

**Title:**

Intentions of Landowners towards Active Management of Ecosystem in South-central USA for  
Deer Habitat Management

**Authorship:**

(Given Name Middle Name (Or absent) Family Name, each author separated by commas).

Bijesh Mishra (विजेश मिश्र)<sup>a</sup>, Omkar Joshi<sup>a</sup>, Binod P. Chapagain<sup>ab</sup>, Lixia He Lambert<sup>c</sup>, Rodney E.

Will<sup>a</sup>

**Affiliations:**

<sup>a</sup> Department of Natural Resource Ecology and Management, Oklahoma State University,  
Stillwater, OK, 74078

<sup>b</sup> Department of Integrated Biology, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, 74078

<sup>c</sup> Department of Agricultural Economics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, 74078

**Corresponding Author:**

Bijesh Mishra:

Email: [Bijesh.mishra@okstate.edu](mailto:Bijesh.mishra@okstate.edu); [bjs.misra@gmail.com](mailto:bjs.misra@gmail.com)

Mailing address: 008C Agriculture Hall (212 N Monroe Street, 008C), Stillwater, OK, 74078

## Supplementary Materials

### Appendix A

Table 1: Distribution of landowners' responses to observed variables used in SEM models.

Constructs	Variables	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
SN	<i>e1value</i>	4.9	6.0	22.4	35.8	30.9
SN	<i>e1diverse</i>	7.2	7.8	24.8	37.8	22.4
SN	<i>e1support</i>	2.4	10.3	18.8	40.0	28.5
SN	<i>e1livable</i>	6.1	10.3	26.0	35.8	21.8
PBC	<i>e1resource</i>	6.6	14.6	22.4	36.4	20.0
PBC	<i>e1improve</i>	3.0	4.9	17.6	43.0	31.5
MRL	<i>e2respect</i>	3.0	0.00	9.8	44.2	43.0
MRL	<i>e2maintain</i>	3.0	2.4	26.1	32.7	35.8
MRL	<i>e2invest</i>	6.1	10.3	31.5	24.2	27.9
ATT	<i>e3manage</i>	1.8	12.1	21.2	48.5	16.4
ATT	<i>e3effort</i>	3.6	11.5	17.0	44.9	23.0
ATT	<i>e3wilder</i>	3.0	10.3	23.6	44.2	18.9
ATT	<i>e3overall</i>	4.9	9.6	25.5	42.4	17.6
Note: Variables are defined in table 1 of main paper.						

Table 2: Distribution of landowners' responses to variables presented in same section of survey but not included in SEM.

Variables	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
<i>e1govt</i> : It would be difficult to conduct forest, rangeland, and deer habitat management without government support.	21.82	22.42	22.42	18.18	15.15
<i>e1commun</i> : It would be difficult to conduct forest, rangeland, and deer habitat management without support from the community.	27.27	20.61	27.88	20.00	4.24
<i>e2harvest</i> : Excessive harvesting of natural resource may limit their use for the future generation.	7.27	3.03	13.94	33.94	41.82
<i>e3benefit</i> : Active Forest, rangeland, and deer habitat can bring economic as well as environmental benefits.	4.24	6.67	15.76	42.42	30.91
<i>e3human</i> : The primary use of forest, rangeland, and deer habitat management should be to benefit human beings.	8.48	16.36	26.06	32.12	16.97
<i>e3restrict</i> : Restricting excessive use of forest, rangeland, and deer habitat can enhance recreational opportunities.	8.48	15.15	33.33	27.27	15.76

<i>e3time</i> : It is important to spend time managing forest, rangeland, and deer habitat.	2.42	3.64	23.64	38.18	32.12
<i>e3balance</i> : Sustainable management of forest, rangeland, and deer habitat is important to maintain balance and diversity in the natural environment.	3.03	3.64	17.58	40.61	35.15
<i>e3connect</i> : I feel connected with nature when I get involved in forest, rangeland, and deer habitat management.	3.03	4.24	24.24	37.58	30.91
<i>e3environ</i> : The primary use of forest, rangeland, and deer habitat management should be to benefit the environment.	4.85	7.88	34.55	33.33	19.39
<i>e3noneed</i> : There is no need for active, forest, rangeland, and deer habitat management.	45.45	30.91	15.76	3.03	4.85

---

