The Contribution of Integrated Arts-Based Groups to People with Mental Health Conditions and Community Members: Processes and Outcomes
(Nitzan & Orkibi, 2022)

Online Supplemental File

People with MHCs: Preliminary Analysis Results

Table 1S

Distribution of Demographics and Background Data of People with MHCs by Group

Variable	value	Integrated groups		Control group		Total		
		n=141	%	*n*=127	%	*N*=268	%	*p*
Gender	Male	64	45.4	62	48.8	126	47	.472
	Female	77	54.6	64	50.4	141	52.6	
	Other	0	0	1	0.8	1	0.4	
Age	*M (SD)*	43 (12.9)		42.2 (12.2)		42.6 (12.5)		.615
	Range	19 - 75		20 - 71		19-75		
Country of birth	Israel	107	75.9	98	77.2	205	76.5	.805
	Other	34	24.1	29	22.8	63	23.5	
Religion	Jewish	127	90.1	114	89.8	241	90	.934
	Other	14	9.9	13	10.2	27	10	
Religiousness	Secular	85	60.3	73	57.5	158	59	.343
	Traditional	35	24.8	36	28.3	71	26.5	
	Religious	7	5	13	10.2	20	7.5	
	Very religious	0	0	1	0.8	1	0.4	
	(Ultra-orthodox)	4	2.8	0	0	4	1.5	
	Other	10	7.1	4	3.1	14	5.2	
Marital status	Married/ with partner	30	21.3	32	25.2	62	23.1	.447
	Other	111	78.7	95	74.8	206	76.9	
Children	Yes	47	33.3	38	29.9	85	31.7	.549
	No	94	66.7	89	70.1	183	68.3	
Residence area	North	8	5.7	17	13.4	25	9.3	.276
	Haifa and Krayot	15	10.6	15	11.8	30	11.2	
	Center	82	58.2	60	47.2	142	53	
	Jerusalem area	17	12.1	16	12.6	33	12.3	
	South	17	12.1	18	14.2	35	13.1	
	Judea and Samaria	2	1.4	1	0.8	3	1.1	

Table 1S continued

Variable	value	Integrated groups		Control group		Total		
		n=141	%	*n*=127	%	*N*=268	%	*p*
Place of Residence	Parents	21	14.9	32	25.2	53	19.8	.131
	Family	35	24.8	30	23.6	65	24.2	
	With a flat mate	12	8.5	3	2.4	15	5.6	
	Alone	49	34.8	36	28.3	85	31.7	
	Assisted living	13	9.2	16	12.6	29	10.8	
	Hostel	3	2.1	2	1.6	5	1.9	
	Other	8	5.7	8	6.3	16	6.0	
Educational level	Elementary school	4	2.8	1	0.8	5	1.9	.872
	Middle school	4	2.8	3	2.4	7	2.6	
	High school	45	31.9	48	37.8	93	34.7	
	Post-secondary/ vocational	50	35.5	40	31.5	90	33.6	
	Academic	38	27	35	27.6	73	27.3	
Employment status	Unemployed	49	34.8	43	33.9	92	34.4	.454
	Part time or Odd jobs	45	31.9	33	26	78	29.1	
	Full time	47	33.3	51	40.2	98	36.6	
Socioeconomic status	Below average	78	55.3	54	42.5	132	49.2	.082
	Average	59	41.8	71	55.9	130	48.5	
	Above average	4	2.8	2	1.6	6	2.2	
Currently on medication	No	12	8.5	9	7.1	21	7.8	.665
	Yes	129	91.5	118	92.9	247	92.2	
Currently in other services	No	10	7.1	18	14.2	28	10.5	.058
	Yes	131	92.9	109	85.8	240	89.5	
Frequency of visiting the community center	Not at all	63	44.7	41	32.3	104	38.8	.584
	Once every 2-3 weeks	22	15.6	44	34.6	66	24.6	
	Once a week	36	25.5	22	17.3	58	21.6	
	Twice a week or more	20	14.2	20	15.7	40	14.9	
Past attendance of integrated group	No	84	59.6	112	88.2	196	73.2	≤ .001
	Yes	57	40.4	15	11.8	72	26.8	
If yes, how many times?	1	33	61.1	6	40	39	51.1	.125
	2	10	18.5	6	40	16	28.7	
	3 or more	11	20.4	3	60	14	39.2	

Note. Continuous variables were tested using a t-test for independent samples; categorical variables were tested using a Pearson Chi square or a Fisher exact test; ordinal variables were tested using a Chi square test for linear trends.

Common Method Variance (CMV) and Measurement Model Fit Tests

As recommended by Podsakoff et al., (2003), in Harman's single factor test all scales items were forced to load on a single factor in exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with a principal axis factoring extraction method without rotation, which accounted for 30.4% of the variance explained by the single factor, that was sufficiently far from the threshold of 50%. To confirm the results, a common latent factor (CLF) was included in the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) model in AMOS.v25 (Byrne, 2016). Then, the differences between standardized regression weights of the models with a common latent factor (CLF) and without a CLF were calculated. All differences were below 0.2, indicating that the responses were not biased. Thus, there was no need to retain the CLF in the model to impute the values. CFA was also used to confirm the factor structure (measurement model), which was acceptable based on common fit indices: $\chi 2/df = 2.0$, RMSEA = 0.06, CFI = 0.80 (Schreiber et al., 2006). The internal consistency reliability of the seven scales was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficients, which ranged from .824 and .935.

Dropout Analysis

Of the 413 initial people with MHCs, 145 only completed Time 1, and 268 completed the two timepoints (for a 35.1% dropout rate). Dropouts were significantly higher than completers in self-stigma ($p \leq .001$, Cohen's d = 0.35) and neuroticism ($p \leq .05$, Cohen's d =0.21) and lower in personal recovery ($p \leq .01$, Cohen's d = 0.27), psychological distress ($p \leq .05$, Cohen's d =0.25), sense of community membership ($p \leq .001$, Cohen's d = 0.37) and agreeableness ($p \leq .01$, Cohen's d = 0.29). See Table 2S for full t-test results comparing dropouts and completers. In addition, using a Chi-square test for association, dropping out of the study was *not*

statistically significantly associated with gender, religion, religiosity, country of birth, residence area, marital status, having children, place of living, education level, employment status, medications, attending other rehabilitation programs or frequency of community center attendance. Next, based on the above findings, a logistic regression model was carried out to estimate the accuracy of predicting dropout explained by personal recovery, self-stigma, psychological distress, sense of community membership, agreeableness, and neuroticism. The model explained only 6.3% of the variance of dropout, correctly classified 15.9% of dropouts and 66.2% of the cases (including dropouts and completers) with an area under the curve (AUC) equal to 0.62, which suggests poor ability of the model to distinguish between dropouts and completers (Hosmer et al., 2013).

Table 2S

T-test Results Comparing Dropouts and Completers with Reliability Coefficients of the Scales

	Dropouts (n = 145)		Completers (n = 268)		t	Cronbach's α
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*		
Age	40.86	12.58	42.61	12.53	1.35	
Number of children	2.06	0.89	2.16	0.96	0.63	
T1: Personal recovery	3.64	0.69	3.82	0.61	2.63**	.92 (.91)
T1: Self-stigma	2.52	0.72	2.28	0.60	3.53***	.82 (.83)
T1: Psychological distress	1.37	0.56	1.24	0.51	2.50*	.89 (.89)
T1: SoCM	3.56	0.72	3.82	0.68	3.62***	.88 (.87)
T1: CSE	3.59	0.77	3.71	0.73	1.64	.82 (.86)
Extraversion	3.50	0.82	3.65	0.88	1.76	.57 [a]
Agreeableness	3.44	0.71	3.63	0.62	2.87**	.45 [a]
Conscientiousness	3.58	0.88	3.73	0.78	1.71	.54 [a]
Neuroticism	3.34	0.96	3.14	0.92	2.02*	.68 [a]
Openness	3.85	0.92	3.88	0.86	0.33	.53 [a]

Note. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$; T2 Cronbach's α values are in parenthesis. [a] Spearman-Brown coefficient; CSE= creative self-efficacy; SoCM= sense of community membership

Differences between the Integrated Groups and Control Group

To explore the potential confounders in the relationship between group and the variables of interest, a t-test was computed. As seen in Table 3S, those in the integrated arts-based groups reported significantly more openness and greater psychological distress at the two time points. No significant differences were found between the two groups in the other variables at the two time points. As shown, no significant differences were found in the change score of the outcome variables between the integrated and control groups.

Table 3S

Descriptive Statistics and t-Test Results Comparing Integrated Groups vs. Control Group for People with MHCs

Dependent variable	Integrated groups (n = 141)		Control group (n = 127)		t
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	
Extraversion	3.72	0.89	3.58	0.86	1.30
Agreeableness	3.62	0.67	3.65	0.57	0.35
Conscientiousness	3.74	0.79	3.71	0.80	0.37
Neuroticism	3.22	0.89	3.06	0.95	1.50
Openness	4.01	0.86	3.74	0.84	2.60**
T1: Personal recovery	3.81	0.59	3.83	0.64	0.31
T1: Self-stigma	2.31	0.61	2.24	0.59	0.94
T1: Psychological distress	1.33	0.51	1.14	0.49	2.96**
T1: Sense of community membership	3.82	0.67	3.82	0.69	0.04
T1: Creative self-efficacy	3.75	0.74	3.66	0.71	1.01
T2: Personal recovery	3.86	0.62	3.89	0.56	0.46
T2: Self-stigma	2.29	0.62	2.22	0.60	0.95
T2: Psychological distress	1.30	0.49	1.14	0.48	2.58**
T2: Sense of community membership	3.84	0.71	3.81	0.65	0.29
T2: Creative self-efficacy	3.75	0.76	3.70	0.73	0.48
Δ Personal recovery	0.05	0.48	0.06	0.45	0.18
Δ Self-stigma	-0.03	0.48	-0.03	0.39	0.04
Δ Psychological distress	-0.03	0.38	-0.00	0.38	0.56

Note. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

Differences between Time 1 (T1) and Time 2 (T2) in People with MHCs

As seen in Table 4S, results of a paired sample t-test yielded only yielded differences between T1 and T2 in personal recovery, for the total sample of people with MHCs.

Table 4S

Summary of Paired T-test at T1 vs. T2 for People with MHCs

	T1 *M (SD)*	T2 *M (SD)*	t
Total sample (N = 268)			
Personal recovery	3.82 (0.61)	3.88 (0.59)	2.03*
Self-stigma	2.28 (0.60)	2.26 (0.61)	0.97
Psychological distress	1.24 (0.51)	1.22 (0.49)	0.67
SoCM	3.83 (0.67)	3.83 (0.68)	0.23
Creative self-efficacy	3.71 (0.72)	3.73 (0.73)	0.55
Integrated groups (N = 141)			
Personal recovery	3.81 (0.59)	3.86 (0.62)	1.31
Self-stigma	2.31 (0.61)	2.29 (0.62)	0.61
Psychological distress	1.33 (0.51)	1.30 (0.48)	0.88
SoCM	3.82 (0.66)	3.84 (0.70)	0.46
Creative self-efficacy	3.75 (0.74)	3.75 (0.73)	0.05
Control group (N = 127)			
Personal recovery	3.83 (0.63)	3.89 (0.56)	1.57
Self-stigma	2.24 (0.59)	2.22 (0.60)	0.78
Psychological distress	1.14 (0.49)	1.14 (0.48)	0.04
SoCM	3.83 (0.69)	3.82 (0.65)	0.14
Creative self-efficacy	3.66 (0.71)	3.71 (0.73)	0.88

Note. SoCM= sense of community membership. *$p \leq .05$, **$p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

Intervariable Correlations with Background Variables

Among the participants with MHCs who attended the integrated groups, no significant correlations were found between group duration and the change score in personal recovery ($p = .310$), self-stigma ($p = .652$), psychological distress ($p = .097$), sense of community membership ($p = .699$) or CSE ($p = .821$).

Pearson correlations were calculated to test whether the outcomes were correlated with the three variables that differed between the two groups: socioeconomic status, past attendance in an integrated group, and openness as

measured at Time 1 (see above Table **1S** and Table **3S**). As seen in Table **5S**, significant correlations were found between openness and socioeconomic status with the variables of interest at the two time points. Based on the results, socioeconomic status and openness were entered as covariates to the hypotheses testing models, to control their effect on the results.

Table 5S

Correlation Table of Potential Covariates with Personal Recovery, Self-Stigma, and Psychological Distress at the Two Time Points for People with MHCs

	Socioeconomic status	Past attendance in integrated group	Openness
T1: Personal recovery	.211***	.066	.263***
T1: Self-stigma	-.196**	.054	-.272***
T1: Psychological distress	-.224***	.046	-.161**
T1: SoCM	.229***	.045	.189**
T1: Creative self-efficacy	.144*	-.016	.422***
T2: Personal recovery	.164**	.005	.158**
T2: Self-stigma	-.165**	.052	-.268***
T2: Psychological distress	-.205***	.065	-.118
T2: SoCM	.175**	.027	.152*
T2: Creative self-efficacy	.121*	.025	.361***

Note. $N = 268$. SoCM = sense of community membership * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

Correlations between Process Variables, In-Group Variables, and Change in Outcomes

As seen in Table 6S, a significant correlation was found between change in process variables (CSE and sense of community membership) and change in outcome variables (personal recovery, self-stigma, and psychological distress) in at least one of the groups or in the total sample. Furthermore, participants' involvement (as reported by the facilitators) did not correlate with any of the change scores, whereas group cohesion (self-reported by the participants) significantly but moderately correlated in

the expected direction with the change in personal recovery, self-stigma, and psychological distress.

Table 6S

Pearson Correlations of Change in Personal Recovery, Self-Stigma, Psychological Distress with Change in CSE, Change in Sense of Community Membership, Group Cohesion and Participant Involvement

	Total sample (*N*=268)		Integrated (*n*=141)				Control (*n*=127)	
	Δ CSE	Δ SoCM	Δ CSE	Δ SoCM	COH	PINV	Δ CSE	Δ SoCM
Δ PR	.492**	.239**	.478**	.243**	.192*	0.021	510**	.237**
Δ STG	-.247**	-.179**	-.276**	-0.141	-.170*	-0.129	-.209*	-.234**
Δ PsD	-.355**	-.203**	-.440**	-0.161	-.168*	-0.073	-.260**	-.250**

Note. CSE= creative self-efficacy; SoCM = sense of community membership; COH = group cohesion; PINV = participant involvement; PR = personal recovery; STG = self-stigma; PsD = psychological distress; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$

Non-clinical community Members: Preliminary Analysis Results

Table 7S

Distribution of Demographics and Background Data of Non-Clinical Community Members by Group

Variable	value	Integrated groups		Control group		Total		
		n=169	%	*n*=205	%	*N*=374	%	*p*
Gender	Male	53	31.4	59	28.8	112	29.9	.588
	Female	116	68.6	146	71.2	262	70.1	
Age	M (SD)	40.01 (16.72)		35.22 (11.76)		37.40 (14. 38)		.001
	Range	18 - 78		18 - 73		18 - 78		
Country of birth	Israel	130	76.9	167	81.5	297	79.4	.280
	Other	39	23.1	38	185	77	20.6	
Religion	Jewish	159	94.1	202	98.5	361	96.5	.019
	Other	10	5.9	3	1.5	13	3.5	
Religiousness	Secular	108	63.9	136	66.3	244	65.2	.101
	Traditional	39	23.1	46	22.4	85	22.7	
	Religious	14	8.3	22	10.7	36	9.6	
	Very religious	2	1.2	0	0	2	0.5	
	Other	6	3.6	1	0.5	7	1.9	
Marital status	Married/ with partner	79	46.7	128	62.4	207	55.3	.002
	Other	90	53.3	77	37.6	167	44.7	
Children	No	94	55.6	94	45.9	188	50.3	.060
	Yes	75	44.4	111	54.1	186	49.7	
Residence area	North	13	7.7	11	5.4	24	6.4	.268
	Haifa and Krayot	16	9.5	20	9.8	36	9.6	
	Center	98	58	104	50.7	202	54	
	Jerusalem area	29	17.2	45	22	74	19.8	
	Judea and Samaria	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.3	
	South	12	7.1	25	12.2	37	9.9	
Place of Residence	Parents	20	11.8	39	19	59	15.8	≤ .001
	Family	81	47.9	135	65.9	216	57.8	
	With a flat mate	32	18.9	7	3.4	39	10.4	
	Alone	32	18.9	19	9.3	51	13.6	
	Assisted living	4	2.4	5	2.4	9	2.4	

Table 7S continued.

Variable	value	Integrated groups		Control group		Total		
		n=169	%	*n*=205	%	*N*=374	%	*p*
Educational level	Elementary school	2	1.2	0	0	2	0.5	.186
	Middle school	1	0.6	0	0	1	0.3	
	High school	48	28.4	48	48	96	25.7	
	Post-secondary/ vocational	33	19.5	49	49	82	21.9	
	Academic	85	50.3	108	108	193	51.6	
Employment status	Unemployed	50	29.6	24	11.7	74	19.8	≤ .001
	Part time or odd jobs	47	27.8	29	14.1	76	20.3	
	Full time	72	42.6	152	74.1	224	59.9	
Socioeconomic status	Below average	22	13	48	23.4	70	18.7	.162
	Average	124	73.4	125	61	249	66.6	
	Above average	23	13.6	32	15.6	55	14.7	
Frequency of visiting the community center	Not at all	111	65.7	152	74.1	263	70.3	.187
	Once every 2-3 weeks	18	10.7	21	10.2	39	10.4	
	Once a week	21	12.4	20	9.8	41	11.0	
	Twice a week or more	19	11.2	12	5.9	31	8.3	
Past attendance of integrated group	No	138	81.7	205	100	343	91.7	≤ .001
	Yes	31	18.3	0	0	31	8.3	

Note. Continuous variables were tested using a t-test for independent samples; categorical variables were tested using a Pearson Chi square or a Fisher exact test; ordinal variables were tested using a Chi square test for linear trends.

Common Method Variance (CMV) and Measurement Model Fit Tests

Similar to the above, as recommended by Podsakoff et al., (2003), on Harman's single factor test all scales items were forced to load on a single factor in EFA with the principal axis factoring extraction method without rotation, accounting for 16.22% of the variance explained by the single factor, which was sufficiently far from the threshold of 50%. To confirm the results, a CLF was included in the CFA model in AMOS.v25. Then, the differences between standardized regression weights of the models with CLF and without CLF were calculated. All differences were below 0.2, indicating that the responses were not biased. Thus, there was no need to retain

the CLF in the model to impute the values. CFA was also used to confirm the factor structure (measurement model), which was acceptable based on the common fit indices: $\chi 2/df = 1.86$, RMSEA = 0.05, CFI= 0.91 (Schreiber et al., 2006). The internal consistency reliability of the seven scales was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficients which ranged from .825 to .847.

Dropout Analysis

Of the 427 initial community members, 53 completed only Time 1, and 393 completed the two timepoints (12.4% dropout rate). Outliers and cases with a low attention score (two or more misses, including for the two time points) were removed from the completers' data (n = 19), resulting in a final dataset of 374 community members (completers). Dropouts were significantly higher than completers in Agreeableness ($p \leq .01$, Cohen's d = 0.40) and Openness ($p \leq .001$, Cohen's d =0.51), and lower in public stigma ($p \leq .01$, Cohen's d = 0.39) and social distance ($p \leq .05$, Cohen's d = 0.35). See Table 8S for the full t-test results comparing dropouts and completers. Next, based on the above findings, a logistic regression model was carried out to estimate the accuracy of predicting dropout explained by public stigma, social distance, agreeableness, and openness. The model explained less than 1% of the variance of dropout, correctly classified 0% of dropouts and 76.5% of the cases (including dropouts and completers) with an area under the curve (AUC) equal to 0.57, which suggests poor ability of the model to distinguish between dropouts and completers (Hosmer et al., 2013).

Table 8S

T-test Results Comparing Dropouts and Completers with Reliability Coefficients of the Scales

	Dropouts (n = 53)		Completers (n = 374)		t	Cronbach's α
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*		
Age	42.59	19.30	37.39	14.40	1.86	
T1: Public stigma	3.05	0.89	3.37	0.75	2.82**	.83 (.83)
T1: Creative self-efficacy	4.12	0.65	4.02	0.64	1.10	.85 (.86)
T1: Desire for social distance	0.90	0.64	1.11	0.55	2.50*	.83 (.84)
Extraversion	4.04	0.82	3.84	0.80	1.65	.60[a]
Agreeableness	3.90	0.68	3.63	0.66	2.68**	.50[a]
Conscientiousness	3.98	0.75	3.86	0.78	1.04	.48[a]
Neuroticism	2.66	0.81	2.65	0.90	0.14	.71[a]
Openness	4.26	0.68	3.87	0.84	3.83***	.45[a]

Note. Cronbach's α values are calculated based on completers' data; T2 Cronbach's α values are in parenthesis.
[a] Spearman-Brown coefficient; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

Differences Between Integrated Groups and Control

To explore the potential confounders in the relationship between group and variables of interest, a t-test was computed. As seen in Table **9S**, integrated groups were statistically significantly higher in openness, agreeableness, extraversion, level-of-contact with mental illness, and CSE at the two time points, and lower in neuroticism, public stigma, and desire for social distance at the two timepoints. The change score of public stigma and desire for social distance was statistically significantly different in favor of the integrated groups in the expected direction.

Table 9S

Descriptive Statistics and t-Test Results Comparing Integrated Groups vs. Control Group for Community Members

Dependent variable	Integrated groups (n = 169)		Control group (n = 205)		t
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	
Extraversion	4.06	0.75	3.67	0.81	4.81***
Agreeableness	3.82	0.64	3.48	0.64	5.16***
Conscientiousness	3.89	0.77	3.84	0.78	0.71
Neuroticism	2.51	0.91	2.76	0.88	2.76**
Openness	4.20	0.73	3.59	0.82	7.63***
T1: Public stigma	3.15	0.80	3.55	0.65	5.48***
T1: DSD	0.96	0.52	1.23	0.55	4.89***
T1: CSE	4.10	0.64	3.95	0.64	2.34*
T2: Public stigma	3.38	0.73	3.66	0.56	4.09***
T2: DSD	0.85	0.53	1.31	0.59	7.72***
T2: CSE	4.16	0.61	3.94	0.63	3.50***
Δ Public stigma	0.24	0.61	0.10	0.55	2.27*
Δ DSD	-0.10	0.45	0.08	0.43	3.92***
Δ CSE	0.06	0.47	-0.01	0.39	1.58
LoC	8.34	2.35	6.96	2.77	5.23***

Note. DSD = Desire for social distance; CSE = creative self-efficacy. LoC = level-of-contact with mental illness. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

Differences between Time 1 (T1) and Time 2 (T2) in Community Members

As seen in Table 10S, the results of a paired sample t-test yielded differences between T1 and T2 in public stigma in all groups, and in desire for social distance in the integrated groups and control group.

Table 10S

Summary of Paired T-test between T1 and T2 for Community Members

	T1 *M (SD)*	T2 *M (SD)*	t
Total sample (N = 374)			
Public stigma	3.37 (0.75)	3.53 (0.66)	5.41***
Creative self-efficacy	4.02 (0.64)	4.04 (0.63)	1.00
Desire for social distance	1.11 (0.55)	1.10 (0.60)	0.24
Integrated groups (N = 169)			
Public stigma	3.14 (0.80)	3.38 (0.73)	5.06***
Creative self-efficacy	4.10 (0.64)	4.16 (0.61)	1.70
Desire for social distance	0.96 (0.52)	0.85 (0.53)	3.01**
Control group (N = 205)			
Public stigma	3.55 (0.65)	3.66 (0.56)	2.62**
Creative self-efficacy	3.95 (0.64)	3.94 (0.63)	0.37
Desire for social distance	1.23 (0.55)	1.31 (0.59)	2.49*

Note. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

Intervariable Correlations with Background Variables

Because age, level-of-contact with mental illness, extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, and openness measured at Time 1 (see Table **7S** and Table **9S**) differed between the two groups, Pearson correlations were calculated to test whether these variables were correlated with the outcome variables. As seen in Table **11S**, significant correlations were found between age, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism, and public stigma at the two time points. Based on the results, age, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism were entered as covariates to the hypotheses testing models, to control for their effect on the results.

Table 11S

Correlation Table of Potential Covariates with Process and Outcome Variables at the Two Time Points for Non-Clinical Community Members

	LoC	AGE	E	A	C	N	O	T2: PS	T2: DSD	T2: CSE
LoC								-.089	-.271**	.156**
AGE	-.057							-.100	.149**	-.054
E	.018	.161**						-.126*	-.029	.373***
A	.036	.133**	.331***					-.181***	-.265***	.180***
C	-.131*	.170**	.308***	.201***				-.010	.037	.275***
N	.111*	-.128*	-.332***	-.383***	-.345***			.134**	.112*	-.266***
O	.216**	-.010	.287***	.198***	.107*	-.061		-.050	-.234***	.414***
T1: PS	-.024	-.204***	-.195***	-.307***	-.023	.219***	-.082	.662***	.177**	-.019
T1: DSD	-.283**	.192***	.020	-.222***	.132*	.013	-.210***	.162**	.707***	-.154**
T1: CSE	.099	.005	.371***	.200***	.288***	-.265***	.445***	-.057	-.093	.775***

Note. N = 374. LoC = Level-of-contact with mental illness; E = extraversion; A = agreeableness; C = conscientiousness; N = neuroticism; O = openness; PS = public stigma; DSD = desire for social distance; CSE = creative self-efficacy; Correlations between T1 and T2 variables are on the diagonal. *$p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

Correlations between Process Variables, In-Group Variables, and Change in Outcomes

As seen in Table 12S, the initial analysis indicated a significant positive correlation between change in desire for social distance and change in public stigma in the total sample and the control group.

Table 12S

Pearson Correlations for Change in Public Stigma with changes in CSE and Desire for Social Distance and with Group Cohesion and Participant Involvement

	Total sample (N=374)		Integrated (n=169)				Control (n=205)	
	Δ CSE	Δ DSD	Δ CSE	Δ DSD	COH	PINV	Δ CSE	Δ DSD
Δ Public stigma	-.028	.180***	-.103	.113	.043	-.087	.033	.299***

Note. Δ CSE= change in creative self-efficacy; Δ DSD = change in desire for social distance; COH= group cohesion; PINV= participant involvement; * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

References

Byrne, B. M. (2016). *Structural equation modeling with Amos: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Hosmer, D. W., Lemeshow, S., & Sturdivant, R. X. (2013). *Applied logistic regression* (Vol. 398). John Wiley & Sons.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879-903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Schreiber, J. B., Nora, A., Stage, F. K., Barlow, E. A., & King, J. (2006). Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: A review. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99*(6), 323-338. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.99.6.323-338