### Supplemental Table 1. Summary of Data Extracted for the Three Studies Included in the Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Study Objectives</th>
<th>Level/Design/Participants</th>
<th>Intervention and Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DeCarlo & Mann (1985)  | Are activity groups more effective than verbal groups at improving self-perceptions of interpersonal communication skills? | Level I  
Randomized controlled trial  
Participants  
N = 19 male outpatients attending a psychiatric day treatment center  
Age range = 26–64 yr  
Ethnicity: Not given  
Diagnoses: Schizophrenia, depression  
Conditions: A, B, and C—further split of demographics not given | Intervention  
Condition A: group activity completion  
Condition B: group verbal discussion  
Condition C: treatment as usual (milieu therapy)  
Setting: Buffalo Veterans Administration Hospital Day Treatment Center  
Who Delivered: Same 2 facilitators for each of the experimental groups, a registered occupational therapist and the primary investigator as cotherapist  
Frequency: 1×/wk for 60 min  
Duration: 8 wk  
Outcome Measure  
The Interpersonal Communication Inventory—measures participants’ perceptions of their own social skills  
Used before and after intervention | Posteriori comparison found that the only significant improvement difference (p < .05) was between the activity and verbal groups, with those in the activity group reporting a higher level of interpersonal skill improvement than those in the verbal therapy group to a significant level. However, neither the activity group nor the verbal therapy group performed statistically significantly better than the control group. | No inclusion or exclusion criteria given  
Ethnicity not given  
All male participants  
Subjective measures: Participant self-report  
Small sample size  
Adequate randomization not described  
Demographics not fully given or comparable for groups at baseline  
No information regarding blinding, and primary investigator is cofacilitator of groups  
No use of confidence intervals to aid inference  
No longer-term follow-up |
| Klyczek & Mann (1986) | Do differences in treatment approach relate to differences in symptom reduction, community tenure, and relapse rate? A comparison of 2 day-treatment centers, 1 offering twice as much activity therapy as verbal therapy and the other offering twice as much verbal therapy as activity therapy | Level II  
Cohort study  
Participants  
N = 122 outpatients attending 2 psychiatric day-treatment centers  
Age range = ≥18 yr  
Ethnicity: White  
Gender: Condition A, 44% men, 56% women; Condition B, 67% men, 33% women  
Diagnosis: All had a primary diagnosis of chronic schizophrenia. | Intervention  
Condition A: Day treatment consisting of twice as much activity therapy as verbal therapy  
Condition B: Day treatment consisting of twice as much verbal therapy as activity therapy  
Setting: 2 adult psychiatric day-treatment programs in western New York  
Who Delivered: Day treatment program staff | Mean Symptom Reduction: Activity group = 1.81, verbal group = −0.52  
Mean Community Tenure (in Days): Activity group = 383.21, verbal group = 374.42  
Mean Relapse Rate (× Times): Activity group = 0.67, verbal group = 0.18  
Mean Length of Stay When Hospitalized: Activity group = 9.75 days, verbal group = 26.15 days | Participants’ primary diagnosis of schizophrenia only  
No control condition  
Comprehensive Mental Health Assessment administered by participants’ primary therapist; therefore, possible bias  
Variable time between first and second measurement  
Comprehensive Mental Health Assessment tool not validated |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Study Objectives</th>
<th>Level/Design/Participants</th>
<th>Intervention and Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Study Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Schindler (1999) | Are groups effective in improving social interaction skills? A study of verbal groups, activity groups, and a control group | Level II Cohort study | Frequency  
- Condition A: Average 4.21 hr/wk activity therapy, 2.17 hr/wk verbal therapy  
- Condition B: Average 1.75 hr/wk activity therapy, 3.16 hr/wk verbal therapy | No further quantitative analysis was used; therefore, statistical inferences cannot be made. | Discrepancy of numbers in each intervention group (A: n = 89, B: n = 33)  
Acknowledges other confounding factors, but does not control for or collect data on these  
Basic descriptive statistics only—no statistical testing or inferential statistics  
No information regarding blinding  
Variety of data collectors and variety of group facilitators  
No details of attrition  
No longer-term follow-up |
| | | Participants  
N = 25 outpatients attending a psychiatric day hospital center  
Age range = 19–64 yr  
Ethnicity: 10% African-American; 65% Hispanic or Asian; 25% White  
Gender: 13 men, 12 women  
Diagnosis: Schizophrenia, n = 22; major affective disorder, n = 3  
Condition: A, B, and C—further split of demographics not given | Intervention  
Condition A: Verbally based group  
Condition B: Activity-based group  
Condition C: Provided with facilities and given free choice |  
Setting: A metropolitan day hospital center  
Who Delivered: The same experienced occupational therapist facilitated both experimental groups and monitored the control group periodically.  
The author of the study and the occupational therapist discussed |  
One-way analysis of variance showed significant difference between the groups.  
Post hoc Scheffé test (p = .05) showed that the significant difference occurred between the activity group and both the discussion and control groups in terms of outcome.  
Paired t test showed significant improvement in scores for activity group (t = 6.22, p = .002) but no significant changes for discussion group (t = 1.47, p = .179) or control group (t = 1.93, p = .085) in terms of outcome. |  
Small sample  
Variation in number of participants allocated to each group (A: n = 9, B: n = 6, C: n = 10)  
Acknowledges confounding factors, but does not control for these or collect relevant data  
Demographics not fully given or comparable for groups at baseline  
Pretest procedures not fully described—potential for time lapse between inclusion scoring and beginning the intervention to be variable |
and decided group topics together for both experimental groups.

**Frequency**: 45 min/day, 5 days/wk, for each condition

**Duration**: 2 wk

**Outcome Measures**
- Global Assessment Scale (GAS) completed when participants were put forward for study; no information on how long before the study this was done and no information given about any re-test using GAS
- Adapted Social Functioning Index (completed at Session 1 and Session 10)

Mean improvement in skills calculated for all groups (where negative results identify improvement) in terms of outcome were as follows:
- Activity group = −0.9446 (significant).
- Discussion group = −0.2308 (not significant).
- Control group = 0.3525 (not significant).

Raw figures for attrition given but not explored further (A [structured discussion]: 75% completed the course, B [activity]: 50% completed the course, C [free choice]: 83.3% completed the course).

Short study (2 wk)

No use of confidence intervals to aid inference

No longer-term follow-up
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