

**Research Bank**

Journal article

**Social cognition psychometric evaluation (SCOPE) in people with early psychosis : A preliminary study**

**Ludwig, Kelsea A., Pinkham, Amy E., Harvey, Philip D., Kelsven, Skylar and Penn, David L.**

This is the accepted manuscript version. For the publisher's version please see:

Ludwig, K. A., Pinkham, A. E., Harvey, P. D., Kelsven, S. and Penn, D. L. (2017). Social cognition psychometric evaluation (SCOPE) in people with early psychosis : A preliminary study. *Schizophrenia Research*, 190, pp. 136-143.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2017.03.001>

This work © 2017 is licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



Published in final edited form as:

*Schizophr Res.* 2017 December ; 190: 136–143. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2017.03.001.

## Social Cognition Psychometric Evaluation (SCOPE) in People with Early Psychosis: A Preliminary Study

Kelsey A. Ludwig<sup>1</sup>, Amy E. Pinkham<sup>2,3</sup>, Philip D. Harvey<sup>4,5</sup>, Skylar Kelsven<sup>6</sup>, and David L. Penn<sup>1,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC

<sup>2</sup>School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, The University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX

<sup>3</sup>Department of Psychiatry, University of Texas Southwestern Medical School, Dallas, TX

<sup>4</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, Miami, FL

<sup>5</sup>Research Service, Miami VA Healthcare System

<sup>6</sup>Department of Psychology, San Diego State University and The University of California at San Diego, San Diego, CA

<sup>7</sup>School of Psychology, Australian Catholic University, Melbourne, VIC

### Abstract

Social cognition is an important outcome in schizophrenia research. Unfortunately, there has been a lack of consensus regarding which measures of social cognition best capture this domain of functioning. The Social Cognition Psychometric Evaluation (SCOPE) study was developed to address the need for a battery of measures that have sound psychometric properties and can be implemented in clinical trials for individuals with chronic schizophrenia. The current study expands upon the SCOPE study by examining the psychometric properties of the eight candidate measures administered to individuals early in the course of psychosis. Thirty-eight stable outpatients with first episode psychosis and thirty-nine healthy controls completed the battery at baseline and one-month follow-up assessments. The SCOPE battery was evaluated on a collection of psychometric properties, including: (1) Reliability – including test-retest and internal consistency, (2) Between group differences, (3) Utility as a repeated measure, (4) Relationship to

---

Correspondence should be addressed to Kelsey A. Ludwig, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 235 E. Cameron Avenue, 266 Davie Hall, Chapel Hill, NC 27599. Phone: (919) 285-1071, Kelsey\_Ludwig@med.unc.edu.

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

#### Contributors

PH, DP and AP (Principal Investigators) designed the study and wrote the protocol for this project. KL wrote the first draft of the manuscript, conducted all statistical analyses, and certified the accuracy of the results. All authors provided edits and revisions to the manuscript, and are in agreement with the final version.

#### Conflicts of Interest

Dr. Harvey serves as a consultant/advisory board member for Acadia Pharma, Boehringer Ingelheim, Lundbeck, Otsuka Digital Health, Roche, Sanofi, Sunovion, and Takeda. The remaining authors declare no conflicts of interest pertinent to this study.

social and occupational functioning, (5) Incremental validity – variance in functioning beyond neurocognition, and (6) Feasibility – including practicality of administration and tolerability. Social cognition accounted for substantially more variance in functional outcome than neurocognition. Only one measure, the Hinting task, displayed adequate psychometric properties to be recommended for use in clinical research with first episode psychosis. The remaining candidate measures would require modifications before implementation or cannot be recommended for use in clinical research with first episode psychosis.

## Keywords

first episode psychosis; schizophrenia; social cognition; measurement; psychometric evaluation

---

## 1. Introduction

Social cognition, defined as the mental processes underlying people's capacity to perceive, process and comprehend social information, is related to quality of life, daily living skills and occupational functioning in schizophrenia (Frith, 2008; Green et al., 2012; Kunda, 1999; Mancuso et al., 2011). Social cognition accounts for additional variance in functioning than various cognitive factors (Brüne, 2007), and mediates the relationship between neurocognition and functioning in psychosis (Fett et al., 2011; Schmidt, Mueller & Roder, 2011). Based on its relation to functional outcome, social cognition in schizophrenia has garnered considerable research interest over the past few decades and is increasingly considered a viable target for treatment (Couture, Penn, & Roberts, 2006; Fett et al., 2011; Green & Leitman, 2008; Penn et al., 1997).

Despite burgeoning interest in studying social cognition, studies investigating this construct vary greatly in the tasks employed, many of which may lack a strong empirical foundation and involve unknown or questionable psychometric properties (Couture & Penn, 2012; Fett et al., 2011; Savla et al., 2013; Thompson, Bartholomeusz, & Yung, 2011). The absence of a validated battery of social cognitive measures is problematic as inadequate and inconsistent measurement can jeopardize the validity, reproducibility, and comparability of findings, and may lead to effective treatments being discarded or ineffective treatments pursued (Drost, 2011).

To address this need, an ongoing NIMH project called the Social Cognition Psychometric Evaluation (SCOPE) study was initiated (Pinkham et al., 2014; Pinkham et al., 2015). SCOPE is a multiphase project that involves identifying the currently accepted domains of social cognition, selecting the best available measures to assess these domains, and administering tasks to a large sample of stable outpatients with schizophrenia and demographically-matched controls.

Findings from the initial validation study suggested the Bell-Lysaker Emotion Recognition Task (*BLERT*; Bell, Bryson, & Lysaker, 1997), Penn Emotion Recognition Task (*ER-40*; Kohler et al., 2003), Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (*Eyes*; Baron-Cohen et al., 2003), The Awareness of Social Inferences Test (*TASIT*; McDonald et al., 2003), and Hinting Task (*Hinting*; Corcoran, Mercer, & Frith, 1995), displayed acceptable reliability and validity for

implementation in clinical research. Remaining measures, including: Ambiguous Intentions Hostility Questionnaire (*AIHQ*; Combs et al., 2007), Relationships Across Domains (*RAD*; Sergi et al., 2009), and Trustworthiness Task (*Trust*; Adolphs, Tranel, & Damasio, 1998), demonstrated weaker characteristics and were deemed inadequate for use in clinical trials targeting social cognition (Pinkham et al., 2015), although subsequent findings support continued development and use of the AIHQ Blame Score (Buck et al., 2017, in press).

Importantly, SCOPE included a predominantly middle-aged, chronic sample typical of many treatment studies. There is some debate as to whether first episode psychosis (FEP) and chronic schizophrenia patients should exhibit the same types and degree of social cognitive impairment (Savla et al., 2013; Thompson, Bartholomeusz, & Yung; 2011; Ventura et al., 2015). Some research suggests attenuated or unremarkable deficits earlier in the course of illness (An et al., 2010; Bora & Pantelis, 2013; Romero-Ferreiro et al., 2016; Sprong et al., 2007), though findings are mixed (Barkl et al., 2014; Green et al., 2012; Horan et al., 2012; Zaytseva, Burova, Garakh, & Gurovich, 2013). FEP samples may also be more heterogeneous than many chronic schizophrenia samples (Birchwood et al., 1998), and differences in social cognition across phase of illness may stem from variations in clinical stability (Bora & Pantelis, 2013; Green et al. 2012) and age-related changes in neurocognitive abilities (Hartshorne & Germine, 2015). Consequently, the results of SCOPE may not accurately represent younger individuals with FEP.

The purpose of the current study was to extend Pinkham et al.'s (2015) psychometric investigation of the SCOPE battery with a younger FEP sample. Paralleling SCOPE, we report on: (1) Reliability: test-retest, internal consistency, (2) Between-group differences, (3) Utility as a repeated measure, (4) Relationship to social/occupational functioning, (5) Incremental validity: variance in functioning beyond neurocognition, and (6) Feasibility: practicality of administration, tolerability.

## 2. Method

### 2.1 Participants

The study took place at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. FEP patients were primarily recruited from the Outreach and Support Intervention Services (OASIS) clinic in Carrboro, NC. Patients required a diagnosis of schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder, schizophreniform disorder, or psychosis NOS, confirmed by the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis-I Disorders, Patient Edition (*SCID-P*; First et al., 2002). OASIS clinicians and/or a trained research assistant at UNC-CH conducted all diagnostic interviews.

Participants were excluded if diagnosed with psychosis for greater than five years, or had been hospitalized within the last two-months. Deterioration is most common before illness onset and during the first few years of psychosis (Birchwood et al., 1998). Furthermore, evidence indicates a subsequent illness “plateau,” during which a level of relative stability is established 2–5 years after illness onset (Srihari et al., 2012). Thus, a cut-off of five years for illness duration was used. Participants were required to be on a stable medication regimen

for a minimum of the two-month hospitalization-free period, though they were not excluded if psychiatrically stable while not receiving antipsychotics.

Control participants were recruited through community flyers and online advertisements. Controls were selected for similarities in age/gender to outpatient participants. Controls were precluded from participation for meeting criteria for any Axis I/II disorder according to the DSM-IV, or if they had a first-degree family member with a history of psychosis.

All participants were considered ineligible based on: 1) presence/history of mental retardation, 2) presence/history of brain injury and/or neurological disorder (e.g., seizures, multiple sclerosis), 3) sensory limitation that would interfere with assessment (e.g., blindness/deafness), and/or 4) evidence of non-nicotine substance dependence in the past six-months, with substance use not being exclusionary. Evidence of substance dependence was collected from patients' healthcare providers, via chart review, and/or through substance use disorder modules from the SCID (DSM-IV; First et al., 2002).

## 2.2 Measures

**Social Cognition**—We administered identical versions of eight candidate measures of social cognition from SCOPE, including: one attributional style measure—*Ambiguous Intentions Hostility Questionnaire*, abbreviated (*AIHQ*; Combs et al., 2007); two emotion processing tasks—*Bell-Lysaker Emotion Recognition Task (BLERT)*; Bell, Bryson, & Lysaker, 1997) and *Penn Emotion Recognition Test (ER-40)*; Kohler et al., 2003); three theory of mind measures—*Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (Eyes)*; Baron-Cohen et al., 2003), *The Awareness of Social Inferences Test, Part-III (TASIT)*; McDonald et al., 2003), and *Hinting Task (Hinting)*; Corcoran, Mercer, & Frith, 1995); one measure of social perception—*Relationships Across Domains*, abbreviated (*RAD*; Sergi et al., 2009); and one novel task that does not fit neatly under the four aforementioned domains—*Trustworthiness Task (Trust)*; Adolphs, Tranel, & Damasio, 1998).

**Neurocognition**—Neurocognition was measured using a subset of *The MATRICS Consensus Cognitive Battery (MCCB)*: Trail-Making Test-Part A, BACS-Symbol Coding, Category Fluency-Animal Naming, Letter-Number Span, and Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-Revised (Nuechterlein et al., 2008). Consistent with SCOPE, subtests were selected according to correlations with composite scores of neurocognitive performance (Keefe et al., 2006; Pinkham et al., 2015). Composite scores were calculated using the standardized mean of corrected *t*-scores for each subtest (See Appendix A). *The Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT-3)* reading-subscale provided an estimate of IQ (Weickert et al., 2000).

**Social and Occupational Functioning**—Social skills were assessed with *The Social Skills Performance Assessment (SSPA)*; Patterson et al., 2001). Participant and experimenter acted out two social situations: meeting a new neighbor and persuading a landlord to fix a bathroom leak. Scenes were audio-recorded and rated by a blind-to-diagnosis, expert coder involved in all previous ratings for SCOPE.

Community and daily living skills were assessed using *The UCSD Performance-Based Skills Assessment-Brief (UPSA-B)*; Mausbach et al., 2007), a performance-based measure of

functional capacity, and *The Specific Level of Functioning Scale, Self-Report (SLOF*; Schneider & Struening, 1983).

**Symptomatology**—Symptom severity was measured using *The Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS*; Kay, Flszbein, & Opfer, 1987).

**Feasibility**—Practicality was operationalized as administration time. To assess tolerability, participants rated candidate measures on a Likert-scale from 1-*very unpleasant* to 7-*very pleasant*.

### 2.3 Procedure

Participants completed two assessments: baseline and a retest assessment scheduled to occur approximately 4 weeks later. With the project approved by the UNC-CH Institutional Review Board, participants provided signed informed consent and completed social cognitive, neurocognitive, and functional outcome measures at baseline. Task block order and the order of individual tasks within the social cognitive battery were counterbalanced. A rater trained using the same procedures employed in SCOPE conducted diagnostic and symptomatic interviews. Symptoms were reassessed in patients at retest. With the exception of TASIT, for which an alternative form was available, identical social cognitive tasks were administered at retest, in a different counterbalanced order. In accord with the original SCOPE protocol, Version-A was administered at baseline, Version-B at retest.

### 2.4 Statistical Analyses

Data analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 23). Statistical significance was defined as  $p < .05$ . We followed the psychometric validation process employed by the initial validation study (Pinkham et al., 2015). See Appendix A for details.

### 2.5 Decision-making Process Regarding SCOPE Battery for FEP

To determine the suitability of the SCOPE battery for FEP, we emphasized test-retest reliability, relationship to functional outcome, and ability to distinguish patient and control performance. **Acceptable at Present** signifies the measure displayed acceptable reliability and validity in the current study, and would not require modifications before use.

**Acceptable with Concerns** indicates specific attributes of the task were concerning and warrant further investigation before implementation. **Currently Unacceptable** signifies a task displayed weak psychometrics overall and was not recommended.

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Participants

Thirty-eight patients and 39 controls completed the baseline assessment. Thirty-five patients and 36 controls returned to complete visit two. Average time between administrations was comparable for both groups ( $M_{FEP}=33.08$  days,  $SD=5.65$ ;  $M_{HC}=31.61$  days,  $SD=4.81$ ;  $t(70)=-1.190$ ,  $P=.238$ ). Groups did not differ in regard to gender, race, ethnicity, age, or estimated IQ (see Table 1). Patients completed significantly fewer years of education than

controls, whereas patients' parents completed significantly more years of education than the control sample. Patients reported relatively low levels of symptoms at baseline.

There were significant reductions in positive symptoms from baseline to retest ( $t(37)=3.137$ ,  $P=.003$ ,  $d_z=.55$ ,  $r=.379$ ). Negative and general symptoms also decreased, though reductions were non-significant (negative:  $t(37)=1.494$ ,  $P=.144$ ,  $d_z=0.20$ ,  $r=.338$ ; general:  $t(37)=1.959$ ,  $P=.058$ ,  $d_z=.26$ ,  $r=.376$ )(Table 1).

### 3.2 Psychometric Properties

**Test-Retest Reliability**—Hinting, RAD, and AIHQ (BS) demonstrated acceptable levels of test-retest reliability (Pearson's  $r$  values  $\geq 0.6$ ) for patients. BLERT, ER-40, Eyes, RAD, and two AIHQ subscales (AB/BS) showed adequate values among controls (Table 2).

**Internal Consistency**—For patients, few candidate measures approached/exceeded acceptable Cronbach's alpha values ( $\alpha \geq 0.8$ ). Exceptions included Trust (.943), TASIT (.795) and AIHQ-BS (.857). Internal consistency was generally lower for controls. Excluding Trust (.821), values for all tasks administered to controls fell below target standards (Table 2).

**Group Differences**—Significant group differences were observed only for ER40, Hinting, and TASIT (Table 3). The magnitude of between-group differences spanned the moderate-to-large range.

**Utility as a Repeated Measure**—For patients, three of eight measures demonstrated statistically significant differences between assessments (Table 4). Patient performance on ER-40 and Hinting improved, whereas TASIT performance worsened from baseline to retest. Effect sizes were moderate (Cohen's  $d_z$  range: .414–.642). Compared to the initial psychometric evaluation (Pinkham et al., 2015), floor/ceiling effects were less evident for this sample. A maximum of two patients (<6%) received perfect or chance-level scores on any measure.

Alternatively, controls performed significantly better on BLERT, ER-40, RAD, and AIHQ-BS at retest. Similar to patients, control performance across versions of the TASIT worsened significantly from baseline to retest. Practice effects varied, with effect sizes in the small-to-medium range (Cohen's  $d_z$  range: .212–.732). Only one control scored at/below chance levels on any task (Eyes) during either visit.

With the exception of the second administration of BLERT and first administration of Hinting, <8% of controls scored at ceiling for any candidate measure. Five (12.8%) received perfect scores on BLERT (visit 2), whereas four (10.3%) scored at ceiling on Hinting (visit 1).

**Relationship to Functional Outcome**—Correlations between social cognitive and neurocognitive tasks, and functional outcome measures for FEP are provided in Table 5. With the exception of BLERT, Trust, and AIHQ-AB, most measures demonstrated significant relationships with one or more outcome measures. Significant associations were in the expected direction, and of medium magnitude (range:  $r=.344$ –.473).

**Incremental Validity**—Social cognition explained additional variance in functional outcome above and beyond neurocognition. Simple linear regression analyses indicated neurocognition, when entered as a single predictor variable, accounted for 22% of variance in UPSA-B total scores (adjusted  $R^2=.218$ ,  $F(1,36)=11.33$ ,  $P<.01$ ) and 12% of variance in SSPA ratings (adjusted  $R^2=.123$ ,  $F(1,35)=6.039$ ,  $P<.05$ ), but was not a significant predictor of SLOF self-report values (adjusted  $R^2=-.012$ ,  $F(1,36)=.550$ ,  $P>.05$ )(Table 6). Sequential regression analyses revealed social cognition, entered after neurocognition as a second block, accounted for an additional 20% of variance in community living skills (UPSA-B;  $R^2$  change=.199,  $P<.05$ ), 19% of variance in social skills (SSPA;  $R^2$  change=.193,  $P<.05$ ), and 21% of variance in real-world functioning (SLOF-SR;  $R^2$  change=.214,  $P<.01$ )(Table 6).

**Practicality and Tolerability**—Excluding BLERT administration time ( $t(75)=5.78$ ,  $P=.019$ ,  $d=.499$ ) and TASIT enjoyability ratings ( $t(74)=5.06$ ,  $P=.027$ ,  $d=.379$ ), practicality and tolerability did not differ significantly between patients and controls (Supplementary Table 1). Most measures required <8 minutes to complete. Participants rated all tasks as relatively pleasant (range:  $M=4.29-5.62$ ).

### 3.3 Recommendations

Regarding suitability for FEP, Hinting was the sole measure to be considered **Acceptable at Present**. RAD was categorized as **Acceptable with Concerns**. Remaining candidate measures (AIHQ, BLERT, ER40, Eyes, TASIT, Trust) were regarded as **Currently Unacceptable**. A comparison between our recommendations and the outcome of the initial psychometric evaluation has been provided in Supplementary Table 2. A discussion of convergence and divergence between studies is provided below.

## 4. Discussion

The current study evaluated the psychometric properties of the SCOPE battery for FEP. Our findings suggest one measure, the Hinting task, was considered **Acceptable at Present**, or appropriate for use with FEP patients. In addition to displaying adequate test-retest reliability and effectively distinguishing between patients/controls, Hinting also exhibited significant relationships with both performance-based measures of functioning.

The RAD was classified as **Acceptable with Concerns** and may be cautiously considered for use with FEP. This measure demonstrated adequate test-retest reliability, a significant relationship to functioning, minimal practice effects, and limited floor/ceiling effects. However, this task was one of the longest to administer and was rated the least enjoyable by patients and controls. RAD's failure to distinguish patients from controls also tempers enthusiasm for this measure. Modification efforts to develop a shortened version may prove beneficial.

The remaining candidate measures were deemed **Currently Unacceptable** for use with FEP and warrant careful consideration if employed in future clinical trials. Though relatively quick and easy to administer, BLERT and Trust displayed the weakest psychometric properties overall, including poor test-retest reliability, failure to differentiate individuals with/without psychosis, and limited relation to functioning. For the ER40 and TASIT, the



primary concern was inadequate test-retest reliability. Based on moderate and significant practice effects observed for the TASIT, there was also concern about possible interference or non-equivalence between versions.

Though AIHQ and Eyes demonstrated significant associations with real-world functioning, predominantly low test-retest reliability estimates and inability to distinguish patients from controls precluded these tasks from recommendation. Notably, however, one subscale of the AIHQ, the BS, was strong on all metrics except group differences. Prior research indicates this subscale of the AIHQ demonstrates adequate psychometric properties, including acceptable internal consistency and test-retest reliability estimates; distinguishes patients from controls; displays significant relationships to functional outcome, and exhibits associations with relevant clinical variables in chronic samples (e.g., hostility and suspiciousness)(Buck et al., 2017, in press). The AIHQ-BS may therefore benefit from further examination and use; however it will be important to determine if it can be used independently of the rest of the measure.

Note that measures were required to demonstrate adequate test-retest reliability among patients, distinguish patients from controls, and exhibit significant relationships to functioning in order to be recommended for use in clinical trials targeting social cognition in FEP. Given the small sample size, we suggest careful consideration of these recommendations and thoughtful interpretation of the present findings. In particular, our recommendations may not be as applicable to other research goals (e.g., cross-sectional designs).

Consistent with Pinkham et al., our data demonstrate that Hinting is a psychometrically valid theory of mind measure that should be considered appropriate for implementation in psychosis research regardless of stage of illness. Importantly, both Pinkham et al. and the present study utilized a more stringent scoring manual. We emphasize the reported psychometric properties as limited to this revised scoring system (available from AEP upon request). Analyses are underway to determine whether the psychometric properties of the task may change if the original scoring criteria are utilized.

Also consistent with the original SCOPE study, our findings substantiate the claim that social cognition accounts for more variance in functional outcome than various cognitive factors. When measures of social cognition were included in the analyses, the explanatory power of neurocognition dropped significantly. These findings corroborate previous research suggesting social cognition mediates the relationship between neurocognition and functioning in psychosis (Fett et al., 2011; Schmidt, Mueller & Roder, 2011). Together, findings from this study provide strong support for the importance of social cognition in FEP.

In contrast, our findings diverge from the initial psychometric evaluation in a number of ways. Although the BLERT displayed some of the strongest properties in SCOPE, it was one of the weakest measures when administered to FEP outpatients. Whereas only two AIHQ subscales (HB/AB) showed inadequate test-retest reliability among patients in SCOPE, Hinting, RAD and one subscale of the AIHQ (BS) were the only measures to reach

acceptable levels when administered to FEP. Reliability estimates were generally lower for controls than patients in SCOPE, while the opposite was observed in our sample. In addition, excluding one AIHQ subscale (AB), all social cognitive tasks adequately differentiated between clinical and normative groups in Pinkham et al. Alternatively, significant group differences were observed for fewer than half the battery when administered to a younger sample.

Certain procedural incongruences and sample differences between our study and the original SCOPE study may have contributed to lower test-retest reliability estimates, differential sensitivity to group differences, and limited relationship to functional outcome. Effect sizes indicating meaningful changes in performance between visits suggested clinically relevant practice effects for half the battery when administered to a younger sample (Table 4). Memory and practice effects have been shown to adversely affect test-retest reliability (Abner et al., 2012; Broglio et al., 2007; Greig et al., 2004). In fact, post-hoc independent samples *t*-tests indicated educational attainment and general intelligence for our patient sample were significantly higher than chronic patients in SCOPE (Equal variances assumed, Education:  $t=-3.55$ ,  $P<.001$ ; IQ:  $t=-4.56$ ,  $P<.001$ ).

Remarkably, FEP performance was more comparable to controls than patients in SCOPE (Supplementary Table 3). Higher levels of general intelligence in the FEP sample may explain the absence of floor effects for the RAD observed in the initial psychometric evaluation. It is also plausible that learning and memory influenced performance at retest and weakened reliability estimates. Implementing dual-baseline assessments, establishing a “learning plateau,” and/or employing truly equivalent alternate forms may bolster test-retest reliability of these measures (Beglinger et al., 2003; Beglinger et al., 2005).

Psychosis onset typically occurs during late adolescence and early adulthood, a period of developmental transition and social/lifestyle changes that may contribute to less stable social cognition early in the course of illness (Horan et al., 2012). To assess the possibility that changes in symptom severity between visits may have impacted social cognitive performance, we recalculated test-retest correlations controlling for symptom fluctuations. Values were unchanged, thus indicating it is unlikely symptom variability accounted for lower test-retest reliability estimates.

Specific differences between our clinical sample and that of SCOPE may also explain why measures did not reliably differentiate patients and controls, and clarify the limited value of most tasks as independent predictors of functional outcome. Post-hoc analyses revealed our FEP sample outperformed chronic patients on all tasks (Supplementary Table 3). It is plausible that social cognitive deficits are less prominent early in the course of illness and/or the outcome measures used to assess social functioning and daily living skills are inappropriate for younger patients.

Finally, certain limitations must be considered. First, the inclusion of a relatively small sample, especially compared to the original SCOPE study, is a noteworthy limitation of the present study. Additionally, data were collected from a relatively homogenous sample of predominantly white, well-educated males from one of the fastest-growing metropolitan

areas in the United States. FEP patients were also recruited from a coordinated specialty care clinic focused on early intervention and recovery, and may qualitatively differ from clinical samples recruited from more traditional community mental health centers. Thus, interpretations of the present findings should be regarded with caution.

In summary, the present study indicates social cognitive assessment needs to be approached differently for individuals early in the course of illness, and investigators should use caution when employing tasks that have been used primarily with chronic samples. This underscores the need for the development of new measures for use with FEP, as well as a better understanding of how social cognition and functioning may differ across stage of illness. In addition to improving the validity, reproducibility, and comparability of research findings, we may use this information to tailor treatment and develop targeted interventions for FEP.

## Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all individuals who participated in this investigation, including all research subjects and research assistants at the participating sites for their significant effort and contribution to the SCOPE study.

### Role of the Funding Source

This work was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (R01 MH093432 awarded to Drs. Harvey, Penn and Pinkham).

## References

- Abner EL, Dennis BC, Mathews MJ, Mendiondo MS, Caban-Holt A, Kryscio RJ, Schmitt FA, Crowley JJ. Practice effects in a longitudinal, multi-center Alzheimer's disease prevention clinical trial. *Trials*. 2012; 13(1):217. [PubMed: 23171483]
- Adolphs R, Tranel D, Damasio AR. The human amygdala in social judgment. *Nature*. 1998; 393(6684):470–474. [PubMed: 9624002]
- An SK, Kang JI, Park JY, Kim KR, Lee SY, Lee E. Attribution bias in ultra-high risk for psychosis and first-episode schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res*. 2010; 118(1):54–61. [PubMed: 20171849]
- Barkl SJ, Lah S, Harris AW, Williams LM. Facial emotion identification in early-onset and first-episode psychosis: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Schizophr Res*. 2014; 159(1):62–69. [PubMed: 25178803]
- Baron-Cohen S, Wheelwright S, Hill J, Raste Y, Plumb I. The 'Reading the Mind in the Eyes' Test revised version: a study with normal adults, and adults with Asperger syndrome or high-functioning autism. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2001; 42(2):241–251. [PubMed: 11280420]
- Beglinger LJ, Ahmed S, Derby MA, Siemers E, Fastenau PS, Crawford-Miller J, Shekhar A, Kareken DA. Neuropsychological practice effects and change detection in people with schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res*. 2003; 62(1):191–194. [PubMed: 12765761]
- Beglinger LJ, Gaydos B, Tangphao-Daniels O, Duff K, Kareken DA, Crawford J, Fastenau PS, Siemers ER. Practice effects and the use of alternate forms in serial neuropsychological testing. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol*. 2005; 20(4):517–529. [PubMed: 15896564]
- Bell M, Bryson G, Lysaker P. Positive and negative affect recognition in schizophrenia: A comparison with substance abuse and normal control subjects. *Psychiatry Res*. 1997; 73(1–2):73–82. [PubMed: 9463840]
- Birchwood M, Todd P, Jackson C. Early intervention in psychosis: the critical-period hypothesis. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol*. 1998; 172(33):53–9.

- Bora E, Pantelis C. Theory of mind impairments in first-episode psychosis, individuals at ultra-high risk for psychosis and in first-degree relatives of schizophrenia: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Schizophr Res.* 2013; 144(1–3):31–36. [PubMed: 23347949]
- Broglio SP, Ferrara MS, Macciocchi SN, Baumgartner TA, Elliott R. Test-Retest Reliability of Computerized Concussion Assessment Programs. *J Athl Train.* 2007; 42(4):509–514. [PubMed: 18174939]
- Brüne M, Abdel-Hamid M, Lehmkamper C, Sonntag C. Mental state attribution, neurocognitive functioning, and psychopathology: what predicts poor social competence in schizophrenia best? *Schizophr Res.* 2007; 92(1):151–159. [PubMed: 17346931]
- Buck B, Iwanski C, Healey KM, Green MF, Horan WP, Kern RS, Lee J, Marder SR, Reise SP, Penn DL. Improving measurement of attributional style in schizophrenia; a psychometric evaluation of the Ambiguous Intentions Hostility Questionnaire (AIHQ). *J Psychiatric Res.* 2017 In press.
- Combs DR, Penn DL, Wicher M, Waldheter E. The ambiguous intentions hostility questionnaire (AIHQ): A new measure for evaluating hostile social-cognitive biases in paranoia. *Cogn Neuropsychiatry.* 2007; 12(2):128–143. [PubMed: 17453895]
- Corcoran R, Mercer G, Frith CD. Schizophrenia, symptomatology and social inference: investigating “theory of mind” in people with schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res.* 1995; 17(1):5–13. [PubMed: 8541250]
- Couture, SM., Penn, DL. Introduction to social cognition in schizophrenia. In: Roberts, DL., Penn, DL., editors. *Social Cognition in Schizophrenia: From evidence to treatment.* Oxford University Press; New York: 2012. p. 1-16.
- Couture SM, Penn DL, Roberts DL. The functional significance of social cognition in schizophrenia: a review. *Schizophr Bull.* 2006; 32(suppl 1):S44–S63. [PubMed: 16916889]
- Drost EA. Validity and reliability in social science research. *Educ Res Perspect.* 2011; 38(1):105.
- Fett AJ, Viechtbauer W, Dominguez M, Penn DL, van Os J, Krabbendam L. The relationship between neurocognition and social cognition with functional outcomes in schizophrenia: A meta-analysis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2011; 35(3):573–588. [PubMed: 20620163]
- First, MB., Spitzer, RL., Gibbon, M., Williams, JBW. *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV-TR Axis I Disorders, Research Version, Patient Edition (SCID-I/P).* John Wiley & Sons; New York: 2002.
- Frith S. Social cognition. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci.* 2008; 363(1499):2033–2039.
- Green MF, Bearden CE, Cannon TD, Fiske AP, Helleman GS, Horan WP, Kee K, Kern RS, Lee J, Sergi MJ, Subotnik KL, Sugar CA, Ventura J, Yee CM, Nuechterlein KH. Social Cognition in Schizophrenia, Part 1: Performance Across Phase of Illness. *Schizophr Bull.* 2012; 38(4):854–864. [PubMed: 21345917]
- Green MF, Helleman GS, Horan WP, Lee J, Wynn JK. From perception to functional outcome in schizophrenia: modeling the role of ability and motivation. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2012; 69(12):1216–1224. [PubMed: 23026889]
- Green MF, Leitman DI. Social cognition in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull.* 2008; 34(4):670–672. [PubMed: 18495642]
- Greig TC, Nicholls SS, Wexler BE, Bell MD. Test–retest stability of neuropsychological testing and individual differences in variability in schizophrenia outpatients. *Psychiatry Res.* 2004; 129(3):241–247. [PubMed: 15661317]
- Hartshorne JK, Germine LT. When does cognitive functioning peak? The asynchronous rise and fall of different cognitive abilities across the life span. *Psychol Sci.* 2015; 26(4):433–443. [PubMed: 25770099]
- Horan WP, Green MF, DeGroot M, Fiske A, Helleman G, Kee K, Kern RS, Lee J, Sergi MJ, Subotnik KL, Sugar CA. Social cognition in schizophrenia, part 2: 12-month stability and prediction of functional outcome in first-episode patients. *Schizophr Bull.* 2011; 38(4):865–872. [PubMed: 21382881]
- Kay SR, Flszbein A, Opfer LA. The Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull.* 1987; 13(2):261–276. [PubMed: 3616518]
- Keefe RE, Bilder RM, Harvey PD, Davis SM, Palmer BW, Gold JM, Meltzer HY, Green MF, Miller DD, Canive JM, Adler LW, Manschreck TC, Swartz M, Rosenheck R, Perkins DO, Walker TM,

- Stroup TS, McEvoy JP, Lieberman JA. Baseline Neurocognitive Deficits in the CATIE Schizophrenia Trial. *Neuropsychopharmacol.* 2006; 31(9):2033–2046.
- Kohler CG, Turner TH, Bilker WB, Brensinger CM, Siegel SJ, Kanes SJ, Gur RE, Gur RC. Facial emotion recognition in schizophrenia: intensity effects and error pattern. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2003; 160(10):1768–1774. [PubMed: 14514489]
- Kunda, Z. *Social cognition: Making sense of people.* first. MIT Press; Cambridge: 1999.
- McDonald S, Flanagan S, Rollins J, Kinch J. TASIT: a new clinical tool for assessing social perception after traumatic brain injury. *J Head Trauma Rehabil.* 2003; 18(3):219–238. [PubMed: 12802165]
- Mancuso F, Horan WP, Kern RS, Green MF. Social cognition in psychosis: multidimensional structure, clinical correlates, and relationship with functional outcome. *Schizophr Res.* 2011; 125(2):143–151. [PubMed: 21112743]
- Mausbach BT, Harvey PD, Goldman SR, Jeste DV, Patterson TL. Development of a brief scale of everyday functioning in persons with serious mental illness. *Schizophr Bull.* 2007; 33(6):1364–1372. [PubMed: 17341468]
- Nuechterlein KH, Green MF, Kern RS, Baade LE, Barch DM, Cohen JD, Essock S, Fenton WS, Frese FJ III, Gold JM, Goldberg T. The MATRICS Consensus Cognitive Battery, part 1: test selection, reliability, and validity. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2008; 165(2):203–213. [PubMed: 18172019]
- Patterson TL, Moscona S, McKibbin CL, Davidson K, Jeste DV. Social skills performance assessment among older patients with schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res.* 2001; 48(2):351–360. [PubMed: 11295387]
- Penn DL, Corrigan PW, Bentall RP, Racenstein JM, Newman L. Social cognition in schizophrenia. *Psychol Bull.* 1997; 121(1):14–132.
- Pinkham AE, Penn DL, Green MF, Buck B, Healey K, Harvey PD. The Social Cognition Psychometric Evaluation study: results of the expert survey and RAND panel. *Schizophr Bull.* 2014; 40(4):813–823. [PubMed: 23728248]
- Pinkham AE, Penn DL, Green MF, Harvey PD. Social cognition psychometric evaluation: Results of the initial psychometric study. *Schizophr Bull.* 2015; 42(2):494–504. [PubMed: 25943125]
- Romero-Ferreiro MV, Aguado L, Rodriguez-Torresano J, Palomo T, Rodriguez-Jimenez R, Pedreira-Massa JL. Facial affect recognition in early and late-stage schizophrenia patients. *Schizophr Res.* 2016; 172(1):177–183. [PubMed: 26874869]
- Savla G, Vella L, Armstrong C, Penn DL, Twamley E. Deficits in domains of social cognition in schizophrenia: A meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Schizophr Bull.* 2013; 39(5):979–992. [PubMed: 22949733]
- Schneider LC, Struening EL. SLOF: a behavioral rating scale for assessing the mentally ill. *J Soc Work Res Abstr.* 1983; 19(3):9–21.
- Sergi MJ, Fiske AP, Horan WP, Kern RS, Kee KS, Subotnik KL, Nuechterlein KH, Green MF. Development of a measure of relationship perception in schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Res.* 2009; 166(1):54–62. [PubMed: 19193447]
- Schmidt SJ, Mueller DR, Roder V. Social cognition as a mediator variable between neurocognition and functional outcome in schizophrenia: empirical review and new results by structural equation modeling. *Schizophr Bull.* 2011; 37(Suppl 2):S41–S54. [PubMed: 21860046]
- Sprong M, Schothorst P, Vos E, Hox J, van Engeland H. Theory of mind in schizophrenia: meta-analysis. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2007; 19(1):5–13.
- Srihari VH, Phutane VH, Ozkan B, Chwastiak L, Ratliff JC, Woods SW, Tek C. Cardiovascular mortality in Schizophrenia: defining a critical period for prevention. *Schizophr Res.* 2013; 146(0): 64–68. [PubMed: 23422728]
- Thompson AD, Bartholomeusz C, Yung AR. Social cognition deficits and the ultra-high risk for psychosis population: a review of the literature. *Early Interv Psychiatry.* 2011; 5(3):192–202. [PubMed: 21726422]
- Ventura J, Ered A, Gretchen-Doorly D, Subotnik KL, Horan WP, Hellemann GS, Nuechterlein KH. Theory of mind in the early course of schizophrenia: Stability, symptom and neurocognitive correlates, and relationship with functioning. *Psychol Med.* 2015; 45(10):2031–2043. [PubMed: 25647289]

- Weickert TW, Goldberg TE, Gold JM, Bigelow LB, Egan MF, Weinberger DR. Cognitive impairments in patients with schizophrenia displaying preserved and compromised intellect. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2000; 57(9):907–913. [PubMed: 10986554]
- Zaytseva Y, Burova V, Garakh Z, Gurovich IY. Attributional style in first episode of schizophrenia and schizophrenia spectrum disorders with and without paranoid ideation. *Psychiatria Danubina*. 2013; 25(2):329–331. [PubMed: 24048407]

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

**Table 1**

## Participant Demographic and Clinical Characteristics

Characteristic	Patients (n=38)		Controls (n=39)	
	n	(%)	n	(%)
Male	33	86.7	32	82.1
Race				
Caucasian	29	76.3	29	74.4
African American	5	13.2	5	12.8
Asian	2	5.3	2	5.1
Other	2	5.3	3	7.7
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	2	5.3	6	15.4
Non-Hispanic	36	94.7	33	84.6
Diagnosis				
Schizophrenia	25	65.8		
Schizoaffective	6	15.8		
Psychosis NOS	7	18.4		
Medication Type				
Typical	1	2.6		
Atypical	32	84.2		
Combination	2	5.3		
Unmedicated	3	7.9		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Age (years)	23.45	3.01	23.77	3.39
Education (years)*	14.03	1.52	15.44	1.80
Maternal Education (years)*	16.21	2.27	14.85	1.99
Paternal Education (years)*	17.33	2.33	15.53	2.81
WRAT-3	105.87	9.35	107.82	8.91
UPSA-B	70.55	11.63	80.53	9.59
SSPA-Avg.	4.10	.39	4.68	.21
SLOF <sub>SR</sub> -Avg.	4.25	.46	4.61	.24
PANSS (Visit 1)				
Positive Total	17.53	4.91		
Negative Total	16.58	3.96		
General Total	36.00	5.95		
Overall Total	70.11	10.37		
PANSS (Visit 2)				
Positive Total	14.63	5.28		
Negative Total	15.21	5.58		

Characteristic	Patients (n=38)	Controls (n=39)
General Total	32.92	10.20
Overall Total	62.76	18.69

*Note:* Patients reported relatively low levels of symptoms at visit 1, and there were moderate reductions in positive symptoms at visit 2 ( $t(37)=3.137, P=.003, d_2=.55$ ).

\*  
 $p<.05$

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript



**Table 2**

## Test-Retest Reliability and Internal Consistency

Task	Test-Retest Reliability (Pearson <i>r</i> )		Internal Consistency (Cronbach's Alpha)	
	Patients (n=34)	Controls (n=36)	Patients (n=38)	Controls (n=39)
AIHQ				
Hostility Bias (HB)	.529	.394	.497	.387
Aggression Bias (AB)	.238	.664	.259	.242
Blame Score (BS)	.737	.680	.857	.742
BLERT	.455	.665	.740	.411
ER-40	.496	.705	.599	.538
Eyes	.534	.708	.488	.630
Hinting	.735	.204	.685	.493
RAD	.753	.735	.683	.558
TASIT	.314	.338	.795	.691
Trust	.218	.537	.943	.821

*Note:* With the outlier included in the analyses, test-retest reliability for the BLERT was .490 (n=35).

Table 3

## Group Differences on Social Cognitive Measures

Task	Patients (n=38)			Controls (n=39)			t	p	Cohen's d
	Mean	SD		Mean	SD				
AIHQ-HB	2.02	.590		1.89	.493		1.081	.283	-.239
AIHQ-AB	1.74	.225		1.77	.198		-.672	.504	.142
AIHQ-BS	7.09	2.15		7.09	1.471		-.007	.995	.000
BLERT	17.14	2.12		17.59	2.04		-.953	.344	.216
ER-40**	32.05	3.54		33.67	3.00		-2.159	.034	.494
Eyes	25.16	3.67		26.54	4.08		-1.558	.123	.356
Hinting***	15.82	2.82		17.72	1.78		-3.554	<.001	.806
RAD	32.34	4.92		33.87	3.95		-1.506	.136	.343
TASIT***	51.89	6.24		57.31	3.95		-4.560	<.001	1.038
Trust	.17	.83		.39	.39		-1.502	.137	.339

\*  $p < .05$ ,\*\*  $p < .01$ ,\*\*\*  $p < .001$ 

Note: BLERT for patients (mean=16.74, SD=2.04) when the outlier is included in the analyses.

Table 4

## Utility as a Repeated Measure

Task	T1		T2		T2-T1 Difference		Number at Floor/Ceiling		t	p value	Cohen's d <sub>r</sub>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	T1	T2			
Patients (n=36)											
AIHQ-HB	1.99	0.577	1.86	.561	-0.125	.552	-	-	-1.359	.183	0.226
AIHQ-AB	1.73	0.226	1.77	.268	-0.047	0.307	-	-	-0.924	.362	0.153
AIHQ-BS	7.10	2.19	7.07	2.29	-0.028	-1.626	-	-	-0.102	.919	0.017
BLERT	17.23	2.14	17.91	1.74	0.686	2.055	1/0	0/1	1.974	.057	0.351
ER-40	32.22	3.55	33.97	2.65	1.750	3.210	0/0	0/0	3.271	.002	0.545
Eyes	25.25	3.74	25.89	3.46	0.639	3.482	2/0	2/0	1.101	.278	0.184
Hinting	15.83	2.87	17.08	2.13	1.250	1.948	2/1	0/2	3.851	<.001	0.642
RAD	32.64	4.88	32.19	5.52	-0.444	3.707	1/0	2/0	0.719	.477	0.120
TASIT*	52.03	6.36	49.00	6.12	-3.028	7.307	1/0	0/1	-2.486	.018	0.414
Trust	.172	0.834	.198	0.531	0.026	0.885	-	-	0.179	.859	0.029
Controls (n=36)											
AIHQ-HB	1.86	.460	1.69	.539	-0.169	0.55	-	-	-1.836	.075	0.307
AIHQ-AB	1.77	.195	1.74	.222	-0.036	0.17	-	-	-1.255	.218	0.212
AIHQ-BS	7.13	1.482	6.59	1.819	-0.544	1.36	-	-	-2.41	.021	0.400
BLERT	17.61	2.032	18.67	1.805	1.056	1.58	0/2	0/5	3.997	<.001	0.668
ER-40	33.67	3.089	34.58	2.781	0.917	2.27	0/0	0/0	2.420	.021	0.404
Eyes	26.78	4.134	27.78	3.958	1.000	3.098	1/0	1/0	1.936	.061	0.323
Hinting	17.92	1.538	18.00	1.639	0.083	2.005	0/4	0/3	0.249	.805	0.041
RAD	34.08	4.003	36.19	3.984	2.111	2.906	0/0	0/0	4.359	<.001	0.726
TASIT*	57.75	3.667	53.47	5.955	-4.278	5.843	0/0	0/2	-4.392	<.001	0.732
Trust	0.394	0.392	0.327	0.413	-0.067	0.388	-	-	-1.091	.282	0.173

\* Alternate forms were used for the TASIT

Note: These are the BLERT values when the outlier is included in the analyses.

---

0.357  
0.040  
2.139  
1/0  
1/0  
2.883  
1.028  
1.78  
17.83  
3.30  
16.81

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

**Table 5**

Correlations between Social Cognitive and Neurocognitive Tasks and Functional Outcome Measures in Patients

	UPSA Total	SSPA Average	SLOF <sub>SR</sub> Average
Social Cognitive			
AIHQ-HB	-.096	-.162	-.360*
AIHQ-AB	.136	.069	-.253
AIHQ-BS	.158	.053	-.372*
BLERT	.265	.159	.138
ER-40	.337*	.435**	-.101
Eyes	.326*	.234	.407*
Hinting	.372*	.473**	.189
RAD	.456**	.344*	.020
TASIT	.475**	.179	.205
Trust	-.037	-.252	.161
Neurocognitive			
MCCB Composite	.489**	.384*	.123

\*  
p<.05,

\*\*  
p<.01

*Note a:* There was an error with scene two for the SSPA role-play for one SCZ participant.

This particular individual's data – the average for scene 1 only – were included in the above analyses.

*Note b:* All participants completed the self-report (SR) version of the SLOF. Informants were identified for each SCZ participant, though only 25 individuals successfully completed the informant version of the measure. Neither performance on the social cognition measures nor scores on the social functioning measures were significantly related to the informant version of the SLOF.

Regression Models Summarizing Independent and Combined Contributions of Neurocognition and Social Cognition to Outcomes

Table 6

<i>Neurocognition only</i>						
<i>MCCB Composite</i>	<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>		
<i>UPSA total</i>	.239	.218	11.354	.002		
<i>SSPA average</i>	.147	.123	6.039	.019		
<i>SLOF<sub>sr</sub> average</i>	.015	-.012	.550	.463		
<i>Social Cognition only</i>						
<i>SC Tasks</i>	<i>R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b* sr<sup>2</sup></i>
<i>UPSA total</i>	.392	.297	4.12	.005		
ER-40					1.241	.224 .029
Eyes					.963	.343 .018
Hinting					.041	.968 .000
RAD					1.486	.147 .042
TASIT					2.099	.044 .084
<i>SSPA average</i>	.323	.262	5.26	.004		
ER-40					1.588	.122 .052
Hinting					2.054	.048 .086
RAD					1.124	.269 .026
<i>SLOF<sub>sr</sub> average</i>	.298	.236	4.82	.007		
AIHQ-HB					-.991	.329 .020
AIHQ-BS					-1.478	.149 .045
Eyes					2.442	.020 .123

*Neurocognition and Social Cognition*

	UPSA-B		SSPA		SLOF <sub>SR</sub>	
	<i>b</i> *	<i>sr</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>b</i> *	<i>sr</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>b</i> *	<i>sr</i> <sup>2</sup>
Block 1 – Neurocognition MCCB Composite	.373***	.120***	.274	.069	-.023	.000
Block 2 – Social Cognition						
AIHQ-HB	–	–	–	–	–.168	.020
AIHQ-AB	–	–	–	–	–	–
AIHQ-BS	–	–	–	–	–.251	.045
ER-40	.216	.035	.257	.053	–	–
Eyes	.043	.001	–	–	.363*	.115*
Hinting	–.030	.001	.294	.070	–	–
RAD	.169	.022	.106	.009	–	–
TASIT	.371*	.091*	–	–	–	–
Overall Model						
<i>Adjusted R</i> <sup>2</sup>	.417*		.316*		.214**	
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> Change	.199*		.193*		.214**	

\*  $p < .05$ ,\*\*  $p < .01$