

### Supplementary A: Statistical tests for development of Q Methodology model of 5 factors

Factor analysis, involving Principal Components Analysis, was performed as it considers the specificity of individual Q sorts, as well as commonality (Webler et al. 2009). As is conventional in factor analysis, factors with Eigenvalues  $>1.00$  were retained for rotation (McKeown & Thomas 1988), with the Eigenvalues reflecting the amount of variation accounted for by each factor. The highest Eigenvalue is 7.94 for Factor 1 and thus this factor represents a common view held by the majority of participants (Table A1). Eigenvalues for factors 2-4 are also  $>1.00$  (2.33, 1.52, 1.39 and 1.15 respectively). While factor 6 is borderline ( $\lambda=1.04$ ), only two participants (P2 and P14) load significantly so it does not constitute a large enough group to merit further examination. Thus, the first five factors, accounting for 65% of the variance, were retained for further analysis (Table A1.1).

**Table S1.** Extracted factors with eigenvalues over 1.

Factor	Eigenvalue ( $\lambda$ )	As %	Cumul. %
1	7.94	36.1	36.1
2	2.33	10.6	46.7
3	1.52	6.9	53.6
4	1.39	6.3	59.9
5	1.15	5.2	65.1
6	1.04	4.7	69.9

Varimax rotation with an automatic flagging of the sorts was employed in order to minimise researcher bias. Factor loadings, like other correlation coefficients, range from -1.00 to +1.00 and indicate the extent to which each participant's Q sort is similar or dissimilar to the factor. Minimum significant loading at  $p<.01$  is calculated using equation  $2.58(1/\sqrt{n})$  where  $n$  equals the numbers of items in Q sort. Thus, for this sample size (i.e. 48 statements):  $2.58(1/\sqrt{48}) = \pm 0.37$ . Therefore, factor loadings in excess of 0.37 are significant ( $p<.01$ ), although to minimise participants loading on multiple factors, a threshold of  $\pm 0.51$  was adopted.

### Supplementary B: Supporting Information

**Table S2.** Ash dieback Q sorts (Q participants) according to narrative groupings.

Factor	Case	Residence (yrs)	Age	Gender	Education	Context	Member of Env. group
N1	P1	20+	70s	M	Diploma	Resident	No
	P4	20+	20s	M	Postgrad	Land M.	Yes
	P6	20+	50s	M	Postgrad	Land M.	Yes
	P8	10-20	60s	M	GCSEs	Resident	No
N2	P2	20+	40s	M	Diploma	Land M.	No
	P5	10-20	70s	M	No quals	Resident	Yes
	P7	10-20	60s	M	Prof quals	Resident	Yes
	P13	5-10	60s	F	Postgrad	Woodland owner	Yes
	P14	10-20	40s	M	Postgrad	Land M.	Yes
	P16	5-10	40s	M	Postgrad	Land M.	No
	P18	20+	40s	M	Degree	Woodland owner	Yes
N3	P22	5-10	30s	M	Degree	Business	No
	P3	20+	50s	M	Diploma	Land M.	No
	P9	10-20	60s	F	A levels	Resident	No
	P16	5-10	40s	M	Postgrad	Land M.	No
N4	P20	20+	20s	F	A levels	Resident	No
N5	P10	10-20	30s	M	Degree	Land M.	No
	P12	20+	60s	M	Postgrad	Resident	Yes
	P15	20+	30s	M	Prof quals	Business	No
	P19	10-20	40s	F	Postgrad	Woodland owner	Yes
No narrative	P11	10-20	70s	M/F	Prof quals	Resident	Yes
	P17	20+	50s	M	A levels	Land M.	Yes
	P21	20+	60s	M	No quals	Resident	No

**Table S3.** Rotated factor matrix with X indicating a defining sort

Q sort	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5
P1	<b>.86X</b>	.21	.04	-.00	-.06
P2	.32	<b>.54X</b>	.08	.09	.26
P3	.15	.25	<b>.79X</b>	-.34	.05
P4	<b>.57X</b>	-.01	.41	.20	.41
P5	.13	<b>.79X</b>	.15	.07	.06
P6	<b>.70X</b>	.09	.23	.03	.27
P7	-.02	<b>.83X</b>	.01	-.01	.03
P8	<b>.74X</b>	-.01	.21	.29	.22
P9	.12	.13	<b>.69X</b>	.45	.08
P10	.18	.48	.08	-.08	<b>.56X</b>
P11	.43	.47	.17	.32	.37
P12	.50	.10	-.22	.19	<b>.70X</b>
P13	.42	<b>.53X</b>	.19	.15	.31
P14	-.04	<b>.51X</b>	.32	.05	.26
P15	.24	.17	.32	-.34	<b>.57X</b>
P16	.39	<b>.62X</b>	<b>.60X</b>	.01	.15
P17	.47	.12	.00	-.18	.49

P18	.05	<b>.63X</b>	.22	-.24	-.19
P19	.07	-.01	.24	.24	<b>.78X</b>
P20	.15	-.06	.06	<b>.76X</b>	-.01
P21	.08	.48	-.02	.50	.39
P22	.38	<b>.59X</b>	.32	-.14	.34
% expl. Var.	16	18	10	7	14