

### Supplementary Material S3: Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ) 32-item checklist

This is the COREQ checklist which accompanies the qualitative data gathering analysis for this dataset. Authors are as follows:

Juan Carlos Bustamante <sup>1</sup>

Manuel Segura Berges <sup>2</sup>

Manuel Lizalde-Gil <sup>3</sup>

Carlos Peñarrubia-Lozano <sup>3</sup>

1. Department of Psychology and Sociology, University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain.

2. Colegio Compañía de María, Zaragoza, Spain.

3. Department of Musical, Plastic and Corporal Expression, University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain.

No	Item	Guide questions/description
<b>Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity</b>		
Personal Characteristics		
1.	Interviewer/facilitator	<b>Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?</b> Second author and fourth author. The first and the third authors were not involved in data collection.
2.	Credentials	<b>What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD</b> The 2 <sup>nd</sup> author is a PhD candidate. The other authors are PhD.
3.	Occupation	<b>What was their occupation at the time of the study?</b> The 2 <sup>nd</sup> author is a primary teacher and PhD candidate. The other authors are Associate Professors at university.
4.	Gender	<b>Was the researcher male or female?</b> All authors are male.
5.	Experience and training	<b>What experience or training did the researcher have?</b> The authors have 16, 5, 25 and 15 years of experience as researchers. The first author is a neuropsychological scientists and a

No	Item	Guide questions/description
		methodologist. The second is a Physical Education researcher and the third and fourth authors are educational scientists who specialises in didactics and in Physical Education.
	Relationship with participants	
6.	Relationship established	<p><b>Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?</b></p> <p>The teachers participating in the focus groups contacted the first author by the letter of invitation to the study described in the procedure section.</p> <p>On the other hand, the students accessed the questionnaires through the same invitation received from their own institutions.</p>
7.	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	<p><b>What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. <i>personal goals, reasons for doing the research</i></b></p> <p>The participants knew that researchers were from University of Zaragoza. The informed consent forms which the participants signed explained the general purposes of the study.</p>
8.	Interviewer characteristics	<p><b>What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator?</b></p> <p>The informed consent form presented the data of the principal investigator of the project regarding name, telephone number, e-mail and university.</p>
<b>Domain 2: study design</b>		
	Theoretical framework	
9.	Methodological orientation and Theory	<p><b>What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study?</b></p> <p>Thematic analysis focuses on the identification of themes related to attitudes and evaluations about e-learning and hybrid teaching. Content analysis was chosen as methodological orientation.</p>
	Participant	

No	Item	Guide questions/description
selection		
10.	Sampling	<p><b>How were participants selected?</b> Participants were selected from faculties and universities, which offer the Teacher Training Degrees, according to the following criteria: the diversity of the public/private university, diversity in the university's origin, participant positive predisposition and accessibility for researchers.</p>
11.	Method of approach	<p><b>How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</b> When participants confirmed their interest in participating, a first questionnaire with socio-demographic aspects was forwarded to the teachers. Then three discussion groups were set up. A link to a Google Form that included informed consent was sent to the students.</p>
12.	Sample size	<p><b>How many participants were in the study?</b> Seventy-nine students and 13 teachers took part in the study.</p>
13.	Non-participation	<p><b>How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?</b> All participants participated in the study.</p>
Setting		
14.	Setting of data collection	<p><b>Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace</b> The focus groups were conducted using Google Meet. They lasted 1 hour each. The questionnaires were applied using Google Forms, with an approximate duration of between 10 and 20 minutes.</p>
15.	Presence of non-participants	<p><b>Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?</b> There was no-one else present besides the participants and researchers</p>
16.	Description of sample	<p><b>Description of sample</b>  In this study, 79 university students (64 women/81.01% and 15 men/18.99%) took part, whose mean age was 23.01±4.96 years. They were registered for the different courses of the Teacher Training Degrees taught in</p>

No	Item	Guide questions/description
		<p>eight distinct public and private faculties and university centres. According to their training, 39 were Early Childhood Education students (49.37%), 38 studied Primary Education (48.10%) and two studied both degrees at the same time (2.53%). The inclusion criterion indicated that they could not be first-course students because first-course students would be unable to provide their view of what happened before confinement took place in March 2020. Five second-course (6.33%), 12 third-course (15.19%) and 62 fourth-course (78.48%) students participated. This study included also 13 teachers (8 women/61.54% and 5 men/38.46%), who also came from different public and private university faculties and centres. Their mean age was <math>43.15 \pm 9.85</math> years and their mean teaching experience was <math>3.08 \pm 6.38</math> years. Of the 13, five also occupy university management posts, such as Vice-Deans or Degree Coordinators.</p>
Data collection		
17.	Interview guide	<p><b>Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?</b> The authors prepared a set of questions for the semi-structured interviews and focus groups in advance. It was not pilot tested.</p>
18.	Repeat interviews	<p><b>Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?</b> There were no repeat interviews.</p>
19.	Audio/visual recording	<p><b>Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?</b> All focus groups were audio-recorded and video-recorded to be able to differentiate voices later.</p>
20.	Field notes	<p><b>Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?</b> The 4<sup>th</sup> author wrote field notes during the focus groups, but not at the end of them or during their transcription.</p>
21.	Duration	<p><b>What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?</b></p>

No	Item	Guide questions/description
		Open questions questionnaire took 10-20 minutes on average. Focus group interviews took 60 minutes.
22.	Data saturation	<b>Was data saturation discussed?</b> Yes, data saturation was discussed.
23.	Transcripts returned	<b>Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?</b> No, they were not.
<b>Domain 3: analysis and findings</b>		
Data analysis		
24.	Number of data coders	<b>How many data coders coded the data?</b> Fourth author was the unique coder of the data. Second author checked the coding.
25.	Description of the coding tree	<b>Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?</b> Yes, in the Appendix.
26.	Derivation of themes	<b>Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?</b> Deductive analysis (to study previously raised problems and elements). The original classification tree was built based on the previously considered concept. The final thematic analysis was promoted by previously established themes, with no emergent themes appearing during the content analysis.
27.	Software	<b>What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?</b> Nvivo software (version 12 Plus, <a href="https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo/home">https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo/home</a> ) was used to analyze all content from open-ended questionnaires and focus groups. SPSS (version 21.0, <a href="https://www.ibm.com/es-es/analytics/spss-statistics-software">https://www.ibm.com/es-es/analytics/spss-statistics-software</a> ) to OQQ.
28.	Participant checking	<b>Did participants provide feedback on the findings?</b> No, they did not provide feedback on the findings.
Reporting		

No	Item	Guide questions/description
29.	Quotations presented	<p><b>Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. <i>participant number</i></b></p> <p>Thematic analysis came with some fragments of text that were obtained directly from the open questionnaires and the discussion groups. The code employed for this purpose included two elements: a descriptor (“US” for the university students and “TE” for the teachers; “TM” was used for those teachers who occupy university management posts), followed by a number (001-107).</p>
30.	Data and findings consistent	<p><b>Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?</b></p> <p>Yes, an attempt was made to gain consistency through various triangulations.</p>
31.	Clarity of major themes	<p><b>Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?</b></p> <p>The major themes are clearly identified by section headings (“Employing ICT in usual teaching”, “Adapting e-learning during confinement” and four sections for the “Evaluating e-learning in mixed face-to-face and virtual (hybrid) teaching during the post confinement course”).</p>
32.	Clarity of minor themes	<p><b>Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?</b></p> <p>Diverse cases were considered, for example negative cases or unexpected examples as set out by previous literature.</p>