

Supplementary Table 1. Survey instrument used during interviews in 8 communities in Arctic Alaska ( $n = 64$ ) and Canada (Churchill  $n = 17$  and Nunavut  $n = 50$ ) in 2013.

1. *We are trying to learn where hunters get their information about animal numbers and locations. Which sources do you trust or not trust regarding information about resource abundance?, [i.e. information about abundance and number for that resource, must be linked to the most important resource mentioned in 9A]*

#### Alaska

Source	Yes	No	NA	Don't know
Other people within your household				
Hunters from the community				
Hunters from outside the community				
Elders who still hunt				
Elders who hunted in the past but don't any longer				
Newspaper/internet articles				
Fish and Game biologists (biological based)				
Wildlife troopers (legal authority)				
NGOs (Sierra Club, Defenders of Wildlife)				
Hunters associations (Alaska Outdoor Council, Safari Club)				
Working groups (ex. Western Arctic Caribou Working Group)				
Co-management groups (ex. WAH working group, Alaska Migratory Bird Co-management council)				

#### Canada

Source	Reliable	Not reliable
Personal experience either yours or others within your household		
Other hunters from the community		
Other hunters from outside the community		
Elders		
Other resource users		
Newspaper articles		
Wildlife biologists (biological based)		
Wildlife Officers (legal authority)		
NGOs		
Hunters and Trappers Organizations		
Others e.g.: Regional Wildlife Board, Territorial Government, Federal Government, international organizations		

2. We would like to know more about trust in different institutions/bodies at different levels. Below we have listed 2 levels and industry as a separate category. We ask you to rank your trust on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 means no trust at all and 7 means high level of trust. [institutions are special for each country]. Eventually trust was categorized as no (1-3), partial (4), and yes (5-7).

**Alaska**

[illegible]

[illegible]

## Canada agencies

[illegible]



Other ex: company Liason officers									
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

3. *What are the two most important institutions mentioned above in relation to your community?*

**[specify]**\_\_\_\_\_

*Why are this/these institutions the most important ones?*

\_\_\_\_\_

Supplementary Table 2. Characteristics of organizations used in our research with the number of interviewee responses ( $n = 131$ ). National organization have management at the highest level and this is where all decisions are made, followed by sub-national (Sub-nat.) which can have regional offices throughout the state and these regions can be run differently, and local is the level closest to the individual level.

Region	Organization	Scale	Elected	Indigenous	Fish and wildlife	Industry	Legal authority	<i>n</i>
Alaska	Federal Subsistence Management	National	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	33
	Other Federal Agencies	National	No	No	No	No	Yes	39
	Misc. Industry	National	No	No	No	Yes	No	64
	Regional Advisory Committees (RAC)	Sub-nat.	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	30
	Division of Subsistence	Sub-nat.	No	No	Yes	No	No	41
	Fish and Game	Sub-nat.	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	44
	Other State Agencies	Sub-nat.	No	No	No	No	Yes	36
	Advisory committee (AC)	Sub-nat.	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	34
	Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN)	Sub-nat.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	49
	Regional Native corporation	Sub-nat.	No	Yes	No	No	No	55
	Working Group	Sub-nat.	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	34
	Tribal council	Local	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	54
	City council	Local	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	41
Canada	Federal government	National	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	53
	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern	National	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	50
	Misc. Industry	National	No	No	No	Yes	No	59
Manitoba	Department of Fisheries and Ocean	National	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	15
	Government of Canada -Health Care	National	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	14
	Human Resources and Social Development							
	Parks Canada Agency	National	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	12
	Natural Resource Canada	National	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	12
	Province of Manitoba	Sub-nat.	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	14
	Manitoba conservation	Sub-nat.	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	15

Region	Organization	Scale	Elected	Indigenous	Fish and wildlife	Industry	Legal authority	<i>n</i>
Nunavut	Other-Provencal	Sub-nat.	Yes	No	No	No	No	4
	Town	Local	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	14
	Other -Local	Local	No	No	No	No	No	16
	Churchill Northern Studies Centre	Local	No	No	No	No	No	5
	Hudson Bay Railway	Local	No	No	No	Yes	No	2
	Port of Churchill	Local	No	No	No	Yes	No	13
	Manitoba Hydro	Local	No	No	No	Yes	No	11
	Inuit Tapirit Kanatami	National	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	38
	Government of Nunavut	Sub-nat.	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	45
	Institutions of Public Government	Sub-nat.	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	40
	Kivalliq Inuit Association	Sub-nat.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	46
	Kivalliq Wildlife Board	Sub-nat.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	41
	Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated	Sub-nat.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	44
	Elders	Local	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	45
	Hamlet	Local	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	46
	Hunters and Trappers Organizations	Local	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	45



Supplementary Table 3. Characteristics of interviewees from interviews conducted in Alaska and Canada (Churchill and Nunavut) in 2013. These characteristics were chosen because they are often collected on basic census forms and used to compose community profiles and have been associated with trust.

Individual	Parameter	Alaska	Churchill	Nunavut
Region		64	17	50
Education				
	No School	1	1	16
	Primary	13	3	14
	Secondary	35	9	17
	Post-Secondary	9	4	3
Residency				
	Less than 10 yrs	1	0	2
	11-20 yrs	2	1	1
	21-30 yrs	9	4	10
	More than 30 yrs	46	12	37
Marital				
	Single*	13	6	7
	Married**	27	10	31
	Divorced	3	0	2
	Widowed	14	1	10
Gender				
	Male	34	13	38
	Female	30	4	12
Age				
	Youth	33	10	24
	Elder	31	7	26

\* includes individuals separated

\*\* includes common law and par