecologically valid. Participants can be evaluated in an environment that simulates the real world, not a contrived testing environment (Gorini et al. 2008). Further, it offers the potential to have ecologically valid computer-based neuropsychological assessments that will move beyond traditional clinic or laboratory borders.

To review, a possible solution to problems of ecological validity in traditional assessment is to utilize technological advances in virtual reality. Advantages of virtual reality computerized testing include the following: (1) enhanced ecological validity by "immersing" the individual into an environment; (2) ability to present and control ecologically valid distractions; (3) ability to objectively record behavioral data; and (4) enhanced reliability increased control over the perceptual world and stimulus presentation. Thus far, a number of virtual environments have been tested on a number of clinical and non-clinical populations.

Assessment of Neurodevelopmental Disorders using Virtual Environments

An optimal ecologically valid approach to diagnosis and treatment of individuals with neurodevelopmental disorders may be to use VR methods to simulate classroom social-educational environments under controlled conditions (Parsons 2014). Impairments in attention are a common and debilitating occurrence in a number of clinical populations. Clinical populations affected by attention deficits include individuals with ADHD, traumatic brain injury, autism spectrum disorders, and a host of other neurodevelopmental and neurodegenerative disorders. Using VR with these populations may be particularly practical due to increased control over the procedure and fewer extraneous distractions.

The Virtual Classroom project represents a joint venture between the University of Southern California and Digital Media Works in Canada (Rizzo et al. 2006). The Virtual Classroom was designed for the study, assessment, and rehabilitation of cognitive and functional processes, particularly in clinical populations with central nervous system (CNS) dysfunction. The vision of this project saw the Classroom as way to advance the scientific study of typical cognitive and behavioral processes as well as to improve the capacity to understand, measure, and treat impairments in this clinical populations. Initially, the Virtual Classroom project focused on the assessment of attention in individuals with ADHD. Due to the heterogeneous nature of the disorder, reaching a consensus on the proper diagnosis and treatment of the disorder has proven to be difficult. Currently, assessment focuses on a number of behavior checklists given to parents and teachers. Diagnosis is made from converging evidence based on these scales. Such scales are vulnerable to a number of errors, such as reporter bias, and so may be inconsistent. Thus, the VR Classroom aims to be a reliable and objective measure of attention functioning in ADHD (Rizzo et al. 2006).

The VR Classroom employs a head-mounted display (HMD) with which individuals view the environment. HMDs are able to occlude extraneous distraction and focus the participant's attention within the VR environment where presentation of distracting auditory and visual stimuli is tightly controlled. In this way, VR is able to identify precisely when individuals make errors due to distraction, and what type of distraction precluded the error. In addition, it is possible to use a number of tracking devices on the head, arms, and legs to track movements besides head movements as a concurrent index of hyperactivity symptoms. Hence, the Virtual Classroom is able to objectively assess not only cognitive abnormalities in ADHD, but also behavioral abnormalities, effectively integrating information traditionally only available from cognitive measures and behavioral rating scales administered separately (Rizzo et al. 2006).

The Virtual Classroom utilizes a continuous performance task paradigm (CPT) commonly used in the assessment of ADHD. Participants are instructed to view a series of letters presented continuously on a blackboard. They are asked to respond via a mouse click only after they view the letter “X” preceded by the letter “A.” Emphasis is placed on speed and accuracy. Individuals with ADHD have generally been shown to make more omission errors (failing to respond to a target) and commission errors (responding to a non-target) on CPT tests. Omission error are considered indicative of inattention while commission errors are indicative of hyperactivity (Nichols and Waschbusch 2004). In the high distraction task, external interference control is also assessed. To begin the task, the participant is immersed in the classroom, and seated in a desk near the center of the classroom with a view of other children, a teacher, and a window, among other things. After instructions are communicated to participants via computer speakers, the task begins. The participants are instructed to respond via a mouse click to each target (the letter “X” preceded by the letter “A”) and to withhold a mouse click for all non-targets. The Virtual Classroom presents distractors in various areas of the classroom. Audio-visual distractors include a school bus driving by, an SUV driving by, a book dropping to the floor, children passing notes, a child raising his hand, the teacher answering the classroom door, and the principal entering the room. Visual distractors include a paper plane flying through the room. Audio distractors include the sound of paper crumpling, a pencil hitting the floor, an airplane passing overhead, a voice from the intercom, the bell ringing, a sneeze and a cough. These distractors are dispersed throughout the left, center, and middle of the classroom. An important feature of the Virtual Classroom is its ability to mimic the complexity of the real world in a controlled environment. Individuals are immersed in this environment and are surrounded by desks, children, a teacher, and a white board much like they would be in a real-world classroom. Additionally, auditory and visual distractors, much like those that would be present in the real world can be enabled or disabled, allowing the researcher to manipulate the complexity of the environment. This ability to manipulate complexity in a virtual environment allows neuropsychologists to generalize results of these standard tests to an individual’s real-world functioning.

The Virtual Classroom for ADHD

As mentioned above, current approaches to assessment of ADHD rely on converging lines of evidence from behavioral rating scales, paper-and-pencil cognitive assessments, and computerized measures of attention (e.g., continuous performance tasks). These approaches are limited in their generalizability to activities of daily living. A possible answer to the problems of ecological validity in assessment of ADHD is to immerse the participant in a virtual classroom environment. Work has been done to develop a virtual classroom that assesses executive functioning (Rizzo et al. 2006). These virtual environments have been found to offer significant advantages to more traditional methods of diagnosis and observation.

In an initial clinical trial of the Virtual Classroom, Parsons et al. (2007) compared performance of ten children with ADHD with ten typically developing children. In this study, children with ADHD performed differently from typically developing children in a number of different ways: (1) children with ADHD made more commission and omission errors (2) children with ADHD exhibited more overall body movement; and (3) children with ADHD were more impacted by distracting stimuli. Additionally, performance measures in the VR Classroom were significantly correlated with traditional measures and behavior checklists (Parsons et al. 2007). Thus, the Virtual Classroom was able to assess not only attentional abnormalities but also behavioral abnormalities concurrently.

Another study of ADHD using the Virtual Classroom focused on distractibility in ADHD. Nineteen adolescent boys with ADHD and sixteen age-matched typically developing adolescents were compared on performance in the Virtual Classroom CPT with and without real-world distractors and on a traditional CPT without distractors. The Virtual Classroom was able to distinguish between ADHD and control groups more so than the traditional CPT, with adolescents with ADHD committing more commission errors and overall errors. Additionally, the Virtual Classroom was more specific, correctly identifying 87.5% of controls, compared to only 68.8% in the standard CPT. Additionally, ecologically valid distractors presented in the task seemed to have a greater impact on the adolescents with ADHD compared to those without. Adam et al. attributed poorer performance in the ADHD group to these distractions, explaining the adolescents with ADHD were less able to cope with the novelty of the situation than those in the control group (2009).

Pollak et al. investigated the use of the Virtual Classroom in assessing the effect of methylphenidate (MPH), a drug used in the treatment of ADHD. Twenty-seven children with ADHD completed the Virtual Classroom CPT, the traditional CPT, and the Test of Variables of Attention (TOVA). These children were divided into MPH and non-MPH (placebo) groups. Ingestion of MPH decreased omission errors in all measures; however, compared to the TOVA and traditional CPT, ingestion of MPH reduced omission errors in the Virtual Classroom to a greater degree. These results suggest the Virtual Classroom may be more sensitive to attention deficits than traditional measures. Additionally, children rated the Virtual Classroom to be more enjoyable than either the TOVA or the traditional CPT (2010). See Table 11.1 for some examples of recent studies using this Virtual Classroom.

The Virtual Classroom Extended

The Virtual Classroom has also been used in study assessing attention in adolescents with sports concussions. Twenty-five sports-concussed adolescents were compared with twenty-five non-sports-concussed adolescents in the Virtual Classroom and on a traditional CPT task. The Virtual Classroom proved to have greater sensitivity in detecting subtle attention deficits due to the sports concussion

Table 11.1 Recent virtual classroom studies

Study	Sample	Research design and traditional tests	Results
Adams et al. (2009)	Sample included 35 boys ages 8–14 years. 19 participants with ADHD were compared to 16 age-matched controls.	Research Design: Comparison of participant performance on the Continuous Performance Test with and without the Virtual Classroom.	Findings revealed greater specificity for Virtual Classroom CPT.
		Traditional tests included: Behavior Assessment System for Children (BASC)	While differences between the two groups were not significant, a significant trend was observed for correct target identification and commission errors.
		VIGIL continuous performance test	
Bioulac et al. (2012)	Sample included 36 boys ages 7–10 years. 20 participants with ADHD were compared to 16 age-matched controls.	Research Design: ADHD and controls children were first tested with the traditional computerized CPT. After 10 min they were tested with the virtual CPT.	Findings revealed that ADHD participants showed a significant performance decrement, as well as a decrease in the number of correct hits. They were also slower with increased reaction time.
		Traditional tests included: Continuous Performance Test (CPT II).	Findings also revealed that ADHD children performed worse than controls on both the Virtual Classroom CPT and the traditional computerized CPT.
		Conners' parents rating scale	
		Child behavior check list	
		State Trait Inventory Anxiety Inventory	
Gilboa et al. (2011)	Sample included 54. 29 with Neurofibromatosis type 1 (NF1). 69% female; mean age 12.2). 25 controls 72% female; mean age = 12.2).	Research Design: Comparison of Virtual CPT and the traditional tests. Cross sectional design.	Findings revealed significant differences between the NF1 and controls on omission errors and commission errors in the Virtual Classroom CPT.
		Traditional tests included: Conners' parent rating scales—revised:	Poorer performance was found in NF1 children.
			Significant correlations were found between number of targets correctly identified, the number of commission errors, and reaction time.

(continued)

Table 11.1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Research design and traditional tests	Results
Gilboa et al. (2015)	Sample included 76. 41 children ages 8–16 with acquired brain injury. 35 age- and gender-matched controls.	Research Design: Cross-sectional design.	Findings revealed significant between group differences for number of targets correctly identified in the Virtual Classroom CPT.
		Traditional tests included: Test of everyday attention for children	Furthermore, 45% of the children with ABI suffered marked deficits in sustained attention on the Virtual Classroom CPT.
		Wechsler abbreviated scale of intelligence (Matrix reasoning and vocabulary)	
		Conners parent rating scales—revised	Attentional performance was found to be related to age, age at injury/ diagnosis and treatment.
Lalonde et al. (2013)	Sample included 38 adolescents ages 13–17 years.	Research Design: Descriptive/correlational study of a Virtual Classroom Stroop task. Convergence validity study.	Findings revealed that the Virtual classroom Stroop task correlated with D-KEFS and BRIEF.
			Performance on the Virtual Classroom Stroop task was correlated with paper–pencil Stroop task.
		Traditional tests included: Delis–Kaplan executive function system (Trail making, tower, twenty questions, verbal fluency, color-word interference)	VR classroom Stroop more accurately reflected everyday behavioral functioning.
		Behavior rating inventory of executive function	
		Child behavior checklist	
Nolin et al. (2009)	Sample included 8 children with acquired brain injury, ages 8–12 years.	Research Design: Repeated measures comparisons.	Findings revealed no difference between the Virtual Classroom CPT and the traditional computerized CPT on total of omissions.
		Traditional tests included: VIGIL continuous performance test	Significantly more commissions and longer reaction times in the Virtual Classroom CPT.
Nolin et al. (2012)	Sample included 50 participants. There were 25 sports-concussed and 25 matched control adolescents.	Research Design: Comparison of the traditional CPT and Virtual CPT was	Findings revealed that the Virtual Classroom CPT showed greater sensitivity to the subtle effects of sports concussion.
		counterbalanced across participants.	It is important to note that the sports concussion group reported more symptoms of cybersickness than the control group.
		Traditional tests included: VIGIL continuous performance test	

Parsons et al. (2007)	Sample included 20 participants with 10 boys diagnosed with ADHD and 10 matched controls.	Research Design: Intergroup comparison of participants with ADHD and normal controls.	Findings revealed ADHD group exhibited more omission errors, commission errors, and overall body movement in the Virtual Classroom CPT.
		Traditional tests included: SWAN Behavior Checklist	ADHD group was more impacted by distraction in the Virtual Classroom CPT.
		Conners' CPT II	Virtual classroom CPT was correlated with traditional ADHD assessment tools, behavior checklist, and traditional computerized CPT.
		Stroop	
		Trail making tests	
		NEPSY (Visual attention, design fluency, verbal fluency)	
		WISC-III (Digit Span, coding, arithmetic, vocabulary)	
		Judgement of line orientation	
Parsons and Carlew (2016)	Two Studies reported—Study #1: Sample included 50 undergraduate students (mean	Research Design: Two studies: Normative study and a clinical study	Findings revealed that the Virtual Classroom Stroop task was correlated with traditional tasks and elicited an interference effect similar to those found in classic Stroop tasks.
		Study #1: Normative study comparing Virtual Stroop to traditional tasks.	During the distraction condition of the Virtual Classroom Stroop the ASD group performance declined.
	age = 20.37; 78% female).	Study #2: Cross sectional design.	
	Study #2: Sample included 8 students with high functioning autism (mean age = 22.88) and 10 matched controls.	Traditional tests included: Wechsler test of adult reading	
		Delis-Kaplan executive functioning system: Color word interference test	
		Stroop task from automated neuropsychological assessment metrics	
		Wechsler abbreviated scale of intelligence- Second edition	
Pollak et al. (2009)	Sample included 37 boys ages 9–17 years, with (n = 20) and without ADHD (n = 17).	Research Design: Crossover design comparing Virtual Classroom on regular computer screen.	Findings revealed ADHD group performed less well on all CPT tasks.
			Virtual classroom CPT showed effect sizes similar to the TOVA.
		Traditional tests included: Test of Variables of Attention – TOVA	Self-reported preference for Virtual CPT.
		Short feedback questionnaire	

(continued)

Table 11.1 (continued)

Study	Sample	Research design and traditional tests	Results
Pollak et al. (2010)	Sample included 27 16 boys and 11 girls, with clinical diagnosis of ADHD.	Research Design: Double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover design.	Findings revealed that metilphenidate (MPH) reduced omission errors to a greater extent on the Virtual classroom CPT compared to the no Virtual classroom CPT and the TOVA, and decreased other CPT measures on all types of CPT to a similar degree.
		Traditional tests included: Test of Variables of Attention – TOVA	Children rated the Virtual Classroom CPT as more enjoyable compared to the other types of CPT.

than did the traditional CPT, detecting a significantly higher number of head movements and commission errors in the adolescents with a sports concussion than in those without (Nolin et al. 2012).

Gilboa et al. utilized the Virtual Classroom to assess attention deficits in children with Neurofibromatosis type 1 (NFI), an inherited neurological disorder with symptoms including attention deficits (2011). NF1 is highly comorbid with ADHD, with 30–50% of individuals meeting diagnostic criteria for both (Keyhan et al. 2006). Twenty-nine children with NF1 and 25 typically developing children completed the Virtual Classroom CPT and the Conners' Parent Rating Scales-Revised: Long (CPRS = R:L; Conners 1997), a questionnaire used to assess ADHD. Children with NF1 performed significantly poorer than typically developing children making more commission and omission errors. Additionally, significant correlations between the rating scale and performance on the Virtual Classroom were observed (Gilboa et al. 2011).

Researchers at the University of Victoria have developed a version of the VR Classroom capable of measuring interference control via the Stroop task. The Stroop task is widely used and well-replicated task which requires participants to inhibit a prepotent response to read the name of a color and name the conflicting ink color it is printed in. In a validity study, the VR Classroom Stroop task elicited similar "interference effects" to the traditional Stroop task. Reaction times to the VR Classroom Stroop were slower overall, possibly due to the increased processing demand. Nevertheless, the VR Classroom Stroop proved to be a valid assessment of interference control (Rizzo et al. 2006). Recently, Parsons and Carlew (2016) applied the Virtual Classroom Stroop task to compare performances between persons with autism spectrum disorder and typically developing participants. While significant differences were not observed between persons with autism spectrum disorder and neurotypical participants on the paper-and-pencil and computerized Stroop tasks, persons with autism spectrum disorder performed significantly worse on the Virtual Classroom Stroop task when distractors were present. These findings suggest the potential of the Virtual Classroom Stroop task to distinguish between prepotent response inhibition (non-distraction condition) and resistance to distractor inhibition (distraction condition) in participants with high functioning autism.

In sum, research suggests the Virtual Classroom is an ecologically valid, highly specific, and enjoyable assessment of attention deficits in multiple populations. Performance on the Virtual Classroom has been correlated with many other well-validated measures of attention including the CPT, TOVA, and behavioral rating scales. Future research should assess a broad range of populations. Additionally, the Virtual Classroom has been expanded beyond the CPT to include a Stroop task. Further development of the Virtual Classroom seeks to expand the clinical utility of the Virtual Classroom beyond executive assessment to rehabilitation and therapy.

Conclusions

This chapter reviewed the ways in which previous research has most often relied on paper-and-pencil and computerized psychometric tests of executive functions. Again, although these approaches provide highly systematic controlled and delivery of performance challenges, they have also been criticized as limited in the area of ecological validity. A possible answer to the problems of ecological validity in assessment of executive functioning is to immerse the child in a virtual classroom environment.

Virtual reality technology is able to replicate real world environments and present standardized neuropsychological tasks within those environments. Additionally, controlled presentation of real-world distractions is possible. These capabilities enhance ecological validity by immersing individuals in a controlled environment that mimics their every-day life to complete neuropsychological assessments. It follows that the results of these assessments are more generalizable and more closely representative of an individual's real world functioning.

The Virtual Classroom was initially developed as an assessment of attention functioning in ADHD. A number of preliminary studies have confirmed its utility for this purpose. The Virtual Classroom is able to distinguish children with ADHD from normal controls on the basis their performance on a CPT test embedded within the environment as well as from behavioral data. Additionally, participants reported enjoying the Virtual Classroom more than the standard CPT.

The Virtual Classroom has been expanded for use in different populations, and also has been expanded to include different neuropsychological task (e.g. the Stroop task). Because initial success has been obtained in these studies, use of the Virtual Classroom should be explored in other populations as well. One possible population in which the Virtual Classroom may be particularly useful is individuals with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Due to the high overlap between symptoms ADHD and ASD, reliable and specific diagnosis is crucial. Special considerations should be made due to the sensory issues of many individuals with ASD. Consequently, future research in virtual reality technology should investigate a less invasive method of presenting the virtual environment than HMDs.

References

Abbes, Z., Bouden, A., Amado, I., Chantal Bourdel, M., Tabbane, K., & Béchir Halayem, M. (2009). Attentional impairment in children with attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder. *La Tunisie Médicale, 87*, 645–650.

Abikoff, H., Courtney, M., Pelham, W. E., Jr., & Koplewicz, H. S. (1993). Teachers' ratings of disruptive behaviors: The influence of halo effects. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 21*, 519–533.

Adams, R., Finn, P., Moes, E., Flannery, K., & Rizzo, A. S. (2009). Distractibility in attention/deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD): The virtual reality classroom. *Child Neuropsychology, 15*, 120–135.

Adólfsdóttir, S., Sorensen, L., & Lundervold, A. J. (2008). The attention network test: A characteristic pattern of deficits in ADHD. *Behavioral and Brain Function, 12*, 9.

Armstrong, C., Reger, G., Edwards, J., Rizzo, A., Courtney, C., & Parsons, T. D. (2013). Validity of the Virtual Reality Stroop Task (VRST) in active duty military. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology, 35*, 113–123.

Baddeley, A. D. (1996). Exploring the central executive. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 49*, 5–28.

Baddeley, A. D., & Hitch, G. J. (1974). Working memory. In G. Bower (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 8, pp. 47–90). San Diego: Academic.

Barkley, R. A. (1997). Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, self-regulation, and time: Toward a more comprehensive theory. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 18*, 271–279.

Barkley, R. A. (2000). Genetics of childhood disorders: xvii. ADHD, Part 1: The executive functions and ADHD. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 39*, 1064–1068.

Barkley, R. A., Grodzinsky, G., & DuPaul, G. J. (1992). Frontal lobe functions in attention deficit disorder with and without hyperactivity: A review and research report. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 20*, 163–188.

Beck, L., Wolter, M., Mungard, N. F., Vohn, R., Staedtgen, M., Kuhlen, T., & Sturm, W. (2010). Evaluation of spatial processing in virtual reality using functional magnetic resonance imaging (FMRI). *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking, 13*, 211–215.

Besnard, J., Richard, P., Banville, F., Nolin, P., Aubin, G., Le Gall, D., et al. (2016). Virtual reality and neuropsychological assessment: The reliability of a virtual kitchen to assess daily-life activities in victims of traumatic brain injury. *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult, 23*(3), 223–235.

Biederman, J. (2005). Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a selective overview. *Biological Psychiatry, 57*, 1215–1220.

Bioulac, S., Lallemand, S., Rizzo, A., Philip, P., Fabrigoule, C., & Bouvard, M. P. (2012). Impact of time on task on ADHD patient's performances in a virtual classroom. *European Journal of Paediatric Neurology, 16*(5), 514–521.

Bohil, C. J., Alicea, B., & Biocca, F. A. (2011). Virtual reality in neuroscience research and therapy. *Nature Reviews: Neuroscience, 12*(12), 752.

Burgess, P. W., & Simons, J. S. (2005). Theories of frontal lobe executive function: Clinical applications. In *The effectiveness of rehabilitation for cognitive deficits* (p. 211). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chaytor, N., & Schmitter-Edgecombe, M. (2007). Fractionation of the dysexecutive syndrome in a heterogeneous neurological sample: Comparing the dysexecutive questionnaire and the brock adaptive functioning questionnaire. *Brain Injury, 21*, 615–621.

Chaytor, N., Schmitter-Edgecombe, M., & Burr, R. (2006). Improving the ecological validity of executive functioning assessment. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology, 21*, 217–227.

Conners, C. K. (1997). *Conners' rating scales—revised: User's manual*. North Tonawanda: Multi-Health Systems.

Conners, C. K., Erhardt, D., & Sparrow, E. (1999). *Conners' Adult ADHD Rating Scales:(CAARS)*. Toronto: MHS.

Corkum, P. V., & Siegel, L. S. (1993). Is the continuous performance task a valuable research tool for use with children with attention-deficit-hyperactivity disorder? *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 34*, 1217–1239.

Denmark, T., Fish, J., Jansari, A., Tailor, J., Ashkan, K., & Morris, R. (2017). Using virtual reality to investigate multitasking ability in individuals with frontal lobe lesions. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 1–22.

Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64*, 135–168.

Dodrill, C. B. (1999). Myths of neuropsychology: Further considerations. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 13*, 562–572.

DuPaul, G. J., Anastopoulos, A. D., Power, T. J., Reid, R., Ikeda, M. J., & McGoey, K. E. (1998). Parent ratings of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder symptoms: Factor structure and normative data. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 20*, 83–102.

Eliason, M. J., & Richman, L. C. (1987). The continuous performance test in learning disabled and nondisabled children. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 20*, 614–619.

Eriksen, B. A., & Eriksen, C. W. (1974). Effects of noise letters upon the identification of a target letter in a nonsearch task. *Perception & Psychophysics, 16*(1), 143–149.

Fan, J., McCandliss, B. D., Sommer, T., Raz, A., & Posner, M. I. (2002). Testing the efficiency and independence of attentional networks. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 14*, 340–347.

Fan, J., Bernardi, S., Van Dam, N. T., Anagnostou, E., Gu, X., Martin, L., Park, Y., Liu, X., Kolevzon, A., Soorya, L., Groberg, D., & Hollander, E. (2012). Functional deficits of the attentional networks in autism. *Brain and Behavior, 2*, 647–660.

Farias, S. T., Harrell, E., Neumann, C., & Houtz, A. (2003). The relationship between neuropsychological performance and daily functioning in individuals with Alzheimer's disease: Ecological validity of neuropsychological tests. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology, 18*, 655–672.

Foerster, R. M., Poth, C. H., Behler, C., Botsch, M., & Schneider, W. X. (2016). Using the virtual reality device Oculus Rift for neuropsychological assessment of visual processing capabilities. *Scientific Reports, 6*, 37016.

Gaggioli, A., Keshner, E. A., Weiss, P. L., & Riva, G. (2009). *Advanced technologies in rehabilitation – Empowering cognitive, physical, social and communicative skills through virtual reality, robots, wearable systems and brain-computer interfaces*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Gilboa, Y., Rosenblum, S., Fattal-Valevski, A., Toledano-Alhadef, H., & Josman, N. (2011). Using a Virtual Classroom environment to describe the attention deficits profile of children with Neurofibromatosis type 1. *Research in developmental disabilities, 32*(6), 2608–2613.

Gilboa, Y., Kerrouche, B., Longaud-Vales, A., Kieffer, V., Tiberghien, A., Aligon, D., et al. (2015). Describing the attention profile of children and adolescents with acquired brain injury using the virtual classroom. *Brain Injury, 29*, 1691–1700. https://doi.org/10.3109/02699052.2015.1075148.

Gioia, G. A., & Isquith, P. K. (2004). Ecological assessment of executive function in traumatic brain injury. *Developmental Neuropsychology, 25*, 135–158.

Goodrich-Hunsaker, N. J., & Hopkins, R. O. (2010). Spatial memory deficits in a virtual radial arm maze in amnesic participants with hippocampal damage. *Behavioral Neuroscience, 124*, 405–413.

Gorini, A., Gaggioli, A., Vigna, C., & Riva, G. (2008). A second life for eHealth: prospects for the use of 3-D virtual worlds in clinical psychology. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 10*, 1–21.

Grodzinsky, G. M., & Barkley, R. A. (1999). Predictive power of frontal lobe tests in the diagnosis of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 13*(1), 12–21.

Grodzinsky, G. M., & Diamond, R. (1992). Frontal lobe functioning in boys with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Developmental Neuropsychology, 8*, 427–445.

Johnson, K. A., Robertson, I. H., Barry, E., Mulligan, A., Dáibhis, A., Daly, M., Watchorn, A., Gill, M., & Bellgrove, M. A. (2008). Impaired conflict resolution and alerting in children with ADHD: Evidence from the Attention Network Task (ANT). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49*, 1339–1347.

Jovanovski, D., Zakzanis, K., Campbell, Z., Erb, S., & Nussbaum, D. (2012a). Development of a novel, ecologically oriented virtual reality measure of executive function: The multitasking in the city test. *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult, 19*(3), 171–182.

Jovanovski, D., Zakzanis, K., Ruttan, L., Campbell, Z., Erb, S., & Nussbaum, D. (2012b). Ecologically valid assessment of executive dysfunction using a novel virtual reality task in patients with acquired brain injury. *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult, 19*(3), 207–220.

Keyhan, N., Minden, D., & Ickowicz, A. (2006). Clinical case rounds in child and adolescent psychiatry: Neurofibromatosis type 1, cognitive impairment, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child an Adolescent Psychiatry, 15*, 87–89.

Knight, R. G., & Titov, N. (2009). Use of virtual reality tasks to assess prospective memory: Applicability and evidence. *Brain Impairment, 10*, 3–13.

Lahey, B. B., Pelham, W. E., Chronis, A., Massetti, G., Kipp, H., Ehrhardt, A., & Lee, S. S. (2006). Predictive validity of ICD-10 hyperkinetic disorder relative to DSM-IV attention-deficit/

hyperactivity disorder among younger children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 47*, 472–479.

Lalonde, G., Henry, M., Drouin-Germain, A., Nolin, P., & Beauchamp, M. H. (2013). Assessment of executive function in adolescence: A comparison of traditional and virtual reality tools. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 219*(1), 76–82.

Law, A. S., Logie, R. H., & Pearson, D. G. (2006). The impact of secondary tasks on multitasking in a virtual environment. *Acta Psychologica, 122*, 27–44.

Lundervold, A. J., Adolfsdottir, S., Halleland, H., Halmoy, A., Plessen, K., & Haavik, J. (2007). Attention network test in adults with ADHD—the impact of affective fluctuations. *Behavioral and Brain Function, 27*, 27.

Neguţ, A., Matu, S. A., Sava, F. A., & David, D. (2016a). Virtual reality measures in neuropsychological assessment: A meta-analytic review. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 30*(2), 165–184.

Neguţ, A., Matu, S. A., Sava, F. A., & David, D. (2016b). Task difficulty of virtual reality-based assessment tools compared to classical paper-and-pencil or computerized measures: A meta-analytic approach. *Computers in Human Behavior, 54*, 414–424.

Nichols, S. L., & Waschbusch, D. A. (2004). A review of the validity of laboratory cognitive tasks used to assess symptoms of ADHD. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 34*, 297–315.

Nigg, J. T. (1999). The ADHD response-inhibition deficit as measured by the stop task: Replication with DSM–IV combined type, extension, and qualification. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 27*, 393–402.

Nolin, P., Martin, C., & Bouchard, S. (2009). Assessment of inhibition deficits with the virtual classroom in children with traumatic brain injury: A pilot-study. *Studies in Health Technology and Informatics, 144*, 240–242.

Nolin, P., Stipanicic, A., Henry, M., Joyal, C. C., & Allain, P. (2012). Virtual reality as a screening tool for sports concussion in adolescents. *Brain Injury, 26*, 1564–1573.

Norman, D. A., & Shallice, T. (1986). Attention to action: Willed and automatic control of behavior. In R. J. Davidson, G. E. Schwartz, & D. Shapiro (Eds.), *Consciousness and self regulation: Advances in research and theory* (Vol. 4, pp. 1–18). New York: Plenum.

Oberlin, B. G., Alford, J. L., & Marrocco, R. T. (2005). Normal attention orienting but abnormal stimulus alerting and conflict effect in combined subtype ADHD. *Behavioral Brain Research, 165*, 1–11.

Odhuba, R. A., Broek, M., & Johns, L. C. (2005). Ecological validity of measures of executive functioning. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 44*, 269–278.

Parsey, C. M., & Schmitter-Edgecombe, M. (2013). Applications of technology in neuropsychological assessment. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 27*(8), 1328–1361.

Parsons, T. D. (2014). Virtual teacher and classroom for assessment of neurodevelopmental disorders. In S. Brahnam & L. C. Jain (Eds.), *Serious games, alternative realities, and play therapy* (pp. 121–137). Germany: Springer.

Parsons, T. D. (2015). Virtual reality for enhanced ecological validity and experimental control in the clinical, affective, and social neurosciences. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 9*, 1–19.

Parsons, T. D., & Carlew, A. R. (2016). Bimodal virtual reality stroop for assessing distractor inhibition in autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 46*(4), 1255–1267.

Parsons, T. D., & Courtney, C. (2014). An initial validation of the virtual reality paced auditory serial addition test in a college sample. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 222*, 15–23.

Parsons, T. D., & Phillips, A. (2016). Virtual reality for psychological assessment in clinical practice. *Practice Innovations, 1*, 197–217.

Parsons, T. D., & Rizzo, A. A. (2008b). Initial validation of a virtual environment for assessment of memory functioning: Virtual reality cognitive performance assessment test. *CyberPsychology and Behavior, 11*, 17–25.

Parsons, T. D., & Rizzo, A. A. (2008a). Affective outcomes of virtual reality exposure therapy for anxiety and specific phobias: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 39*, 250–261.

Parsons, T. D., Bowerly, T., Buckwalter, J. G., & Rizzo, A. A. (2007). A controlled clinical comparison of attention performance in children with ADHD in a virtual reality classroom compared to standard neuropsychological methods. *Child Neuropsychology, 13*, 363–381.

Parsons, T. D., Rizzo, A. A., Rogers, S. A., & York, P. (2009). Virtual reality in pediatric rehabilitation: A review. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation, 12*, 224–238.

Parsons, T. D., Courtney, C., & Dawson, M. (2013). Virtual reality stroop task for assessment of supervisory attentional processing. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology, 35*, 812–826.

Parsons, T. D., McMahan, T., & Kane, R. (2018). Practice parameters facilitating adoption of advanced technologies for enhancing neuropsychological assessment paradigms. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 32*(1), 16–41.

Pineda, D., Ardila, A., Rosselli, M. N., Cadavid, C., Mancheno, S., & Mejia, S. (1998). Executive dysfunctions in children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *International Journal of Neuroscience, 96*, 177–196.

Plancher, G., Gyselinck, V., Nicolas, S., & Piolino, P. (2010). Age effect on components of episodic memory and feature binding: A virtual reality study. *Neuropsychology, 24*(3), 379–390.

Plancher, G., Tirard, A., Gyselinck, V., Nicolas, S., & Piolino, P. (2012). Using virtual reality to characterize episodic memory profiles in amnestic mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease: Influence of active and passive encoding. *Neuropsychologia, 50*(5), 592–602.

Plancher, G., Barra, J., Orriols, E., & Piolino, P. (2013). The influence of action on episodic memory: A virtual reality study. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 66*(5), 895–909.

Plehn, K., Marcopulos, B. A., & McLain, C. A. (2004). The relationship between neuropsychological test performance, social functioning, and instrumental activities of daily living in a sample of rural older adults. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 18*, 101–113.

Pollak, Y., Weiss, P. L., Rizzo, A. A., Weizer, M., Shriki, L., Shalev, R. S., & Gross-Tsur, V. (2009). The utility of a continuous performance test embedded in virtual reality in measuring ADHD-related deficits. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 30*, 2–6.

Pollak, Y., Shomaly, H. B., Weiss, P. L., Rizzo, A. A., & Gross-Tsur, V. (2010). Methylphenidate effect in children with ADHD can be measured by an ecologically valid continuous performance test embedded in virtual reality. *CNS Spectrums: The International Journal of Neuropsychiatric Medicine, 15*.

Posner, M. I. (1980). Orienting of attention. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 32*, 3–25.

Posner, M. I., & Petersen, S. E. (1990). The attention system of the human brain. *Annual Review of Neuroscience, 13*, 25–42.

Posner, M. I., & Rothbart, M. K. (2007). Research on attention networks as a model for the integration of psychological science. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 1–23.

Powers, M. B., & Emmelkamp, P. M. (2008). Virtual reality exposure therapy for anxiety disorders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 22*, 561–569.

Rapport, M. D., Chung, K. M., Shore, G., Denney, C. B., & Isaacs, P. (2000). Upgrading the science and technology of assessment and diagnosis: Laboratory and clinic-based assessment of children with ADHD. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 29*(4), 555–568.

Raz, A., & Buhle, J. (2006). Typologies of attentional networks. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 7*, 367–379.

Ready, R. E., Stierman, L., & Paulsen, J. S. (2001). Ecological validity of neuropsychological and personality measures of executive functions. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 15*, 314–323.

Renison, B., Ponsford, J., Testa, R., Richardson, B., & Brownfield, K. (2012). The ecological and construct validity of a newly developed measure of executive function: The virtual library task. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society, 18*(3), 440–450.

Rizzo, A. (2005, March). Virtual reality technology for behavioral/cognitive/neuropsychologicai assessment and intervention: Applications and issues. In *Virtual reality. Proceedings. VR 2005. IEEE* (pp. 309–309).

Rizzo, A. A., & Buckwalter, J. G. (1997a). The status of virtual reality for the cognitive rehabilitation of persons with neurological disorders and acquired brain injury. *Studies in Health Technology and Informatics, 39*, 22.

Rizzo, A. A., & Buckwalter, J. G. (1997b). Virtual reality and cognitive assessment. *Virtual Reality in Neuro-Psycho-Physiology: Cognitive, Clinical and Methodological Issues in Assessment and Rehabilitation, 44*, 123.

Rizzo, A., & Kim, G. J. (2005). A SWOT analysis of the field of virtual reality rehabilitation and therapy. *Presence: Teleoperators & Virtual Environments, 13*(2), 119–146.

Rizzo, A. A., & Schultheis, M. T. (2002). Expanding the boundaries of psychology: The application of virtual reality. *Psychological Inquiry, 13*(2), 134–140.

Rizzo, A. A., Buckwalter, J. G., & Neumann, U. (1997). Virtual reality and cognitive rehabilitation: A brief review of the future. *The Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, 12*(6), 1–15.

Rizzo, A. A., Wiederhold, B., Riva, G., & Van Der Zaag, C. (1998a). General reviews of virtual reality and neuropsychology. *CyberPsychology and Behavior, 1*(4), 413–426.

Rizzo, A. A., Wiederhold, M. D., & Buckwalter, J. G. (1998b). Basic issues in the use of virtual environments for mental health applications. *Studies in Health Technology and Informatics*, 21–42.

Rizzo, A. A., Schultheis, M., Kerns, K. A., & Mateer, C. (2004). Analysis of assets for virtual reality applications in neuropsychology. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation, 14*(1–2), 207–239.

Rizzo, A., Bowerly, T., Buckwalter, J., Klimchuk, D., Mitura, R., & Parsons, T. D. (2006). A virtual reality scenario for all seasons: The virtual classroom. *CNS Spectrums, 11*(1), 35–44.

Rizzo, A., Parsons, T. D., Kenny, P., & Buckwalter, J. G. (2012). Using virtual reality for clinical assessment and intervention. In *Handbook of technology in psychology, psychiatry, and neurology: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 277–318). Hauppauge: Nova Science Publishers.

Rose, F. D., Brooks, B. M., & Rizzo, A. A. (2005). Virtual reality in brain damage rehabilitation: Review. *CyberPsychology and Behavior, 8*, 241–262.

Rothbart, M. K., & Bates, J. E. (2006). Temperament. In W. Damon, R. Lerner, & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology*. Hoboken: Wiley.

Sayal, K., & Taylor, E. (2005). Parent ratings of school behaviour in children at risk of attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 111*, 460–465.

Schachar, R., Mota, V. L., Logan, G. D., Tannock, R., & Klim, P. (2000). Confirmation of an inhibitory control deficit in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 28*, 227–235.

Schatz, P., & Browndyke, J. (2002). Applications of computer-based neuropsychological assessment. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, 17*, 395–410.

Scheres, A., Oosterlaan, J., Geurts, H., Morein-Zamir, S., Meiran, N., Schut, H., et al. (2004). Executive functioning in boys with ADHD: Primarily an inhibition deficit? *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology, 19*(4), 569–594.

Schultheis, M. T., & Rizzo, A. A. (2001). The application of virtual reality technology in rehabilitation. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 46*(3), 296–311.

Schultheis, M. T., Himelstein, J., & Rizzo, A. A. (2002). Virtual reality and neuropsychology: Upgrading the current tools. *The Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, 17*(5), 378–394.

Scotti, J. R., Morris, T. L., McNeil, C. B., & Hawkins, R. P. (1996). DSM–IV and disorders of childhood and adolescence: Can structural criteria be functional? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 1177.

Silver, C. H. (2000). Ecological validity of neuropsychological assessment in childhood traumatic brain injury. *The Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation, 15*(4), 973–988.

Wilson, B. A. (1993). Ecological validity of neuropsychological assessment: Do neuropsychological indexes predict performance in everyday activities? *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 2*, 209–215.

Wilson, B. A., Evans, J. J., Emslie, H., Alderman, N., & Burgess, P. (1998). The development of an ecologically valid test for assessing patients with a dysexecutive syndrome. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation, 8*, 213–228.

Zakzanis, K. K., Quintin, G., Graham, S. J., & Mraz, R. (2009). Age and dementia related differences in spatial navigation within an immersive virtual environment. *Medical Science Monitor, 15*(4), CR140–CR150.