**Supplementary Analyses**

These analyses included individuals who identified as autistic, and individuals who reported having a family member on the autism spectrum.

**Employability**

A 2 (candidate diagnosis: autistic, non-autistic) × 3 (condition: no disclosure, brief disclosure, detailed disclosure) mixed-model ANOVA examined main effects and interactions for employability. Employability responses are displayed in Figure 2. There was a significant main effect for diagnosis, *F*(1, 329) = 46.09, *p* < .001, η*p*2 = .123, suggesting autistic candidates were rated significantly lower on employability compared to non-autistic candidates. There was also a significant main effect for disclosure condition, *F*(2, 329) = 7.04, *p =* .001, η*p*2 = .041, indicating that autism disclosure improved employability ratings.

Bonferroni corrected pairwise comparisons revealed there were significant differences in candidate employability ratings between no disclosure and brief disclosure (*p* = .010), and no disclosure and detailed disclosure (*p* = .002). However, the difference between brief disclosure and detailed disclosure was not significant (*p* > .05).

**First impressions**

A 2 (candidate diagnosis: autistic, non-autistic) × 3 (condition: no disclosure, brief disclosure, detailed disclosure) mixed-model ANOVA examined main effects and interactions for first impressions. There was a significant main effect for diagnosis, *F*(1, 329) = 42.61 *p* < .001, η*p*2 = .115, suggesting autistic candidates were rated lower on first impressions compared to non-autistic candidates. There was a significant main effect for condition on first impressions, *F*(2, 329) = 12.67, *p* = .001, η*p*2 = .072, with first impressions differing according to level of autism disclosure. The Diagnosis × Condition interaction was not significant, *F*(2, 329) = 1.67, *p* = .190, η*p*2 = .010, indicating the effect of diagnosis was independent of disclosure condition.

 Bonferroni corrected pairwise comparisons revealed there were significant differences in first impressions ratings between no disclosure and brief disclosure (*p* = .001), and no disclosure and detailed disclosure (*p* < .001). However, the difference between brief disclosure and detailed disclosure was not significant (*p* > .05).

**Hiring decision**

A chi square test of independence was calculated to compare frequency of hiring selections for autistic and non-autistic candidates within disclosure conditions. There was a significant association between diagnosis and hiring selections for no disclosure, χ2 (1)= 16.08, *p* < .001, and brief disclosure, χ2 (1)= 14.82, *p* < .001. However there was not a significant association between diagnosis and hiring selection in the detailed disclosure condition, χ2 (1)= 3.31, *p* = .069.

**Endorsement**

**Overall endorsement.** There was a significant main effect for diagnosis on endorsement ratings, *F*(1, 329) = 41.53, *p* < .001, η*p*2 = .112, with autistic candidates rated significantly lower on endorsement than non-autistic candidates. There was also a significant main effect for condition on endorsement ratings, *F*(2, 329) = 11.07, *p* < .001, η*p*2 = .063, suggesting endorsement ratings were affected by level of autism disclosure. However, the Diagnosis × Disclosure interaction was not significant, *F*(2, 329) = 2.71, *p* = .068, η*p*2 = .016, indicating the main effect of diagnosis on endorsement was independent from autism disclosure.

Bonferroni corrected pairwise comparisons revealed there were significant differences in endorsement ratings between no disclosure and brief disclosure (*p* = .001), and no disclosure and detailed disclosure (*p* < .001). However, the difference between brief disclosure and detailed disclosure was not significant (*p* > .05).

**Endorsement by hiring decision status.** Endorsement rating was examined separately for selected (i.e., ‘hired’) and unselected candidates to determine whether there was an effect of diagnosis on ratings for selected (and unselected) candidates, using a one-way ANOVA. For selected candidates, there was no significant difference in endorsement ratings between autistic and non-autistic candidates *F*(1, 331) = 0.67, *p* = .413, η*p*2 = .002. This demonstrates there was no effect of diagnosis on endorsement ratings for selected candidates. By contrast, for unselected candidates, there was a significant difference in endorsement ratings between autistic and non-autistic candidates, *F*(1, 331) = 5.59, *p* = .019, η*p*2 = .017. This shows there was a significant effect of diagnosis for unselected candidates, whereby unselected autistic candidates were rated less favourably on endorsement compared to unselected non-autistic candidates.

**Comment on differences**

Differences between the results in the reported paper and the results included here (which include autistic individuals and family members of autistic individuals) include:

* Differences in candidate employability rating between study conditions (significant differences between no information and brief information conditions, and no information and detailed information conditions). In the reported results when these individuals were excluded, there were no differences between conditions.
* Differences in hiring decision, where in the detailed information condition there was no significant difference between the number of autistic and non-autistic individuals selected to be ‘hired’.

These differences indicate that when autistic individuals and family members were included, the level of information provided about autism made more of a difference to the outcome (with regard to employability rating and hiring decision). These findings align with those of Morrison et al. (2019), who found that among individuals with higher autism knowledge impressions of autistic individuals improved when a diagnosis was provided to the rater (although, this was among non-autistic raters only). One could assume that this subgroup of excluded individuals would have a higher knowledge of autism as they are either autistic or a family member of an autistic individual.