

Supplementary Information

Table S1. Demographics of respondents (N = 211).

Demographics		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	133	63.1%
	Female	78	36.9%
Age	15~29 s	57	27.0%
	30~39 s	79	37.4%
	40~49 s	42	19.9%
	50~59 s	25	11.8%
	60 s and above	8	3.8%
Education	No schooling	11	5.2%
	Primary School	67	31.8%
	Junior High School	80	37.9%
	Senior High School	40	18.9%
	University and higher	13	6.2%
Ethnic type	Dai	117	55.5%
	Jinuo	16	7.6%
	Hani	75	35.5%
	Han	3	1.4%
Occupation	Farmer	158	74.9%
	Student	13	6.2%
	Own business	20	9.48%
	Other	20	9.48%
Annual family income (CNY yuan)	<20000	49	23.2%
	20,000–39,999	82	38.8%
	40,000–59,999	42	19.9%
	>60,000	38	18%

We first performed factor analysis. In terms of content validity, the KMO value of sampling adequacy was 0.799 (>0.5) and the P-value of Bartlett's test of sphericity reached significant level of 0.01, indicating that the questionnaire met the validity criteria. Then, reliability analysis was also conducted, and results showed that the reliability levels of all latent variables were greater than 0.5, except for low internal aggregation of latent variables for Economics. Therefore, field samples satisfied model analysis. It should be noted that the use of Cronbach's alpha also has its limits when it comes to measuring the consistency of variables [1]. Secondly, the low value of Economic indicator may be due to the effect of E2 classified by the area of villagers' land owned.

Table S2. Reliability and validity tests of constructs.

Variables	Item	Standard Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability
Economics	E1	0.97	0.07	0.577
	E2	0.22		
External factors	EF1	0.85	0.80	0.87
	EF2	0.81		
	EF3	0.82		
	A1	0.71	0.67	0.74

Awareness of the two mountains theory	A2	0.70		
	A3	0.74		
	A4	0.43		
	AES1	0.57		
Attitude towards ecosystem services	AES2	0.51		
	AES3	0.73	0.76	0.77
	AES4	0.82		
	AES5	0.50		
Willingness to conserve nature	W1	0.76		
	W2	0.52	0.50	0.53
	W3	0.21		

Table S3. Multiple comparisons of ANOVA on willingness to conserve across age, income, and education scales.

Test method	Age (I)	Age (J)	Mean difference(I-J)	Std. error	Sig.
LSD	1	2	−0.055	0.138	0.690
		3	0.210	0.1618	0.194
		4	0.551 **	0.190	0.004
		5	0.382	0.299	0.202
	2	1	0.055	0.138	0.690
		3	0.265	0.151	0.082
		4	0.606 ***	0.182	0.001
		5	0.437	0.294	0.138
	3	1	−0.210	0.161	0.194
		2	−0.265	0.151	0.082
		4	0.341	0.200	0.090
		5	0.173	0.305	0.573
	4	1	−0.551 **	0.190	0.004
		2	−0.606 ***	0.182	0.001
		3	−0.341	0.200	0.090
		5	−0.168	0.322	0.601
	5	1	−0.382	0.299	0.202
		2	−0.437	0.294	0.138
		3	−0.173	0.305	0.573
		4	0.168	0.322	0.601
Education (I)		Education (J)			
Tamhane	1	2	0.246	0.342	0.999
		3	−0.125	0.331	1.00
		4	−0.312	0.335	0.990
		5	−0.110	0.399	1.00
	2	1	−0.246	0.342	0.999
		3	−0.370	0.138	0.080
		4	−0.558 **	0.148	0.003
		5	−0.355	0.263	0.884
	3	1	0.125	0.331	1.00
		2	0.370	0.138	0.080
		4	−0.188	0.120	0.730
		5	0.015	0.249	1.00
	4	1	0.312	0.335	0.990
		2	0.558 **	0.148	0.003

	3	0.187	0.120	0.730
	5	0.203	0.255	0.997
5	1	0.110	0.399	1.00
	2	0.355	0.263	0.884
	3	−0.015	0.249	1.00
	4	−0.203	0.255	0.997

The median-based chi-square tests for age, income, and education scales were 0.360, 0.311, and 0.11, and the significance of their variance results were 0.009, 0.393 and 0.07, respectively. Thus, we performed multiple comparisons of education scale using Tamhane's method for variance heterogeneity in response. We found insignificant results for their willingness to conserve on income scale, while at least one group reached significant levels on age and education scales. Note: ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Table S4. Semi-structured interview contents.

No.	Items
1	How much area does your household plant rubber? 1a. Have you ever thought of changing rubber land use and then using it to plant other fruit trees or herbal plants with high economic benefits? 1b. How much area of rubber land is planned to be changed?
2	Have you ever fished or picked wild edible plants such as wild mushrooms and wild vegetables before? 2a. Which one do you prefer? 2b. What do you think about protecting them? 2c. What are your hobbies in life? 2d. how much do you get in return for your annual material gain?
3	How well do you think local nationalized forests or community forests are protected? 3a. Will the unprotected have any impact on your lives?
4	What is the status of fish in the local rivers? 4a. How do you usually catch fish? 4b. Is the number of fish now reduced compared to before?
5	Do you think the future village will affect your living habits when it is well developed? 5a. The well-developed means more ways to entertain and relax, so will you participate in it?

Reference

1. Sijtsma, K. On the Use, the Misuse, and the Very Limited Usefulness of Cronbach's Alpha. *Psychometrika* **2008**, *74*, 107.