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

| Item | Response | Reported on page/section |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Domain 1: Research team and reﬂexivity |  |  |
| Personal Characteristics |  |  |
| 1. Interviewer/facilitator | The first author conducted the interviews | 8 |
| 2. Credentials | The first author is a PhD candidate and one facilitator of the program under evaluation. The other authors have doctoral qualifications and experience in aged care research, and qualitative evaluations | 8 |
| 3. Occupation | The interviewer was a PhD candidate | 8 |
| 4. Gender | The interviewer is female | 8 |
| 5. Experience or training | The interviewer has several years of experience in residential aged care facilities, working with volunteers and older adults, and several years of experience managing various research projects. | 8 |
| Relationship with participants |  |  |
| 6. Relationship established | The first author <removed for peer review>, a PhD candidate, was known to the participants, as she co-facilitated the Digital Stories program, which involved initial recruitment of volunteers and facilitating education and training sessions as per the above program protocol. She completed all of the interviews. | 8 |
| 7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer | The participants were aware of the above information regarding the interviewer (#6). | 8 |
| 8. Interviewer characteristics | As above (#6). | 8 |
| Domain 2: study design |  |  |
| Theoretical framework |  |  |
| 9. Methodological orientation and Theory | An inductive approach to thematic analysis was taken, in which the themes are data-driven rather than theory-driven and organised around topics related to the research questions (e.g., enablers, barriers). | 9 |
| Participant selection |  |  |
| 10. Sampling | Participants were selected by purposive sampling | 7 |
| 11. Method of approach | Volunteers were approached to participate in the evaluation via email | 8 |
| 12. Sample size | 12 volunteers participated in the study | 8 |
| 13. Non-participation | 12 out of 24 volunteers invited participated in the study (50%). | 8 |
| Setting |  |  |
| 14. Setting of data collection | 9 interviews were face-to-face, and 5 were conducted over the phone. | 8 |
| 15. Presence of non-participants | No non-participants were present. | 8 |
| 16. Description of sample | The sample comprised of volunteers who delivered the program in 2018-2019. A table of demographic information is provided. | 7 & 34 |
| Data collection |  |  |
| 17. Interview guide | A semi-structured interview schedule was developed and included in the manuscript. | 8 |
| 18. Repeat interviews | No repeat interviews were conducted. | - |
| 19. Audio/visual recording | All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim | 9 |
| 20. Field notes | Notes were taken by the researcher following each interview and throughout the transcription process. | 9 |
| 21. Duration | Interviews with volunteers ranged from 6m 44s to 23m 24s (M = 10m 30s). | 8 |
| 22. Data saturation | Data saturation is not discussed. The sample was purposive, and prospective participants approached for the evaluation comprised of all individuals posed to provide data in relation to the research questions. | - |
| 23. Transcripts returned | Transcripts were not returned. | - |
| Domain 3: analysis and ﬁndings |  |  |
| Data analysis |  |  |
| 24. Number of data coders | One researcher <removed for peer review> coded the data. Two co-authors assisted with naming and grouping of codes <removed for peer review> | 9 |
| 25. Description of the coding tree | To document this process as systematic and rigorous, an audit trail of code generation was regularly maintained, and several iterations of coding trees and thematic maps were kept. These were created using MS Excel. | 9 |
| 26. Derivation of themes | After open coding, the codes were examined for higher order themes. Thematic maps were used to aid in this process. Again, peer debriefing was conducted to examine the overarching patterns in the data and reach consensus regarding the defining of themes that were coherent, meaningful and distinct | 10 |
| 27. Software | Data were analysed using Quirkos 2.3.1 (2020). | 9 |
| 28. Participant checking | Participants did not provide feedback on the findings. | - |
| Reporting |  |  |
| 29. Quotations presented | Quotes from volunteers are presented. Pseudonyms are used to name participants and residents. | Results (beginning page 10) |
| 30. Data and ﬁndings consistent | The data and findings presented are consistent. | Results (beginning page 10) |
| 31. Clarity of major themes | Major themes are presented. | Results (beginning page 10) |
| 32. Clarity of minor themes | Minor themes are presented as subthemes within major themes. | Results (beginning page 10) |