

## Supplementary Material 1: The Narrative Interview Process

After initial meetings scoping meetings (January to April 2018), we began recruitment and interviewing. Narrative interviews started in May 2018. They lasted anywhere from one to three hours and followed a consistent structure. During the interview, themes were introduced using initial questions with framings such as, “Tell me about a time when...?” (Jovchelovitch and Bauer, 2000).<sup>1</sup> Then, interviews allowed the participant to complete their story with little interruption to aide interpretation (Junqueira Maylaert et al., 2014). Then interviews included probing questions such as, “Tell me more...?” or “Why do you think that happened?” The phrasing of the questions and probes seemed to be intuitive for the interviewees, as they were able to communicate their perspectives in a story format similar to how they would in everyday conversation.

Interviewees were asked for stories on self-reported changes and behavioural responses across their lifetime in the fishery and these questions were guided by a typology of fisher behaviour (Andrews et al. 2020). The interview structure was based on three goals. First, we sought to understand change and behavioural responses chronologically. Interviews began with some simple questions about the fisher and their enterprise: “What licenses do you hold?”, “What boat to you operate or work on?” or “Which species do you pursue now?” Then, we moved into questions that drew stories from interviewees about their behavioural responses to change overtime. We asked questions according to decadal periods. For example, we began with questions about early life in the community and fishery. For example, we asked, “Can you tell us a story about the first time you participated in the fishery?” In order to tie this to explanations, we ask, “Why did you want to participate?” Then, we moved through each decade until the 2010s. If the fisher exited by 2015, we asked for a story about their strategizing and actions that led to their retirement. If they did not, we asked active fishers about strategizing related to their future retirement and potential for their children to enter the fishery. In addition, we also provided space for comments about fisheries management, a key discussion focus desired by most interviewees.

Second, we wanted to ensure interviewees told stories about all behaviours reflected in the typology of fisher behaviour, and did record other behaviours that were tied to the context of the inshore fisheries in Newfoundland and Labrador. We did this by tracking the behaviours mentioned for each decade. Additional probes were used to draw out stories about behaviours in the typology not covered by the interviewee. For example, we asked, “You never mentioned about upgrading your gear or vessel during this time. Can you share any stories about that?”

Third, we wanted to have conversations about psychosocial explanations for behavioural change. Most often, participants used language they associated as a motivation for behaviour that reflected emotions, values, and perceptions terms. For example, participants responded with answers such as “because I loved it” (emotions), “we wanted to make sure we had enough money” (values), and “I think...but am not sure” (perceptions related to experiences of uncertainty). Less often, probes were used to draw out those factors. We asked, “How did that change make you feel? How did those feelings influence how you responded?” In many cases interviewees were more confident about the explanations for adapting behavioural changes.

---

<sup>1</sup> References included in article’s reference list

However, interviewees did associate emotions with coping behaviours, but it was difficult to assess them credibly enough to report on coping behavioural change. As a result, we reported on those adapting behaviours for results on patterns of explanations.

The narrative interview format did not reflect an interview guide that is typical for most interviewing methods. Rather, the interview followed a consistent temporal structure within which interviewees were able to share their life story, and the interviewee was able to ensure that core research concepts were covered. In the end, conversations were really personalized and contextual.

Interviews were audio recorded, transcribed, and verified by participants. Verification involved a trip back to the field site, in which participants were presented with a pamphlet that highlighted the major themes in this chapter. Participants verified the behavioural patterns assessed below and provided reminders about the importance of different types of fishers in the fishery, a theme that was highlighted through the grouped pathways according to different forms of well-being (see Subsection 5.1). They were also keen to discuss how decisions were made, contributing to a better understanding of group emotional decision-making (see Subsection 5.2). By the end of August 2018, recommendations for new participants began to overlap, newly recommended fishers were not interested or busy fishing, and time between interviews increased. Data collection was terminated in September 2018, and the data analysis stage began.