

## Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist

Developed from:

Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19(6), 349–357.

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on Page #
<b>Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity</b>		
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>		
1. Inter viewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the inter view or focus group?	All authors participated in conducting the interviews
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	All researchers had a PhD degree
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	All researchers were teaching and research staff at the respective universities.
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	A man and three women.
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	All of the people have had previous experiences in other research projects as well as experience with qualitative work in their doctoral thesis. In addition, you have other recent publications of a qualitative nature such as the work of the author Irene Crestar Fariña: Martínez-Figueira, M. E., Fernández-Menor, I., Crestar-Fariña, I. y Mulloni Martínez, S. (2024). What is the meaning of family participation in schools? A multi-voice perspective, <i>Educational Research</i> , 66(4), 381-395. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2024.2385414">https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2024.2385414</a> ; Sierra-Martínez, S., Crestar, I., Fernández- Menor, I. & Latas, Á.P. (2024) Theory is inclusive, practice is integrative? Discourses on inclusion in the education community. <i>Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs</i> , 25, 209-221. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12720">https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12720</a>
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship	Was a relationship	Yes

established	established prior to study commencement?	
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher?	Reasons for doing the research
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator?	Reasons and interests for studying, university of origin and professional work context
<b>Domain 2: study design</b>		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study?	As mentioned in line 188 and following, it is a qualitative, exploratory and interpretive study. Discourse analysis and content analysis are performed
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected?	Proposals and snowball (lines 217-219)
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached?	Face to face
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	39
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	None
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected?	Workplace or public places
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	No
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample?	Direct relationship with inclusion, at a professional and/or personal level
<i>Data collection</i>		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Yes. Yes.
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	No
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Yes, audio recording.
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the	Yes

	inter view or focus group?	
21. Duration	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	Approximately one hour (line: 278)
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Yes (lines 234-236)
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	Yes
<b>Domain 3: analysis and findings</b>		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	4 authors
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	Yes (line: 338)
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Yes
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	MAXQDA (line: 331)
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	Yes, but not in a significant way, the results were discussed with some significant participants
<i>Reporting</i>		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified?	Yes. Yes.
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Yes
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	No