TITLE: EPELI: a novel virtual reality task for the assessment of goal-directed behavior in real-life contexts

AUTHORS AND AFFILIATIONS: Erik Seesjärvi^{1,2} (ORCHID-ID 0000-0002-8130-7148), Jasmin Puhakka¹, Eeva T. Aronen^{3,4} (ORCHID-ID 0000-0001-8756-8894), Alexandra Hering⁵ (ORCHID-ID 0000-0002-7952-9032), Sascha Zuber^{6,7} (ORCHID-ID 0000-0001-9464-7048), Liya Merzon¹⁰, Matthias Kliegel^{6,8} (ORCHID-ID 0000-0002-2001-2522), Matti Laine⁹ (ORCHID-ID 0000-0003-4529-4965), and Juha Salmi^{1,10,11} (ORCHID-ID 0000-0001-5623-6598)

¹Department of Psychology and Logopedics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

²Child Neurology, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland

³Child Psychiatry, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland

⁴New Children's Hospital, Pediatric Research Center, Laboratory of Developmental Psychopathology, Helsinki, Finland

⁵Department of Developmental Psychology, Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands

⁶Swiss National Centre of Competence in Research LIVES, Geneva, Switzerland

⁷Institute on Aging & Lifelong Health, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada

⁸Department of Psychology, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

⁹Department of Psychology, Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland

¹⁰Department of Neuroscience and Biomedical Engineering, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland

¹¹MAGICS, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland

Corresponding Author:

Name: Erik Seesjärvi

Address: Department of Psychology and Logopedics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland. P.O. BOX 4, 00014 University of Helsinki, FINLAND

Email: erik.seesjarvi@helsinki.fi

Abstract

A recently developed virtual reality task, EPELI (Executive Performance in Everyday Living), quantifies goal-directed behavior in naturalistic conditions. Participants navigate a virtual apartment, performing household chores given by a virtual character. EPELI aims to tap attention, executive function, and prospective memory. To ensure its applicability to further research and clinical work and to study its relationship to relevant background factors, we examined several key properties of EPELI in 77 typically developing 9–13-year-old children. These included EPELI's internal consistency, age and gender differences, sensitivity to gaming experience, head-mounted display (HMD) type, and verbal recall ability, as well as its relationships with parent-rated everyday executive problems. Of the eight EPELI measures, the following six showed good internal consistency: task and navigation efficacy, number of correctly performed tasks and overall actions, time monitoring, and controller movement. Some measures were associated with age, gender, or verbal encoding ability. Moreover, EPELI performance was associated with parent-rated everyday executive problems. There were no significant associations of gaming background, task familiarity, or HMD type with the EPELI measures. These results attest to the reliability and validity of this new virtual reality tool for the ecologically valid assessment of attention, executive functions, and prospective memory in children.

Keywords: Attention, goal-directed behavior, executive function, human-environment interaction, prospective memory, virtual reality

Preprint of the manuscript is available at: <https://psyarxiv.com/aqbwt>

1 Introduction

In cognitive psychology and neuropsychology, there is a long history of using experimental paradigms that contain a very narrow set of stimuli and allow for only a limited range of behavioural responses from the experimentee (Hatfield, 2002). In a similar vein, most neuropsychological measures in clinical use today aim to measure one single cognitive domain at a time with prestructured repetitive tasks, thus stressing controllability over naturalism (See Lezak, 2012, for a comprehensive compendium). The use of such paradigms and measures has unarguably yielded a wealth of information on human cognition in both healthy participants and clinical groups. However, some critics have questioned whether this approach alone is sufficient when the subject of the study is something as complex as human goal-directed behavior taking place in complex everyday situations (e.g. Brunswik, 1943; Gibson, 1970; Neisser, 1976; Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Kingstone et al., 2008). Likewise, it has been argued that many traditional tests of executive function lack generalizability (e.g. Burgess et al., 2006; Chaytor et al., 2006). This has created a need to develop new tests with greater resemblance to everyday life, which could increase predictive validity in relation to real-life problems and hence provide greater clinical utility (Burgess et al., 2006; Parsons et al., 2017).

To implement tests simulating daily activities, many have turned to new technologies such as *Virtual Reality (VR)* and *head-mounted displays (HMDs)* (e.g., Ouellet et al., 2018; Barnett et al., 2021; Chicchi Giglioli et al., 2021). VR refers to digitally generated, immersive artificial environments. Today, VR-based neuropsychological research targeting, for example, attention, executive functions, and memory (see review by Kim et al., 2021) is being published at an accelerating rate (Krohn et al., 2020). In children, VR has been successfully used to implement conventional experimental tasks, such as a variant of the widely used Continuous Performance Test where the task is performed in a virtual classroom environment (see, e.g., Parsons & Rizzo, 2019). One major benefit of VR is that it also allows the creation of complex, realistic

everyday scenarios while simultaneously providing precise control over test parameters and measurements (Parsons et al., 2017). Indeed, in adult populations, several VR tasks that simulate common everyday activities (e.g., grocery shopping or cooking) with immersive HMDs have already been successfully employed (Ouellet et al., 2018; Barnett et al., 2021; Chicchi Giglioli et al., 2021). A more comprehensive endeavor was taken up by Kourtesis and colleagues (2020), who developed *VR-EAL*, a VR-based neuropsychological battery for adults that lasts about 60 minutes and consists of multiple scenes with real-life elements. Taken together, these studies point to the feasibility of immersive VR as a versatile medium for creating more realistic neuropsychological measures. However, especially for children there is a lack of naturalistic tasks, which would, for example require the participants to engage in goal-directed behavior in open-ended, lifelike situations.

To study the goal-directed behavior of children in everyday context, we developed *EPELI (Executive Performance in Everyday Living; Seesjärvi et al., 2021)*. To our knowledge, EPELI is the first HMD-based VR task that requires children to plan and carry out multiple tasks by navigating a virtual environment and interacting with the relevant target objects there, while monitoring the time and ignoring distracting objects and events. The development of EPELI was inspired by naturalistic prospective memory studies (Rendell & Craik, 2000) and studies carried out in real-life environments, such as *Multiple Errands Test* (Shallice & Burgess, 1991). In EPELI, children perform short scenarios consisting of everyday chores in a virtual apartment. Each scenario starts with an encoding phase during which a dragon character tells the child what tasks need to be done next. In the subsequent execution phase, the goal of the child is to perform the given tasks by navigating the apartment and interacting with the relevant objects. Successful performance in EPELI requires a diverse set of attentional-executive functions (e.g., visual search, selective attention, inhibition, planning, decision making, working memory, multitasking) and prospective memory, the ability to remember and execute delayed intentions in the future (Kliegel et al., 2008). Simulating everyday situations and contexts has been suggested to overcome the key limitations of simplified

laboratory tasks discussed above (e.g., Burgess et al., 2006; Chaytor et al., 2006; Dawson & Marcotte, 2017; Miller and Barr, 2017). Our first EPELI results, which compared ADHD and typically developing children, showed that EPELI performance is linked to ADHD symptoms and successfully discriminates between ADHD and typically developing children (Seesjärvi et al., 2021). Moreover, EPELI performance correlated strongly with parent evaluations of everyday executive problems as evaluated across all participants, thus exhibiting good concurrent validity. Moreover, the participants on average gave highly positive ratings regarding the EPELI playing experience and very few participants reported simulator sickness symptoms or usability problems.

In utilizing the various opportunities provided by VR for the development of new neuropsychological tasks, several possible confounding factors should be taken into account. The gaming background might affect task performance, with regular gamers performing better than non-gamers (Bediou et al., 2018). If the paradigm uses real-life elements, it should be ensured that the contents are familiar enough for all participants to ensure unbiased evaluation. Although earlier generations of HMDs have been reported to cause simulator sickness, adverse effects or dropouts seem to be rare in studies that employ newer HMDs (see review by Kourtesis et al., 2019). Nevertheless, the possibility of sickness symptoms is still an important factor to consider in VR studies, even though it is unlikely that it would continue to hinder the development of VR-based neuropsychological tasks.

The present study examined several key properties of EPELI in a sample of 77 typically developing children of middle school age. The aims of this study include probing EPELI's key psychometric properties, both its reliability (internal consistency) and validity, which are essential to be reported for any neuropsychological instrument to demonstrate that it is able to provide robust results. Moreover, we wanted to study the role of age and gender in the development of real-world goal-oriented behaviors that EPELI measures. Previous studies examining the development of goal-directed behavior have mostly utilised isolated tasks,

and it is still unclear whether the related findings generalize to open-ended situations provided in EPELI. Furthermore, the possible confounding effects related to VR technology need to be considered to examine whether the device being used to implement the task influences the results. Finally, even though the two relevant phases in prospective memory, encoding and execution, have been widely studied both in children (Mahy et al., 2014; Ballhausen et al., 2019) and across life-span (Zuber & Kliegel, 2020), it is still unclear how much the ability to encode the given instructions dictates the performance in the execution phase of an open-ended, naturalistic task such as EPELI. Thus, the specific aims were as follows:

- (i) To evaluate the internal consistency of the EPELI measures that were created and used by Seesjärvi and colleagues (2021). Internal consistency was assessed for the full-length version with 13 scenarios as well as for smaller task sets, as developing a shorter version could be beneficial in situations with time constraints, such as in clinical use.
- (ii) To examine the effects of age (from 9 to 13 years), gender, and their possible interaction on the EPELI measures. As executive functions (Best & Miller, 2010; Klenberg, 2015) and prospective memory (Ballhausen et al., 2019; Mahy et al., 2014; Zuber et al., 2019; Zuber & Kliegel, 2020) continue developing during the early school years and beyond, we expected to see better EPELI performances (higher total scores and efficacies) in older children within our age range. Even though the issue of gender differences in executive functions is controversial, there is some evidence that males may be more impulsive than females across the lifespan (for a review, see Grissom & Reynes, 2019). Moreover, Barnett and colleagues (2007) found that in 8–10 year-olds, girls have better scores on attention tasks and show less impulsivity than boys.
- (iii) To test possible confounding effects associated with user experience and VR technology. User-related effects that were tested included participants' gaming background and familiarity with the task contents. Moreover, to see if the type of the HMD would affect

performance, we employed two different HMDs (*Oculus GO* and *Pico Neo 2 Eye*). This is important because VR technology is developing rapidly and new hardware updates are released annually.

(iv) To probe to what extent the ability to encode verbal instructions explains EPELI performance. To this end, children also performed an instruction recall task, in which they orally repeated a list of tasks similar to those that they executed in EPELI. Studying the associations between the instruction recall task and EPELI was expected to clarify the contributions of memory and executive processes, which are intertwined in prospective memory performance (Kliegel et al., 2008; see also Zuber & Kliegel, 2020).

(v) To explore the relationships between the EPELI measures and different aspects of parent-rated problems of executive function. In our first study (Seesjärvi et al., 2021), we showed that the EPELI measures correlate with parents' overall evaluation of everyday executive problems. We expected to acquire similar results here. However, that analysis lumped together children with ADHD and their controls, leaving it open whether such associations would exist even within the normal variation that healthy children exhibit. Moreover, it remained unclear to what extent more specific types of executive problems (i.e., those related to either behavioral regulation or metacognitive skills) are associated with EPELI performance.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Participants

The participants were drawn from two samples (A and B). Sample A consisted of 68 typically developing children from our previous study (Seesjärvi et al., 2021) and Sample B of 32 typically developing children, who used different type of HMD than Sample A and thus enabled the comparison between two different HMDs. In both samples, the inclusion criteria were (a) native language Finnish, (b) the age of 9–12 years

when recruited, and (c) no history of psychiatric or neurologic diagnoses or special support at school. They were recruited from schools in Kirkkonummi and Espoo, Finland, by sending advertisement letters to parents via schools' electronic message boards and giving brief educational lectures at schools and online during which the study was mentioned. From Sample A, 11 children had to be discarded due to wrong settings and six due to technical failures. From Sample B, three children had to be discarded due to technical issues. There were no differences between the samples regarding age, gender, familial income, or average parental education (see Appendix A). After outlier analysis (see below), the final sample consisted of 77 children (31 girls, age range 9.0–13.0 years; mean age 10.8 years; Table 1). The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Helsinki University Hospital. Informed consent according to the Declaration of Helsinki was obtained from all participants, and they received two movie tickets each as compensation for participation.

2.2 EPELI task

EPELI (<https://aalto.cloud.panopto.eu/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=3eb4836f-1238-4f27-853a-ad3700745b31>; for the original description, see Seesjärvi et al., 2021) was designed with equal contribution by ML, JS, and ES, and implemented by the Peili Vision Company (<http://www.peilivision.fi/>). Participants in Sample A used Oculus Go (2560 x 1440 resolution, 60/72 Hz refresh rate, and 101-degree field of view) and Sample B Pico Neo 2 Eye (3840 x 2160 resolution, 75 Hz refresh rate, and 101-degree field of view) HMD. The experimenter launched EPELI and followed the gameplay using a Samsung Galaxy Tab S3 tablet. The participant interacted with the objects by pointing at them with the hand controller and simultaneously pushing a button, with a thumb on Oculus Go and with an index finger on Pico Neo 2 Eye. They could interact with the movable objects by picking them up by pushing the button and releasing the object by pointing at a desired location and pushing the button again. Navigating was performed by pointing at a waypoint circle on the floor and pressing the button, which resulted in teleporting to that location. Motion tracking sensors in the HMD and the controller recorded the participant's movements.

There is a difference between the two HMDs in how they track participant motion: the Pico Neo 2 Eye tracks both position and rotation, and moving the head or the controller results in similar movement in the virtual space, while the Oculus GO tracks only rotation, and the movement of the head and the controller in the virtual space is estimated from rotation.

The VR environment in EPELI is a rather typical apartment with a living room, an open adult bedroom, an open kitchen, a children's room, a utility room, a bathroom, and a balcony that is not accessible but visible through windows (see Figure 1 for a bird's eye view not shown to the participants). Before the actual task, there is a practice session during which the participant gets familiar with the apartment and practice navigating around, interacting with the objects, and monitoring time with a watch that can be seen when the participant looks down to the hand controller and turns its face towards him/herself. The actual task comprises 13 short everyday scenarios (e.g., "going to school", "meal preparation", and "coming back from football training"). A cartoon dragon character guides the participant through the practice session and comes back to give oral instructions before each task scenario, which consist of four to six subtasks (e.g., "turn off the tap that your father forgot to close", "take your backpack to your room", "call your mother at two o'clock"). The theme of each scenario is also explicitly given to the participant (e.g., "you are just about to leave for the school"). There are 70 subtasks altogether, 52 of which can be completed at any time, 13 that must be completed at a certain time (time-based subtasks), and five after an external sound cue (event-based subtasks, e.g., a doorbell or cell phone tone). The child is asked to perform the subtasks in the given order, except for the subtasks to be completed at a certain time or after a certain sound cue, but the completion order does not influence the scoring. One task scenario lasts until all subtasks are correctly performed or until the time limit of 90 s is reached. The order of the 13 task scenarios was counterbalanced between the participants so that every other participant conducted them in reverse order. To probe possible distractor effects, seven (forward order) or six (reverse order) scenarios included both auditory distractors (dog barking, child coughing, traffic, music from the radio)

and audiovisual distractors (fly buzzing around the player, TV program, water tap left running). These scenarios also contained more task-irrelevant objects. The participants with the scenarios in forward order had different scenarios embedded with the distractions and more task-irrelevant objects than the participants with the scenarios in reverse order, so that at the group level, half of the gameplays for every scenario had distractors and the other half did not. Distractors were on during the whole scenario except for the running tap, TV, and radio, which the participant could turn off. The length of EPELI with the practice session and all 13 task scenarios is on average around 30 minutes (a maximum of 35 minutes), depending on the time the participant uses in the practice session and to complete the scenarios.

Figure 1.

EPELI floor plan (picture copyright Peili Vision, 2022).

The eight EPELI measures originally presented in Seesjärvi and others (2021) were used as the dependent variables. These measures include *Total score* (correctly performed subtasks; considered a general measure of prospective memory in a multitasking condition), *Task efficacy* (percentage of relevant actions, i.e., actions that were necessary to successfully complete the subtasks, out of all actions excluding clicks on the waypoints that enable moving around in the environment; considered to reflect attention control in a complex situation), *Navigation efficacy* (Total score divided by distance covered, which includes the distance walked and the distance to each manipulated object when used; considered to reflect planning of the task execution), *Controller motion* (controller angular movement in degrees during task performance; considered to reflect overall motor activity level), *Total actions* (number of clicks plus number of times hitting the drums in the child's room by swinging the controller, also including the clicks done during the instruction phase of each task scenario; considered to reflect impulsive tendencies), *Time-based prospective memory score* (TBPM; correctly performed time-based subtasks; reflecting accuracy in performing tasks in designated time), *Clock checks* (reflecting time-monitoring behavior), and *Event-based prospective memory score* (EBPM; correctly performed event-based subtasks; reflecting responsiveness to external memory cues). In TBPM, only subtasks performed within ± 10 seconds of the given time were considered correct. In EBPM, only subtasks performed within 10 seconds from the start of the cue were scored correct. Total score included TBPM and EBPM subtasks, among the other subtasks.

2.3 Other tasks

Reasoning abilities were assessed with the Similarities and Matrix reasoning subtests of *the Finnish version of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-IV; Wechsler, 2003)*. Capacity for encoding verbal instructions was assessed with an instruction recall task (see the Repetition task in Seesjärvi et al., 2021), in which the participants verbally repeated a list of instructions like those used in EPELI. Raw scores from each of these three tasks were used in the following data analyses.

2.4 Parent and self-ratings

Parents rated their child's possible everyday problems in executive functioning with *Behavior Rating Inventory for Executive Functions (BRIEF)* (Gioia et al., 2000). BRIEF includes eight clinical scales, which form two broader indexes, Behavioral Regulation Index (BRI) and Metacognition Index (MI). The indexes can be summed to obtain an overall score, the Global Executive Composite (GEC). From BRIEF, the raw scores of the BRI, MI, and GEC were used.

After EPELI, the children answered *the Simulator Sickness Questionnaire* (Kennedy et al., 1993), a gaming experience questionnaire (see Seesjärvi et al., 2021), a shortened version of *the Presence Questionnaire 3.0* (Witmer et al., 2005), and an object familiarity questionnaire (see Seesjärvi et al., 2021). To assess child's familiarity with the tasks performed during EPELI, they were asked the question "From a scale of 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much), how much have you performed similar tasks in real life?". In the following analyses, gaming background (regular gamer or not) and the self-assessed familiarity with the tasks on a scale of 1–7 were used as independent variables.

2.5 Procedure

Measurements were conducted in dedicated rooms at primary schools or at Aalto University, Espoo. For sample A, most tasks (EPELI and questionnaires related to gameplay, the instruction recall task, WISC-IV Matrix reasoning) were completed in a single session except for the WISC-IV Similarities, which was administered at the beginning of a separate session that also included other tasks used in an earlier study (Seesjärvi et al., 2021). For sample B, all tasks were completed in a single session. EPELI was played sitting in a chair that rotated 360 degrees to enable turning in the game effortlessly. Head set position was adjusted if necessary. Sound loudness was the same for all participants and allowed the instructions to be heard clearly.

2.6 Statistical analyses

Statistical analyses and data visualization were done in R version 4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020) with the additional packages data.table (Dowle & Srinivasan, 2021), stringr (Wickham, 2019), stringi (Gagolewski et al., 2020), dplyr (Wickham et al., 2021), ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016), gridExtra (Auguie, 2017), patchwork (Pedersen, 2020), psych (Revelle, 2020), and ltm (Rizopoulos, 2006).

First, the two samples (A and B) were compared regarding age, gender, average parental income, and average parental education. As there were no differences between the samples on these background variables (see Appendix A), the samples were combined for the statistical analyses. The data was complete except for one participant, who found the instruction recall task oppressive and did not finish it.

In the outlier analyses, the EPELI measures were checked for univariate outliers (± 3 SDs from the group mean). As a result, three participants were removed from the final sample, as all analyses included EPELI (final $N=77$). Also the BRIEF measures (GEC, BRI, MI) were checked for univariate outliers, and based on the results one more participant was excluded from the analyses that included BRIEF. After that, the data was checked for participants with multivariate outliers (Mahalanobis distance, χ^2 using α level $p < .001$) in the same measures, but none were found. The internal consistency of each EPELI measure across scenarios was assessed with the reliability measure of Cronbach's alpha, and reliabilities above 0.7 were considered acceptable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

The effects of background factors (age, gender, gaming background, familiarity with the tasks, and the HMD used) on the EPELI measures were examined with general linear models. There was no collinearity between the independent variables apart from more boys playing regularly than girls (45 boys playing regularly and 1 not, 22 girls playing regularly and 9 not, Fisher's Exact $p < .001$). The best fitting models were determined using three methods (starting from a null model and adding one independent variable at a time; starting from a full model and removing one independent variable at a time; starting from a full

model and both adding and removing one independent variable at a time) for the selection of the independent variables, and a decrement in the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) was employed as the stopping rule. All three selection methods resulted in the same models except for the analyses with Clock checks as the dependent variable, where the model that resulted from starting from the null model was chosen, since it had lower AIC than the model that resulted from starting from the full model. To analyze the effect of child's capacity of encoding verbal instructions on EPELI performance, general linear models with each EPELI measure at a time as the dependent variable and the instruction recall task raw score as the independent variable were estimated. The relationships between EPELI and parent-reported difficulties in executive function were examined by calculating correlations between the EPELI measures and BRIEF measures (GEC, BRI, MI).

3 Results

3.1 Background characteristics

The background characteristics of the final sample (age range 9.0–13.0 years) are shown in Table 1. The average parental income and education level appeared to be slightly higher than in the general Finnish population of 30–44-year-olds¹. The verbal reasoning abilities are on average slightly higher ($t(77) = 4.41$, $p < .001$) and the perceptual reasoning abilities are on par ($t(77) = 0.61$, $p = 0.55$) with the norms reported in the Finnish WISC-IV test manual (Wechsler, 2003). The children evaluated that they had done similar tasks fairly often in their everyday life as they did in EPELI and reported very few VR-related sickness symptoms after EPELI.

¹ The average income before tax was 3406 €/m in 2016 for adults aged 30–44 (Official Statistics of Finland, 2022a). The average education for adults aged 30–44 is 2.3 when converted to the scale used in this study (Official Statistics of Finland, 2022b).

Table 1.

Background Characteristics of the Final Sample (N = 77).

Variable	Mean	SD
Age	10 y 9 m	1 y 1 m
Handedness (left / right)	6 / 71	
Gender (boy / girl)	46 / 31	
Parental income*	4.3	0.83
Parental education**	2.8	0.41
WISC-IV Similarities***	11.3	2.70
WISC-IV Matrix Reasoning***	10.2	3.38
BRIEF GEC (0–144)	101.1	15.77
BRIEF BRI (0–56)	35.2	5.48
BRIEF MI (0–44)	65.4	11.64
Gaming background (regular / not)	67 / 10	
Familiarity of the tasks (1–7)	4.9	1.05
Simulator sickness (0–14)	0.1	0.13

Note. * Before tax per adult; 1 = less than 1500 €/m, 2 = 1500–2200 €/m, 3 = 2200–3000 €/m, 4 = 3000–4000 €/m, 5 = over 4000 €/m. ** 1 = Comprehensive school, 2 = High school / Vocational school, 3 = University degree or equivalent. *** Standard score.

3.2 Reliability of the EPELI measures

The internal consistency of the EPELI measures is reported in Table 2. The consistency is acceptable (Cronbach's $\alpha \geq .70$) for all measures except TBPM and EBPM. When the number of scenarios is reduced, the consistency stays acceptable down to five scenarios for Total actions, to seven scenarios for Task efficacy and Controller motion, and to eleven scenarios for Navigation efficacy and Clock checks but drops under 0.7 for Total score for eleven scenarios (see Appendix B).

Table 2.

Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of the EPELI measures.

Measure	α (95 % CI) *
Total score	.70 [.57, .77]
Task efficacy	.83 [.76, .87]
Navigation efficacy	.74 [.63, .80]

Controller motion	.88 [.84, .91]
Total actions	.87 [.79, .91]
TBPM	.59 [.43, .71]
Clock checks	.72 [.56, .81]
EBPM	.33 [.00, .52]

Note. $N = 77$. * a Bootstrap 95 % Confidence Interval. TBPM, time-based prospective memory score. EBPM, event-based prospective memory score.

3.3 The associations between background factors and EPELI performances

The best fitting linear models with each EPELI measure as the dependent variable and the background factors as the independent variables are presented in Table 3 (see Appendix C for the full models). There were statistically significant gender differences in five measures with girls obtaining higher total scores, having higher task and navigation efficacies, and performing fewer total actions and clock checks. Regarding age, older children had significantly higher total and TBPM scores, navigated more efficiently and performed fewer actions. As there were both gender and age effects on Total score, Navigation efficacy, and Total actions, additional models that included interaction between these variables were fitted, but no significant interactions were found. Scatter plots with EPELI measures per age are shown in Figure 2 (for descriptive statistics, see Appendix G).

Table 3.

The best fitting linear models with each EPELI measure as the dependent variable and age, gender, gaming background, familiarity of the tasks, and the type of HMD as independent variables.

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Estimate	SD	t	p	ΔAIC	R^2	Adj. R^2
Total score	(Intercept)	21.253	8.166	2.60	.011*	-3.77	.192	.159
	Gender	4.524	1.615	2.80	.007**			
	Age (years)	2.326	0.700	3.33	.001**			
	Gaming background	4.272	2.344	1.82	.072			
Task efficacy	(Intercept)	0.138	0.153	0.90	.371	-3.04	.185	.151
	Gender	0.099	0.029	3.34	.001**			
	Age (years)	0.024	0.013	1.77	.082			
	HMD	-0.051	0.030	-1.74	.085			

Navigation efficacy	(Intercept)	0.010	0.021	0.46	.645	-2.97	.220	.199
	Gender	0.014	0.004	3.35	.001***			
	Age (years)	0.006	0.002	3.25	.002**			
Controller motion	(Intercept)	92835	18483	5.02	<.001***	-5.33	.073	.048
	Gender	-7095	3580	-1.98	.051			
	Age (years)	-2664	1685	-1.58	.118			
Total actions	(Intercept)	836.820	157.34	5.32	<.001***	-5.01	.137	.114
	Gender	-85.100	30.480	-2.79	.007**			
	Age (years)	-32.570	14.340	-2.27	.026*			
TBPM	(Intercept)	-3.586	2.921	-1.23	.223	-2.16	.130	.107
	Age (years)	0.787	0.266	2.95	.004**			
	Gender	1.038	0.566	1.83	.070			
Clock checks	(Intercept)	34.696	1.919	18.08	<.001***	-3.02	.055	.042
	Gender	-6.309	3.025	-2.09	.040*			
EBPM	(Intercept)	3.870	0.118	32.79	<.001***	-6.42	.039	.026
	Gender	0.324	0.186	1.74	.086			

Note. $N = 77$. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. For gender, girl = 1 and boy = 0. Age in years. For gaming background, regular gaming = 1, no regular gaming = 0. For HMD, Pico Neo 2 Eye = 1, Oculus GO = 0. Δ AIC, change in the Akaike Information Criterion from the full model.

331 **Figure 2.**

332 *Scatter plots of the EPELI measures per age. The regression line between an EPELI measure and age is shown on those*

333 *plots where that association was statistically significant.*

To consider the associations presented above in greater detail, the best models were redone with the instruction recall task raw score as an additional independent variable (Appendix D). In these models, instruction recall task performance influences Total score, Task efficacy, Navigation efficacy, and EBPM. Compared to the models presented above, the gender effect on Total score and the age effect on Total actions become non-significant, whereas in Controller motion, the gender effect becomes significant, with boys moving more than girls.

Gaming background, familiarity of the task contents, and HMD type had no statistically significant effect on any of the EPELI measures. Even though the HMD type did not affect EPELI performance, there was a difference in the perceived hand controller quality as the Pico Neo 2 Eye users reported fewer problems than the Oculus GO users (see Appendix E).

3.4 The effect instruction recall performance on the EPELI measures

Table 4 shows the effect of the instruction recall task on each EPELI measure. The performance in the instruction recall task explains interindividual differences in Total score, Task efficacy, Navigation efficacy, Total actions, and EBPM ($R^2 = .07-.21$).

Table 4.

The linear models with each EPELI measure as the dependent variable and the instruction recall task as an independent variable.

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Estimate	SD	t	p	R ²	Adj. R ²
Total score	(Intercept)	42.645	2.352	18.13	<.001***	.194	.183
	Instruction recall task	0.309	0.073	4.23	<.001***		
Task efficacy	(Intercept)	0.245	0.049	4.95	<.001***	.162	.151
	Instruction recall task	0.006	0.002	3.79	<.001***		
Navigation efficacy	(Intercept)	0.058	0.007	8.23	<.001***	.160	.149
	Instruction recall task	0.001	<0.001	3.76	<.001***		
Controller motion	(Intercept)	65541	6151	10.65	<.001***	.006	-.007
	Instruction recall task	-.133	.191	-0.69	.491		
Total actions	(Intercept)	593.161	52.119	11.40	<.001***	.099	.087
	Instruction recall task	-4.633	1.621	-2.86	.006**		
TBPM	(Intercept)	3.926	0.990	3.965	<.001***	.030	.017
	Instruction recall task	0.047	0.031	1.523	.132		
Clock checks	(Intercept)	29.226	5.238	5.580	<.001***	.005	-.008
	Instruction recall task	0.100	0.163	0.617	.539		
EBPM	(Intercept)	3.340	0.297	11.237	<.001***	.073	.060
	Instruction recall task	0.022	0.009	2.417	.018*		

Note. N = 76. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

3.5 The associations between the EPELI measures and different domains of parent-reported executive function problems

The correlations between EPELI and BRIEF measures are shown in Table 5. The GEC is negatively associated with both Task and Navigation efficacy. Regarding the two indexes that comprise the GEC, BRI has a negative correlation with Task and Navigation efficacy and a positive correlation with Total actions, while MI only correlates negatively with Task efficacy. The instruction recall task is negatively associated with BRI, but not with other BRIEF measures (see Appendix F).

Table 5.

Correlations between EPELI and BRIEF measures.

		BRIEF		
		GEC	BRI	MI
EPELI	Total score	-.17	-.15	-.17
	Task efficacy	-.33 **	-.34 *	-.29 *
	Navigation efficacy	-.29 *	-.31 *	-.24
	Controller motion	.14	.21	.09
	Total actions	.27	.40 *	.18
	TBPM	-.11	-.06	-.12
	Clock checks	.15	.09	.16
	EBPM	-.22	-.20	-.21

Note. $N = 76$. GEC = Global Executive Composite. BRI = Behavioral Regulation Index. MI = Metacognition Index. FDR correction. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

4 Discussion

There is a call for tasks modelled after real-life functions, as these could provide better predictive validity and clinical applicability than tasks that target single cognitive domains (Burgess et al., 2006; Parsons et al., 2017). The aim of this study was to evaluate some key properties of EPELI, a new open-ended virtual reality task for the assessment of goal-oriented behavior (Seesjärvi et al., 2021), which is required to warrant its future use in research and clinical work. The internal consistency was found to be good for six out of eight EPELI measures (Cronbach's $\alpha = .70-.88$). There were several age and gender differences in EPELI measures that favored older children and girls, whereas no statistically significant effects attributable to previous user experience, task familiarity, or VR technology were found. The ability to encode verbal instructions was related to inter-individual differences on several EPELI measures. As for the relationship between EPELI measures and parent-rated problems in executive function, some similar associations were found as in Seesjärvi and others (2021), although the correlations were weaker in the present study, which did not include a clinical group. Below, we discuss each finding in greater detail.

4.1 Reliability of EPELI

Although internal consistency is an essential aspect of any new test measure, estimates of internal consistency are yet to be reported for many of the new VR-based neuropsychological tasks (e.g., Ouellet et al., 2018; Barnett, et al., 2021; Chicchi Giglioli et al., 2021). In the present study, six out of eight EPELI measures showed acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .70-.88$) in the analysis with all 13 scenarios. A roughly similar level of reliability ($\alpha = .79$) has been reported for the VR-EAL task (Kourtesis et al., 2021). The internal consistency was highest for the measures based on the most datapoints (Controller motion and Total actions) and lowest for the measures with the fewest datapoints (time-based and event-based prospective memory). For prospective memory measures, a long inter-item interval is often desired, which limits the number of datapoints and thus the reliability of the measures (McDaniel & Einstein, 2007). Besides internal consistency, test-retest reliability of a prospective memory task is also important to establish (see e.g., Mioni et al., 2015; Zuber et al., 2021). Thus, this should be probed in future studies with EPELI.

To explore the internal consistency of shorter, more clinically viable EPELI versions, we re-examined the alpha coefficients while dropping out one task scenario at a time. Some of the EPELI measures showed good internal consistency even when about half of the task scenarios were cut out. Thus, the use of a shortened version of EPELI would mean that one should also cut down the relevant outcome variables. According to the present data, a useful compromise could be reached with seven task scenarios, for which three outcome measures (Task efficacy, Controller motion, and Total actions) still show good internal consistency. Alternatively, one could reduce the total duration of the task by shortening the maximum duration of each scenario. However, it remains to be seen how this would affect the reliability coefficients.

4.2 The effects of age, gender, and other background variables on EPELI performance

Age effects. Executive functions continue to develop until at least early adulthood, and the age range of our participants (9–13 years), albeit rather narrow, is an important period in this maturation process (Casey et al., 2005). One could thus expect to find age effects but due to the novelty of EPELI and the variety of its measures, which range from attentional control to motor activity, it was important to examine the age differences for each measure.

As hypothesized, it was found that older children attained higher Total scores and Navigation efficacy. Given the age effects observed on other types of executive function tasks (Best & Miller, 2010; Klenberg, 2015; Vuontela et al., 2013) and prospective memory (Ballhausen et al., 2019; Mahy et al., 2014), these findings were quite expected. A similar result was also assumed for Task efficacy, but this was not the case. One could speculate whether observing age effects in Total scores but not in Task efficacy could reflect differences in the developmental trajectories of cognitive functions within the present limited age range. For instance, Total score relies more on the memory domain and Task efficacy on the attention domain.

We also found that older children performed fewer actions overall. As the number of actions required by the tasks is constant and rather low compared to the average number of actions performed by the children², this decrease indicates less task-irrelevant, exploratory behavior. This could reflect diminished impulsivity with increasing age. This interpretation is in line with our current result that Total actions correlate with parent-rated problems of behavioral regulation (BRIEF BRI). It also concurs with our previous finding that ADHD children, prone to impulsive behavior, perform more actions in EPELI than typically developing children (Seesjärvi et al., 2021). Similar age-related differences have been observed

² To obtain full score of 70, 107 actions plus moving actions are required. In the present sample, the children performed on average 451 actions, of which on average 150 were related to moving.

in studies of response inhibition (Best & Miller, 2010; Klenberg et al., 2015). Finally, in our previous EPELI study (Seesjärvi et al. 2021), we did observe a clear correlation ($r = .48$) between Total actions and ADHD symptoms of impulsivity. Total actions here also correlated significantly ($r = .40$) with the Behavioral Regulation Index derived from the parent-rated BRIEF questionnaire. However, another explanation is that the age difference in Total actions reflects better memory of the task instructions in older children, lessening the need for exploration to find out forgotten subtasks. Indeed, when instruction recall performance was controlled for in a post hoc analysis, there was no longer an age effect on Total actions.

Older children appear to perform better than younger children in the EPELI TBPM but not EBPM subtasks. While TBPM subtasks require accurate monitoring of time while being engaged in other activities, EBPM subtasks rely on external triggers and thus load much less on the executive system. Low number of items (5) and ceiling rate performances can explain the lack of age effects on EBPM. The appearance of an age effect on TBPM tasks, in turn, could reflect the development of time perception (Droit-Volet, 2013) or related cognitive functions such as working memory updating and performance monitoring (Voigt et al., 2014). As there was no age effect in overt time monitoring as measured by Clock checks, our findings could well be related to the development of underlying cognitive functions.

Gender effects. In line with Barnett and colleagues (2007) who reported gender effects in attention tasks of typically developing children, we found higher scores for girls in several measures reflecting attentional-executive functions (Task efficacy, Navigation efficacy, Total score), and they also performed fewer actions than boys. This pattern of results concurs with the findings that brain maturation follows different trajectories in girls than and boys in this age group (Lenroot et al., 2007; Brenhouse & Andersen, 2011; Giedd et al., 2012). According to the present results, girls were approximately 2.0–2.7 years ahead of boys in their task performance in the measures in which gender differences were observed. There could also be more specific mechanisms underlying gender differences on certain EPELI measures. For example, post

hoc analyses indicated that the gender difference in Total score was no longer present when instruction recall performance was controlled for. This suggests that the higher accuracy in girls may be due to superior ability in memory, and not in the actual execution of the task. There were no interactions between age and gender, which suggests that the maturation processes discussed above may not differ considerably between boys and girls, at least with respect to the indicators used in the present study.

The effects of other background variables. Besides age and gender, we examined the associations between the instruction recall task, gaming background, HMD-type, and familiarity of the task contents on EPELI measures. Based on findings reported in Seesjärvi and colleagues (2021) and evidence of the role played by episodic memory in prospective memory task outcomes (Kliegel et al., 2008), we expected that instruction recall performance would explain part of the variance in the EPELI tasks, especially regarding those measures that have a strong memory component. This was indeed the case, as the ability to verbally recall instructions was associated with five out of eight EPELI measures. However, it explained only 6–20 % of the variability on these EPELI measures, highlighting the role of task execution besides the memory component in EPELI performance.

Gaming background has been reported as a factor that might influence task performance in various types of computerized cognitive tasks (Bediou et al., 2018), but no effects were found in the present study. While our VR task may resemble some commercial games, it has been suggested that in VR tasks where interaction with the environment is realistic and intuitive, the effects of gaming background might be less prominent than in other computerized tasks (see Kourtis et al., 2021). The task contents in EPELI were designed so that they would be familiar to all participants. High familiarity ratings were indeed reported by our participants, and familiarity had no effect on EPELI measures. Finally, as expected, the two different HMDs provided highly similar results, even though there was a difference in the perceived hand controller quality. Thus, small differences between the displays and movement sensors should not influence the

EPELI measures. This is a positive finding considering that manufacturers may provide up to one or two updates in HMDs per year.

4.3 The associations between EPELI measures and parent-reported executive function problems

This study replicated the previously reported (Seesjärvi et al., 2021) associations between EPELI efficacy measures and parent-reported executive function problems as evaluated with the BRIEF questionnaire total score (GEC). The present replication is important in showing that this association also exists in typically developing children. EPELI efficacy measures also showed highest correlations with BRIEF GEC in the study by Seesjärvi and colleagues (2021). Other associations found in the previous study, with a sample including both ADHD children and typically developing children, did not reach statistical significance in this sample, nor did the measures of specific prospective memory domains (TBPM, EBPM, and monitoring). It appears a reasonable inference that the global measures reflecting how the task was performed rather than the level of performance in a specific domain would be the most sensitive indicators of everyday problems. However, further evidence is clearly needed to confirm this preliminary finding.

In this study, we further examined the associations between EPELI measures and two BRIEF indexes, namely the Behavioral Regulation Index (BRI) and Metacognition Index (MI). There were some associations between EPELI and BRI (Total actions and Navigation efficacy) that were not observed when EPELI measures were correlated with MI. It does make sense that both Total actions as well as Navigation efficacy could reflect self-regulation abilities (e.g., inhibition of irrelevant actions) rather than meta-cognitive functions. This could be further tested by conducting item-level analyses clarifying the behavioral processes associated with these two EPELI measures.

The correlations between performance-based and rating measures of executive function are generally low, and it has therefore been suggested that these measures assess different mental constructs (Toplak et al., 2013). The correlation estimates acquired here cannot be tested straightforwardly against those reported in earlier studies. However, in an earlier study (Seesjärvi et al., 2021), the correlation between EPELI Task efficacy and BRIEF was stronger than the correlations between BRIEF and other performance-based measures, except for CPT reaction time variability. This suggests that in contrast to the previously used highly structured tasks with highly restricted stimuli and responses, open-ended tasks that simulate real-life contexts and functions could provide objective measures more closely associated with the constructs assessed by the rating measures.

4.4 Limitations of the study

There are some potential limitations to be considered when interpreting the present findings. First, even though our sample size is larger than in most previous VR studies examining attentional-executive functions (see, e.g., Parsons et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2021), it is somewhat limited considering the sampling distributions. Especially the age distribution in this sample is relatively narrow, and since the participants were recruited so that the families contacted us based on the advertisements, a sampling bias may be present. This could reflect to parent education, for instance. Second, when using BRIEF as a criterion measure for everyday problems, it should be considered that, unlike EPELI, BRIEF is affected by subjective bias and the evaluation given encompasses a longer time. It is also possible that the underlying constructs that executive function questionnaires and tasks tap are not quite the same. Questionnaires concern typical performance in daily life, while laboratory measures such as EPELI represent an explicit testing situation where the motivation is high due to the engaging task and competitive configuration (see Toplak et al., 2013). Such factors might thus influence the correlational analyses. Third, in this validation study we decided to focus on average performance over multiple scenarios. However, EPELI does provide

precise item-level raw data regarding any object interaction or movement from one location to another. There are thus opportunities for more detailed analyses in future studies.

4.5 Conclusions

This study set out to examine several key properties of a novel virtual reality task, EPELI, that has been developed to measure goal-directed behavior in naturalistic conditions. Our findings demonstrate acceptable internal consistency for six out of eight EPELI measures. Moreover, for four measures, internal consistency remained adequate even when the number of scenarios was cut to approximately half. EPELI performance was also associated with interindividual variability in everyday attentional executive problems. This demonstrates the opportunities of ecologically valid VR tasks in objective measurement of children's cognitive functions in situations resembling those where they manifest in real-life. Moreover, we report the effects of age and gender on EPELI performance. Our results suggested that girls are better able to focus selectively on the relevant tasks, plan their route in the game more efficiently, and successfully executed higher number of instructed tasks. As task scenarios in EPELI were selected to represent relevant aspects of children's daily life, this type of games may provide a more direct way of measuring individual differences in cognitive abilities in contextually relevant and engaging conditions. Both age and gender are also important factors to consider for future studies in different child populations. In conclusion, we provide evidence of the reliability and validity of a new virtual reality tool for ecologically valid objective assessment of attention, executive functions, and prospective memory in children.

Acknowledgements

We thank all participants and their families as well as our collaborators at schools of Kirkkonummi and Espoo, Aalto University, Åbo Akademi University, and University of Helsinki for their invaluable help and making this study possible.

Statements and Declarations

The study was supported by the Academy of Finland (grants #325981 and #328954 to JS, grant #323251 to ML). ES received support from the Finnish Cultural Foundation (grants #00190963 and #00201002) and Arvo and Lea Ylppö Foundation (grant #202010005). LM acquired grants from the Finnish Cultural Foundation (#00210721) and the Finnish Foundation for Psychiatric Research (#20210019). None of the authors have any biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest.

References

- Auguie, B. (2017). *gridExtra: Miscellaneous functions for “grid” graphics*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gridExtra>
- Ballhausen, N., Hering, A., Rendell, P. G., & Kliegel, M. (2019). Prospective memory across the lifespan. In J. Rummel & M. McDaniel (Eds.), *Prospective Memory*, (pp. 135–156). Routledge.
- Barnett, J. H., Heron, J., Ring, S. M., Golding, J., Goldman, D., Xu, K., & Jones, P. B. (2007). Gender-specific effects of the catechol-o-methyltransferase val 108/158 met polymorphism on cognitive function in children. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 164(1), 142–149. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.2007.164.1.142>
- Barnett, M. D., Childers, L. G., & Parsons, T. D. (2021). A virtual kitchen protocol to measure everyday Memory Functioning for Meal Preparation. *Brain Sciences*, 11(5), 571. <https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci11050571>
- Bediou, B., Adams, D. M., Mayer, R. E., Tipton, E., Green, C. S., & Bavelier, D. (2018). Meta-analysis of action video game impact on perceptual, attentional, and cognitive skills. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(1), 77–110. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000130>

551 Best, J. R., & Miller, P. H. (2010). A developmental perspective on executive function: development of
552 executive functions. *Child Development*, 81(6), 1641–1660. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01499.x)
553 [8624.2010.01499.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01499.x)

554 Brenhouse, H. C., & Andersen, S. L. (2011). Developmental trajectories during adolescence in males and
555 females: A cross-species understanding of underlying brain changes. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral*
556 *Reviews*, 35(8), 1687–1703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.04.013>

557 Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American*
558 *Psychologist*, 32(7), 513–531. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.32.7.513>

559 Brunswik, E. (1943). Organismic achievement and environmental probability. *Psychological Review*, 50(3),
560 255–272. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0060889>

561 Burgess, P. W., Alderman, N., Forbes, C., Costello, A., M-A.Coates, L., Dawson, D. R., Anderson, N. D.,
562 Gilbert, S. J., Dumontheil, I., & Channon, S. (2006). The case for the development and use of “ecologically
563 valid” measures of executive function in experimental and clinical neuropsychology. *Journal of the*
564 *International Neuropsychological Society*, 12(2), 194–209. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617706060310>

565 Casey, B., Tottenham, N., Liston, C., & Durston, S. (2005). Imaging the developing brain: What have we
566 learned about cognitive development? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 9(3), 104–110.
567 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2005.01.011>

568 Chaytor, N., Schmitteredgecombe, M., & Burr, R. (2006). Improving the ecological validity of executive
569 functioning assessment. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 21(3), 217–227.
570 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acn.2005.12.002>

571 Chicchi Giglioli, I. A., Pérez Gálvez, B., Gil Granados, A., & Alcañiz Raya, M. (2021). The virtual cooking task:
 572 A preliminary comparison between neuropsychological and ecological virtual reality tests to assess
 573 executive functions alterations in patients affected by alcohol use disorder. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior,*
 574 *and Social Networking*, 24(10), 673–682. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2020.0560>

575 Dawson, D. R., & Marcotte, T. D. (2017). Special issue on ecological validity and cognitive assessment.
 576 *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 27(5), 599–602. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09602011.2017.1313379>

577 Dowle, M., & Srinivasan, A. (2021). *data.table: Extension of `data.frame`*. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=data.table)
 578 [project.org/package=data.table](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=data.table)

579 Droit-Volet, S. (2013). Time perception in children: A neurodevelopmental approach. *Neuropsychologia*,
 580 51(2), 220–234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.09.023>

581 Gagolewski, M. (2020). *R package stringi: Character string processing facilities*.
 582 <http://www.gagolewski.com/software/stringi/>

583 Gibson, J. J. (1970). On the Relation between Hallucination and Perception. *Leonardo*, 3(4), 425.
 584 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1572259>

585 Giedd, J. N., Raznahan, A., Mills, K. L., & Lenroot, R. K. (2012). Review: Magnetic resonance imaging of
 586 male/female differences in human adolescent brain anatomy. *Biology of Sex Differences*, 3(1), 19.
 587 <https://doi.org/10.1186/2042-6410-3-19>

588 Gioia, G. A., Isquith, P. K., Guy, S. C., & Kenworthy, L. (2000). *Behavior rating inventory of executive*
 589 *function: BRIEF*. Psychological Assessment Resources.

590 Grissom, N. M., & Reyes, T. M. (2019). Let's call the whole thing off: Evaluating gender and sex differences
 591 in executive function. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 44(1), 86–96. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-018-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-018-0179-5)
 592 [0179-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-018-0179-5)

593 Hatfield, G. (2002). Psychology, philosophy, and cognitive science: Reflections on the history and
 594 philosophy of experimental psychology. *Mind & Language*, 17(3), 207–232.
 595 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0017.00196>

596 Kennedy, R. S., Lane, N. E., Berbaum, K. S., & Lilienthal, M. G. (1993). Simulator sickness questionnaire: An
 597 enhanced method for quantifying simulator sickness. *The International Journal of Aviation Psychology*,
 598 3(3), 203–220. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327108ijap0303_3

599 Kim, E., Han, J., Choi, H., Prié, Y., Vigier, T., Bulteau, S., & Kwon, G. H. (2021). Examining the academic
 600 trends in neuropsychological tests for executive functions using virtual reality: Systematic literature
 601 review. *JMIR Serious Games*, 9(4), e30249. <https://doi.org/10.2196/30249>

602 Kingstone, A., Smilek, D., & Eastwood, J. D. (2008). Cognitive ethology: A new approach for studying
 603 human cognition. *British Journal of Psychology*, 99(3), 317–340.
 604 <https://doi.org/10.1348/000712607X251243>

605 Klenberg, L. (2015). *Assessment and development of executive functions in school-age children*. [Doctoral
 606 dissertation, University of Helsinki]. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-0867-8>

607 Kliegel, M., McDaniel, M. A., & Einstein, G. O. (Eds.). (2008). *Prospective memory: Cognitive, neuroscience,*
 608 *developmental, and applied perspectives*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

609 Kourtesis, P., Collina, S., Doumas, L. A. A., & MacPherson, S. E. (2019). Technological competence is a pre-
 610 condition for effective implementation of virtual reality head mounted displays in human neuroscience:

611 A technological review and meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 13, 342.
612 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2019.00342>

613 Kourtesis, P., Collina, S., Doulas, L. A. A., & MacPherson, S. E. (2021). Validation of the Virtual Reality
614 Everyday Assessment Lab (VR-EAL): An immersive virtual reality neuropsychological battery with
615 enhanced ecological validity. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 27(2), 181–196.
616 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617720000764>

617 Kourtesis, P., Korre, D., Collina, S., Doulas, L. A. A., & MacPherson, S. E. (2020). Guidelines for the
618 development of immersive virtual reality software for cognitive neuroscience and neuropsychology: The
619 development of Virtual Reality Everyday Assessment Lab (VR-EAL), a neuropsychological test battery in
620 immersive virtual reality. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, 1, 12.
621 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2019.00012>

622 Krohn, S., Tromp, J., Quinque, E. M., Belger, J., Klotzsche, F., Rekers, S., Chojecki, P., de Mooij, J., Akbal,
623 M., McCall, C., Villringer, A., Gaebler, M., Finke, C., & Thöne-Otto, A. (2020). Multidimensional evaluation
624 of virtual reality paradigms in clinical neuropsychology: Application of the VR-check framework. *Journal*
625 *of Medical Internet Research*, 22(4), e16724. <https://doi.org/10.2196/16724>

626 Lenroot, R. K., Gogtay, N., Greenstein, D. K., Wells, E. M., Wallace, G. L., Clasen, L. S., Blumenthal, J. D.,
627 Lerch, J., Zijdenbos, A. P., Evans, A. C., Thompson, P. M., & Giedd, J. N. (2007). Sexual dimorphism of brain
628 developmental trajectories during childhood and adolescence. *NeuroImage*, 36(4), 1065–1073.
629 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.03.053>

630 Lezak, M. D. (Ed.). (2012). *Neuropsychological assessment* (5th ed). Oxford University Press.

631 Mahy, C. E. V., Moses, L. J., & Kliegel, M. (2014). The development of prospective memory in children: An
 632 executive framework. *Developmental Review*, 34(4), 305–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2014.08.001>
 633 McDaniel, M. A., & Einstein, G. O. (2007). Prospective memory: An overview and synthesis of an emerging
 634 field. SAGE.
 635 Miller, J. B., & Barr, W. B. (2017). The technology crisis in neuropsychology. *Archives of Clinical*
 636 *Neuropsychology*, 32(5), 541–554. <https://doi.org/10.1093/arclin/acx050>
 637 Mioni, G., Rendell, P. G., Stablum, F., Gamberini, L., & Bisiacchi, P. S. (2015). Test–retest consistency of
 638 Virtual Week: A task to investigate prospective memory. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 25(3), 419–
 639 447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09602011.2014.941295>
 640 Neisser, U. (1976). *Cognition and reality: Principles and implications of cognitive psychology*. Freeman.
 641 Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed). McGraw-Hill.
 642 Official Statistics of Finland (2022a): *Structure of Earnings [e-publication]*.
 643 ISSN=1799-0092. 2016, Appendix table 1. Average monthly earnings and dispersion of earnings of full-time
 644 wage and salary earners in 2016 by age group. Helsinki: Statistics Finland [referred: 3.2.2022].
 645 Access method: http://www.stat.fi/til/pr/2016/pr_2016_2017-09-21_tau_001_en.html
 646 Official Statistics of Finland (2022b). *Educational structure of population [e-publication]*.
 647 ISSN=2242-2919. Helsinki: Statistics Finland [referred: 3.2.2022].
 648 Access method: http://www.stat.fi/til/vkour/index_en.html
 649 Ouellet, É., Boller, B., Corriveau-Lecavalier, N., Cloutier, S., & Belleville, S. (2018). The Virtual Shop: A new
 650 immersive virtual reality environment and scenario for the assessment of everyday memory. *Journal of*
 651 *Neuroscience Methods*, 303, 126–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2018.03.010>

652 Parsons, T. D., Carlew, A. R., Magtoto, J., & Stonecipher, K. (2017). The potential of function-led virtual
653 environments for ecologically valid measures of executive function in experimental and clinical
654 neuropsychology. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 27(5), 777–807.
655 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09602011.2015.1109524>

656 Parsons, T. D., Duffield, T., & Asbee, J. (2019). A comparison of virtual reality classroom continuous
657 performance tests to traditional continuous performance tests in delineating ADHD: A meta-analysis.
658 *Neuropsychology Review*, 29(3), 338–356. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-019-09407-6>

659 Parsons, T. D., & Rizzo, A. “Skip.” (2019). A review of virtual classroom environments for
660 neuropsychological assessment. In A. “Skip” Rizzo & S. Bouchard (Eds.), *Virtual Reality for Psychological*
661 *and Neurocognitive Interventions* (pp. 247–265). Springer New York. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-9482-3_11)
662 [9482-3_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-9482-3_11)

663 Pedersen, T. L. (2020). *patchwork: the composer of plots*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=patchwork>

664 R Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical
665 Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>

666 Rendell, P. G., & Craik, F. I. M. (2000). Virtual week and actual week: Age-related differences in prospective
667 memory. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 14(7), S43–S62. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.770>

668 Revelle, W. (2020). *psych: procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality research*.
669 Northwestern University. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>

670 Rizopoulos, D. (2006). ltm: An R package for latent variable modelling and item response theory analyses.
671 *Journal of Statistical Software*, 17(5), 1–25.

672 Seesjärvi, E., Puhakka, J., Aronen, E. T., Lipsanen, J., Mannerkoski, M., Hering, A., Zuber, S., Kliegel, M.,
673 Laine, M., & Salmi, J. (2021). Quantifying ADHD Symptoms in Open-Ended Everyday Life Contexts With a
674 New Virtual Reality Task. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 18.
675 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F10870547211044214>

676 Shallice, T., & Burgess, P. W. (1991). Deficits in strategy application following frontal lobe damage in man.
677 *Brain*, 114(2), 727–741. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/114.2.727>

678 Toplak, M. E., West, R. F., & Stanovich, K. E. (2013). Practitioner review: Do performance-based measures
679 and ratings of executive function assess the same construct? *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*,
680 54(2), 131–143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12001>

681 Voigt, B., Mahy, C. E. V., Ellis, J., Schnitzspahn, K., Krause, I., Altgassen, M., & Kliegel, M. (2014). The
682 development of time-based prospective memory in childhood: The role of working memory updating.
683 *Developmental Psychology*, 50(10), 2393–2404. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037491>

684 Vuontela, V., Carlson, S., Troberg, A.-M., Fontell, T., Simola, P., Saarinen, S., & Aronen, E. T. (2013).
685 Working memory, attention, inhibition, and their relation to adaptive functioning and
686 behavioral/emotional symptoms in school-aged children. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 44(1),
687 105–122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-012-0313-2>

688 Wechsler, David. (2003). *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children—Fourth Edition (WISC-IV) administration*
689 *and scoring manual*. The Psychological Corporation.

690 Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York.
691 <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>

692 Wickham, H. (2019). *stringr: simple, consistent wrappers for common string operations*. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr)
693 [project.org/package=stringr](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr)

694 Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2021). *dplyr: A grammar of data manipulation*.
695 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>

696 Witmer, B. G., Jerome, C. J., & Singer, M. J. (2005). The factor structure of the presence questionnaire.
697 *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 14(3), 298–312.
698 <https://doi.org/10.1162/105474605323384654>

699 Zuber, S., Haas, M., Framorando, D., Ballhausen, N., Gillioz, E., Kunzi, M., & Kliegel, M. (2021). The Geneva
700 Space Cruiser: A fully self-administered online tool to assess prospective memory across the adult lifespan.
701 *Memory*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2021.1995435>

702 Zuber, S., & Kliegel, M. (2020). Prospective memory development across the lifespan: An integrative
703 framework. *European Psychologist*, 25(3), 162–173. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000380>

704 Zuber, S., Mahy, C. E. V., & Kliegel, M. (2019). How executive functions are associated with event-based
705 and time-based prospective memory during childhood. *Cognitive Development*, 50, 66–79.
706 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2019.03.001>