Outcome Measure	The Relationships Across Domains (RAD)
Sensitivity to Change	Not known
Population	Adult
How to obtain	Available from the authors
Domain	Social Cognition
Type of Measure	Performance Task: Available from first author on request
Time to administer	**14-16 minutes**
Description	*The Relationships Across Domains* (RAD) examines implicit knowledge of four relational models (i.e., communal sharing, authority ranking, equality matching, and market pricing – contribution to social interaction and return) (Sergi et al., 2009). The abbreviated version is comprised of 15 written vignettes involving different male-female dyads that represent one of the relational models. Participants read each vignette and answered 3 yes/no questions about whether a future behaviour is likely to happen given the described relationship. Performance is scored as the total number of correct responses (ranging from 0 to 45). **Time to administer: 16 minutes**
Properties	Internal consistency: Cronbach's alphas: .717 (Patients with SSD), .81 (adults with ASD); .63-70 (Healthy adults) (Morrison et al., 2019; Pinkham, Penn, Green, & Harvey, 2016) Test-retest reliability: (2-4 weeks) .751 (Patients), .756 (Healthy adults) (Pinkham et al., 2016) with a small increase in scores (effect size 0.26). Construct Validity: *Convergent:* The RAD loads on a "social appraisals" factor, along with TASIT and the Hinting Task in people with ASD and is associated with TASIT in normal adults (Morrison et al., 2019). Discriminant Validity: The RAD has been mainly used in people with SSD. It is shown to discriminate people with SSD from demographically matched controls with a large effect size (Cohen's d = .93) (Pinkham et al., 2016) and also adults with ASD (Cohens d = .41) (Morrison et al., 2019) Concurrent Validity: Using high quality informants with mental health experience, the RAD was significantly correlated with real world function (the SLOF; r = .202), financial and communication skills (the UPS A: r = .439) and social skills (the SSPA: r = .243) in people with schizophrenia (Pinkham et al., 2016). Note these associations were no longer significant after accounting for general neurocognitive performance. Normative data: Pinkham (Pinkham et al., 2016) provides normative data for 104 healthy adults from the community.
Advantages	Discriminates people with schizophrenia from healthy comparison groups. One of the only measures of social perception available.
Disadvantages	Has floor effects, where a high proportion of patients performed at chance levels. It does not predict functional outcomes once neurocognitive performance is accounted for. It is also relatively long to administer. It was not recommended by Pinkham et al 2016 for these reasons.

References

Morrison, K. E., Pinkham, A. E., Kelsven, S., Ludwig, K., Penn, D. L., & Sasson, N. J. (2019). Psychometric Evaluation of Social Cognitive Measures for Adults with Autism. *Autism Research, 12*(5), 766-778. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/aur.2084

Pinkham, A. E., Penn, D. L., Green, M. F., & Harvey, P. D. (2016). Social cognition psychometric evaluation: Results of the initial psychometric study. *Schizophrenia Bulletin, 42*(2), 494-504.

Sergi, M. J., Fiske, A. P., Horan, W. P., Kern, R. S., Kee, K. S., Subotnik, K. L., . . . Green, M. F. (2009). Development of a measure of relationship perception in schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Research, 166*(1), 54-62.