**COREQ** Table 1 For: **BPSY-D-20-00084** Impacts of stigma and discrimination in the workplace on people living with psychosis

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

| **No** | **Item** | **Guide questions/description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity**  |   |   |
| Personal Characteristics  |   |   |
| 1.  | Interviewer/facilitator  | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?  Dr Margaret Hampson |
| 2.  | Credentials  | What were the researcher's credentials? *E.g. PhD, MD* Margaret was a PhD student with more than 20 years psychology experience |
| 3.  | Occupation  | What was their occupation at the time of the study? A Senior Administrator in Centrelink, Australian government.  |
| 4.  | Gender  | Was the researcher male or female?  Female |
| 5.  | Experience and training  | What experience or training did the researcher have? Many years experience as a psychologist, trainer and facilitator for Centrelink |
| Relationship with participants  |   |   |
| 6.  | Relationship established  | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? No |
| 7.  | Participant knowledge of the interviewer  | What did the participants know about the researcher? e*.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research*  |
| 8.  | Interviewer characteristics  | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. *Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic*  |
| **Domain 2: study design**  |   |   |
| Theoretical framework  |   |   |
| 9.  | Methodological orientation and Theory  | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? *e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis*  |
| Participant selection  |   |   |
| 10.  | Sampling  | How were participants selected? *e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball*  |
| 11.  | Method of approach  | How were participants approached? e*.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email* and via posters explaining the study  |
| 12.  | Sample size  | How many participants were in the study? 137 in the current study |
| 13.  | Non-participation  | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? No one dropped out in terms of the current analysis. As invitations were open and voluntary there was no need ‘to refuse to participate’  |
| Setting  |   |   |
| 14.  | Setting of data collection  | Where was the data collected? e*.g. home, clinic, workplace* Focus groups and interviews were held in specified centres at the University and in community centres |
| 15.  | Presence of non-participants  | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? No. However, as part of the research team we also had a second practising facilitator psychologist available.  |
| 16.  | Description of sample  | What are the important characteristics of the sample? *e.g. demographic data, date* A mix of stakeholders in relation to people with psychosis- those with psychosis, helping professionals (psychiatrists, GPs, counsellors, social workers+), employers, HR professionals).  |
| Data collection  |   |   |
| 17.  | Interview guide  | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?  Yes to both questions  |
| 18.  | Repeat interviews  | Were repeat interviews carried out? NO If yes, how many?  |
| 19.  | Audio/visual recording  | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? Yes, audio recording with permission of group and personal responses  |
| 20.  | Field notes  | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? Observations and notes were made to assist recollection at a later stage (of analysis) |
| 21.  | Duration  | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?  Usually about 1 hour |
| 22.  | Data saturation  | Was data saturation discussed? For our research purposes and number of focus groups, yes |
| 23.  | Transcripts returned  | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? No- transcribing was checked carefully  |
| **Domain 3: analysis and findings**z  |   |   |
| Data analysis  |   |   |
| 24.  | Number of data coders  | How many data coders coded the data? One but with 2 coders at least recoding and checking |
| 25.  | Description of the coding tree  | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?  No |
| 26.  | Derivation of themes  | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?  |
| 27.  | Software  | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? Thematic analysis was used, with attention to major and sub- nodes in the data.  |
| 28.  | Participant checking  | Did participants provide feedback on the findings? No, not as part of the study |
| Reporting  |   |   |
| 29.  | Quotations presented  | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? YES Was each quotation identified? e*.g. participant number* The participant responses were able to be identified by number  |
| 30.  | Data and findings consistent  | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? There was no cause for concern in the data and the relationships with the themes identified.  |
| 31.  | Clarity of major themes  | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? Definitely (the main two- with 5 minor or sub-themes)  |
| 32.  | Clarity of minor themes  | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? Certainly—the sub-themes are a central part of the study and presentation of results, making an important contribution to our understanding of the impacts of stigma and discrimination among people with psychosis in relation to the workplace.  |