Outcome Measure	**Intentionality Bias Test (IBT)**
Population	Adult
How to obtain	Available from authors upon request.
Domain	Social Cognition
Type of Measure	Performative:
Time to Administer	**5-6 minutes**
Description	**The Intentionality Bias Test** (Rosset, 2008) originally comprised 34 sentences which were ambiguous with respect to intentionality (e.g. He hit the man with his car") The participant is required to say whether the action was intentional or accidental. It was found that people were more inclined to say it was intentional when they were under speeded conditions although this was not replicated in a subsequent study (Hughes, Sandry, & Trafimow, 2012). Another French version using 78 sentences has been developed (Peyroux, Strickland, Tapiero, & Franck, 2014) and there is also a 24-sentence version (12 presented requiring a fast response- 2.4 seconds and 12 providing more time (5 seconds) (Pinkham, Harvey, & Penn, 2018). The score is the "Intentionality index" which is the proportion of intentional answers over all answers (0-1). **Time to administer: 5-6 minutes**
Properties	Internal reliability: This has been estimated as .50 in healthy controls (Pinkham et al., 2018) Test-retest reliability: This has been estimated as .51 (2 weeks) in healthy controls (Pinkham et al., 2018) Construct Validity: Convergent: No evidence for convergent validity is available Discriminant validity: The IBT yields higher intentionality indexes for people with schizophrenia when compared to normal healthy adults (Peyroux et al., 2014; Pinkham et al., 2018). Concurrent Validity: Performance on the IBT has been found to be significantly associated with specific questions on the PANASS tapping

	poor impulse control, excitement and uncooperativeness in people with schizophrenia (Peyroux et al., 2014). It also uniquely predicted functional capacity and real-world functional outcomes in people with schizophrenia (Pinkham et al., 2018). Normative data: The original paper (Rosset, 2008) provides proportional intention responses based on 90 undergraduate students. Peyroux et al., 2014 provides comparative data for 38 healthy adults and data based on a further 154 are available in Pinkham et al (Pinkham et al., 2018). According to this: *Healthy M* = 0.40 (0.15).
Advantages	• This is one of very few performative measures of attributional bias • It is quick to administer (around 5 minutes) • The score is also simple to obtain • It discriminates people with schizophrenia from matched control participants and predicts functional outcomes
Disadvantages	• No convergent validity data available • The speeded component (Pinkham et al., 2018) is too difficult for many patients

*

References

Hughes, J. S., Sandry, J., & Trafimow, D. (2012). Intentional Inferences Are Not More Likely Than Unintentional Ones: Some Evidence Against the Intentionality Bias Hypothesis. *The Journal of social psychology, 152*(1), 1-4. doi:10.1080/00224545.2011.565383

Peyroux, E., Strickland, B., Tapiero, I., & Franck, N. (2014). The intentionality bias in schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Res, 219*(3), 426-430. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2014.06.034

Pinkham, A. E., Harvey, P. D., & Penn, D. L. (2018). Social Cognition Psychometric Evaluation: Results of the Final Validation Study. *Schizophrenia Bulletin, 44*(4), 737-748. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbx117

Rosset, E. (2008). It's no accident: Our bias for intentional explanations. *Cognition, 108*(3), 771-780. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2008.07.001