Online Supplement - The Effectiveness of the NAMI Homefront Program for Military and Veteran Families: In-person and Online Benefits

Description of NAMI Homefront Class Formats and Sizes: The online program is delivered as a live webinar, with teachers using PowerPoint to present material along with lecture, while in-person teachers present the material verbally using white boards or flip charts and lecture. The curriculum content is identical in both formats. The manuals have built-in stopping points for group discussion; online participants may use a microphone to speak, or type in a communal chatbox which teachers narrate. For introductions and sharing personal stories, online teachers and participants use webcams. Mirroring the in-person format, the online platform also allows splitting into small groups to facilitate participation in skills workshops. The suggested class size is 12-14 participants. Online classes typically reach capacity, while in-person classes have been known to vary, ranging from groups of four to 18, depending on location (e.g. rural states).

Participant States: In-person classes spanned 15 states in all regions of the U.S. (West (AZ, CA, OR); Midwest (IA, IL, MO, NE, OH); Northeast (NY); South (DE, GA, MD, OK, TN, TX)). Online participants resided across 22 states in all regions of the U.S. (West (CA, MT, OR, UT, WA); Midwest (IA, IL, KS, MI, OH, WI); Northeast (CT, MA, ME, NJ, NY, RI); South (FL, GA, NC, SC, TX)).

Approximate Study Enrollment Rate: We do not have the total number of class participants who were actually offered study participation; however, the average class sizes for in-person and online classes were 8 and 12 participants respectively. If we assume that all participants were offered participation, we estimate a study enrollment rate of approximately 36% for in-person programs, and

1

50% for online programs. We do not have information on the characteristics of program participants who took the class but did not enroll in the study.

Comparison of NAMI Homefront to FTF intervention on demographics and baseline scores: See the tables on the following pages for comparison of demographics and baseline measures. NAMI Homefront participants were significantly more female, more likely to be a spouse (rather than a parent), and less likely to be white in comparison to participants in FTF (3). At baseline, participants in NAMI Homefront had significantly greater community-focused empowerment, less worry (subjective burden) and more positive experience of caregiving (all ECI scales used), but worse acceptance (coping), worse psychological distress across all subscales, and worse family functioning (both general and problem-solving scales) than FTF participants (3, 5).

	NAMI Homefront Baseline (N=119)		FTF Base (N=133				
Characteristic ^a	Ν	%	Ν	%	T Value	df	P Value
Age (M±SD)	50.8±13.6		52.6±10.2		1.196	250	0.232
					Chi-square	df	P Value
Gender					10.746	1	0.001
Male	11	9	33	25			
Female	108	91	99	75			
Race/Ethnicity ^c					4.141	1	0.041
White or Caucasian	64	57	92	70			
Non-White or Caucasian	48	43	40	30			
Education ^d					1.518	1	0.217
Less than college graduate	32	27	46	35			
College graduate or higher	85	73	87	65			
Relationship to ill family member ^e					53.833 ^f	2	< 0.001
Parent	23	20	75	56			
Spouse/partner	64	54	18	14			
Other	31	26	40	30			

Comparison of demographic characteristics for NAMI Homefront and FTF intervention participants

^a Income was excluded from analysis because data were missing for 24 (20%) of NAMI Homefront participants. Diagnoses were excluded from analysis because FTF reported mutually exclusive groups and NAMI Homefront did not; additionally there was a lack of overlapping groups (e.g. no PTSD in FTF group). ^b Data retrieved from Dixon et al. (3)

^c n=6 missing for NAMI Homefront; n=1 missing for FTF

^d n=2 missing from NAMI Homefront

^e n=1 missing from NAMI Homefront

parent*spouse post-hoc: T=53.255; df=1; p<0.001 parent*other post-hoc: T=7.720; df=1; p<0.01

spouse*other post-hoc: T=19.115; df=1; p<0.001

			NAMI Homefront Baseline (N=119)		FTF Baseline (N=133) ^a				
Measure	Items	Scoring Range	Μ	SD	Μ	SD	T Value	df	P Value
Empowerment									
Family Empowerment Scale									
Family subscale	12	1-5 ^b	3.4	0.8	3.4	0.6	0	250	1.000
Service system subscale	10	1-5 ^b	3.2	0.9	3.2	0.8	0	250	1.000
Community subscale	12	1-5 ^b	2.9	1.0	2.6	0.7	2.781	250	0.005
Knowledge test	16-20 ^c	0-100 ^b	57.4	25.0	60.6	16.8	1.203	250	0.229
Subjective burden									
FEIS ^d									
Worry subscale	7	0-4 ^e	2.4	0.9	2.7	0.8	2.801	250	0.005
Displeasure subscale	7	1-5 ^e	2.7	1.1	2.8	0.8	0.831	250	0.406
Coping									
Brief COPE Inventory									
Acceptance subscale	4	4-16 ^b	12.3	3.2	13.0	2.3	2.008	250	0.045
Psychological distress									
BSI (T score) ^f									
Global severity index	18	33-81 ^e	57.0	12.0	51.8	9.0	3.916	250	< 0.001
Somatization scale	6	33-81 ^e	53.3	11.1	48.2	8.2	4.176	250	< 0.001
Depression scale	6	33-81 ^e	58.1	11.1	52.0	9.2	4.766	250	< 0.001
Anxiety scale	6	33-81 ^e	56.5	12.1	52.5	9.1	2.984	250	0.003
Family functioning									
Family Assessment Device									
General functioning scale	12	12-48 ^e	28.6	7.1	24.8	6.6	4.402	250	< 0.001
Problem-solving scale	6	6-24 ^e	14.4	3.5	13.0	3.0	3.418	250	< 0.001

Comparison of baseline outcome scores for NAMI Homefront and FTF intervention participants

Caregiving experience									
ECI ^g									
Positive personal experience subscale	8	0-32 ^b	20.5	5.4	17.8	5.9	3.908	275 ^h	< 0.001
Good aspect of relationship subscale	6	0-24 ^b	14.6	5.4	13.2	4.5	2.350	275 ^h	0.019
Positive scale (both above)	14	0-56 ^b	35.2	9.6	31.0	9.1	3.713	275 ^h	< 0.001

^a Data retrieved from Dixon et al. (3), with the exception of ECI scales (see ^g below) ^b The higher the score, the better the outcome (better knowledge, better coping)

^c The NAMI Homefront knowledge measure was 16-items while the FTF knowledge measure was 20-items

^d FEIS, Family Experiences Interview Schedule

^e The higher the score, the worse the outcome (more worry, more depression symptoms, worse functioning)

^fBSI, Brief Symptom Inventory ^gECI, Experience of Caregiving Inventory

^h The FTF results for ECI were obtained from Toohey et al. (5) which included all FTF individuals with a baseline assessment (N=158). The remainder of the results in this table were obtained from Dixon et al. (3) which did not include ECI scales, and only included FTF individuals who completed a follow-up assessment (N=133).