# Online Resource 1

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

**Manuscript title:** A Lifelong Responsibility: A Transcendental Phenomenological Study of Mothers of Children with Disabilities

Page numbers refer to the anonymized manuscript file submitted for review.

Developed from: Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, *19*(6), 349–357. https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042

| No. | Item | Guide questions/description | Reported in (section, page) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity** | | | |
| **Personal characteristics** | | | |
| 1 | Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? | One of the authors facilitated the focus group. *Researcher Characteristics*, p. 12 |
| 2 | Credentials | What were the researcher's credentials? (e.g. PhD, MD) | PhD in Guidance and Psychological Counseling. *Researcher Characteristics*, p. 12 |
| 3 | Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? | Associate Professor (academic). *Researcher Characteristics*, p. 12 |
| 4 | Gender | Was the researcher male or female? | Male. *Researcher Characteristics*, pp. 12–13 |
| 5 | Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have? | Qualitative research, counseling, special education, family-related research and facilitation of group processes. *Researcher Characteristics*, p. 12 |
| **Relationship with participants** | | | |
| 6 | Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? | No prior personal or professional relationship. *Researcher Characteristics*, p. 12 |
| 7 | Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? (e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research) | Informed about the purpose of the study and the researcher's role. *Researcher Characteristics*, p. 12 |
| 8 | Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? (e.g. bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic) | Professional background, dual role (facilitator and coder), insider–outsider positioning and reflexive strategies. *Researcher Characteristics*, pp. 12–13 |
| **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) | Moustakas's transcendental phenomenology. *Research Model*, p. 6; *Data Analysis*, pp. 10–11 |
| **Participant selection** | | | |
| 10 | Sampling | How were participants selected? (e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball) | Criterion (purposive) sampling with stated inclusion criteria. *Study Group*, p. 7 |
| 11 | Method of approach | How were participants approached? (e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email) | Study announcements at rehabilitation centers. *Study Group*, p. 7 |
| 12 | Sample size | How many participants were in the study? | Six mothers. *Study Group*, p. 7; table 1, p. 8 |
| 13 | Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons? | Eight mothers expressed interest; two could not participate because of scheduling constraints. *Study Group*, p. 7 |
| **Setting** | | | |
| 14 | Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? (e.g. home, clinic, workplace) | Online via Zoom; participants joined from their own homes. *Data Collection*, pp. 9–10 |

| No. | Item | Guide questions/description | Reported in (section, page) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Presence of non-participants | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? | No one other than the participants and the researcher. *Data Collection*, pp. 9–10 |
| 16 | Description of sample | What are the important characteristics of the sample? (e.g. demographic data, date) | Age, education, marital status, number of children, child's age and type of disability. Table 1, p. 8 |
| **Data collection** | | | |
| 17 | Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? | Three main questions and 11 follow-up questions, reviewed by three experts; main questions and example probes reported; not pilot tested. *Interview Form*, pp. 8–10 |
| 18 | Repeat interviews | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many? | No; a single online focus group session, with no follow-up interviews. *Data Collection*, pp. 9–10; *Limitations*, pp. 27–29 |
| 19 | Audio/visual recording | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? | Audio recording, with participants' permission. *Data Collection*, pp. 9–10 |
| 20 | Field notes | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? | Yes, field notes were kept throughout the session. *Data Collection*, pp. 9–10 |
| 21 | Duration | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? | 104 minutes (mean speaking time per participant approx. 14 minutes, range 11–16). *Study Group*, pp. 7–8; *Data Collection*, p. 10 |
| 22 | Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? | Yes; saturation was not used as a criterion, and sample adequacy was justified with reference to information power and the depth of individual accounts. *Study Group*, pp. 7–8 |
| 23 | Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? | No; member checking was not conducted. *Trustworthiness*, p. 12 |
| **Domain 3: Analysis and findings** | | | |
| **Data analysis** | | | |
| 24 | Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? | Two researchers coded independently; themes reviewed by the full team. *Data Analysis*, p. 11; *Researcher Characteristics*, pp. 12–13 |
| 25 | Description of the coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? | Significant statements, meaning units, individual experiential accounts, then themes and subthemes. *Data Analysis*, pp. 10–11; table 2, pp. 14–16 |
| 26 | Derivation of themes | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? | Derived from the data (horizontalization and phenomenological synthesis). *Data Analysis*, pp. 10–11 |
| 27 | Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? | None; data were analyzed manually. *Data Analysis*, p. 11 |
| 28 | Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the findings? | No; member checking was not conducted. Reflective summaries were checked with participants during the session. *Trustworthiness*, p. 12; *Researcher Characteristics*, pp. 12–13 |
| **Reporting** | | | |
| 29 | Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? (e.g. participant number) | Yes; quotations are identified by code name and participant number (P1–P6). *Results*, pp. 16–21; table 2, pp. 14–16 |
| 30 | Data and findings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? | Yes; individual accounts, themes, composite descriptions and essence. *Results*, pp. 13–22 |
| 31 | Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? | Four themes (dimensions). *Results*, pp. 13–14 and 16–21; table 2, pp. 14–16 |

| No. | Item | Guide questions/description | Reported in (section, page) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? | Subthemes and individual variation across mothers are described. *Results*, pp. 13–14 and 16–21; table 2, pp. 14–16 |