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# *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 | *e1value* | 4.9 | 6.0 | 22.4 | 35.8 | 30.9 |
| SN | *e1diverse* | 7.2 | 7.8 | 24.8 | 37.8 | 22.4 |
| SN | *e1support* | 2.4 | 10.3 | 18.8 | 40.0 | 28.5 |
| SN | *e1livable* | 6.1 | 10.3 | 26.0 | 35.8 | 21.8 |
| PBC | *e1resource* | 6.6 | 14.6 | 22.4 | 36.4 | 20.0 |
| PBC | *e1improve* | 3.0 | 4.9 | 17.6 | 43.0 | 31.5 |
| MRL | *e2respect* | 3.0 | 0.00 | 9.8 | 44.2 | 43.0 |
| MRL | *e2maintain* | 3.0 | 2.4 | 26.1 | 32.7 | 35.8 |
| MRL | *e2invest* | 6.1 | 10.3 | 31.5 | 24.2 | 27.9 |
| ATT | *e3manage* | 1.8 | 12.1 | 21.2 | 48.5 | 16.4 |
| ATT | *e3effort* | 3.6 | 11.5 | 17.0 | 44.9 | 23.0 |
| ATT | *e3wilder* | 3.0 | 10.3 | 23.6 | 44.2 | 18.9 |
| ATT | *e3overall* | 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 (%)** |
| *e1govt:* 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 |
| *e1commun:* 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 |
| *e2harvest:* Excessive harvesting of natural resource may limit their use for the future generation. | 7.27 | 3.03 | 13.94 | 33.94 | 41.82 |
| *e3benefit:* Active Forest, rangeland, and deer habitat can bring economic as well as environmental benefits. | 4.24 | 6.67 | 15.76 | 42.42 | 30.91 |
| *e3human:* 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 |
| *e3restrict:* Restricting excessive use of forest, rangeland, and deer habitat can enhance recreational opportunities. | 8.48 | 15.15 | 33.33 | 27.27 | 15.76 |
| *e3time:* It is important to spend time managing forest, rangeland, and deer habitat. | 2.42 | 3.64 | 23.64 | 38.18 | 32.12 |
| *e3balance:* 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 |
| *e3connect:* 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 |
| *e3environ:* 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 |
| *e3noneed:* There is no need for active, forest, rangeland, and deer habitat management. | 45.45 | 30.91 | 15.76 | 3.03 | 4.85 |