

Supplementary Materials

Table S1: Description of survey measures (adapted from [1])

Measures of SLO variables	Question/ Items	Scale Type/ Reliability α	Items	Source
Relationship quality	Q3 1-2	Seven-point Likert scale for agreement 0.79	Transparency, honesty and openness of the company	[1]
			Engagement in two-way dialogue	[1]
Trust in industry	Q4 1-7	Seven-point Likert scale for agreement 0.85	Trust to act in society's best interests	[2]
			Trust to act responsibly	[2]
			Trust to do what is right	[2]
			Overall trust in agricultural sector	[1]
			Overall trust in wood processing/ -manufacturing industry	[1]
			Overall trust in research institutions	[1]
Procedural fairness	Q5 1-6	Seven-point Likert scale for agreement 0.81	Overall trust in project	[1]
			Opportunities to participate	[3]
			Thoughts being recognized	[4]
			Opinions being respected and listened to	[4]
			Ability to change practises	[5]
			Influence of powerful companies on smaller stakeholders	[3]
Distributional Fairness	Q6 1-5	Seven-point Likert scale for agreement 0.71	Consistency in actions over time	[5]
			Fair distribution of created value	[2]
			Reward corresponds investment	[3]
			Just investment/reward ratio for every stakeholder	[6]
			Benefits for small stakeholders from cooperation with more powerful private companies	[7]
			Fair share of benefits for local area	[1]
Governance	Q7			
Formal Governance	Q7 1-4		Government's ability to hold private business accountable	[1]
			EU's power over private business	[1]
			Trust in legislation and regulation	[1]
			PPPs contribution to social welfare	[3]
Informal Governance	Q7 5-6	Seven-point Likert scale for agreement 0.78	Being heard by D4EU	[1]
			Being listened to and respected by D4EU	[1]
Trust in Governance	Q7 7-9	Seven-point Likert scale for agreement 0.83	Trust in regulations of the Slovak government	[1]
			Trust in regulations of the EU	
			Trust in monitoring activities of D4EU	
Perceived benefits	Q8 1-11	Seven-point Likert scale	Positive changes to the local natural environment	[8]
			Positive landscape changes	[9]
			Additional local employment	[1]

		for agreement 0.93	Opportunities for young people to stay in the region Mitigation of rural depopulation Local business opportunities Benefits for local farmers Benefits for landowners Additional local services and facilities Economic benefits for the region Overall perception of benefits	[1] [10] [1] [11] [11] [1] [12] [1]
Perceived impacts	Q9 1-12	Seven-point Likert scale for agreement 0.94	Negative environmental changes Dust and noise pollution Negative landscape changes Soil degradation Loss of biodiversity Negative health impacts Conflict with food or feed production Conflict with forestry Community division over this project Economic risks for local farmers Economic risks for other stakeholders Overall perception of negative impacts	[1] [1] [8] [13] [13] [1] [2] [2] [1] [14] [15] [1]
Emotions towards the project	Q12 1-4	Seven-point Likert scale for agreement 0.87	Pleasure Optimism Anger Worry	[1]
Acceptance of the project	Q13 6	Six-point Scale	Rejection Tolerance Acceptation Approval Embracement Not Sure	[1]
Participatory behavioural intentions	Q14 6-7	Seven-point Likert scale for likelihood 0.9	Enabling the success of the project Contribution to the project	[1]
Oppositional behavioural intentions	Q14 3-5	Seven-point Likert scale for likelihood 0.8	Complaining about the project/ Discouraging others from participating Resistance towards the project	[1]
Information seeking behavioural intentions	Q14 1-2	Seven-point Likert scale for likelihood 0.91	Wanting more information about the project Visiting the D4EU website	[1]
Knowledge of relevant items	Q1 1-3	Three-Point Likert Scale	Prior knowledge about bioeconomy Prior knowledge about SRC Prior knowledge about D4EU	own formulation
	Q15		No background	

Potential background in agriculture or forestry		Open question	Background in agriculture Background in forestry	own formulation
Worldview/ environmental awareness	Q2	Four-point Scale	The environment is fragile and will only be protected if there are large changes in human behaviour and society. The environment can be managed by the Slovak government, the European Union, and experts if there are clear rules about what is allowed. The environment can adapt to changes and technology will solve environmental problems eventually. The environment is unpredictable, and we cannot control what will happen in the future.	[2]
Demographics	Q16-Q20		Q15 Nationality Q16 Kraj Q17 Gender Q18 Rural/ urban Q19 Level of education	own formulation

S2: Questionnaire

S2.1: Introduction letter

Dear participants,

as part of my master thesis at the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Vienna in cooperation with Wood K plus I am conducting a survey to understand the underlying reasons of perceived fairness of wood-based value chains in Slovakia.

The creation of efficient bio-based value chains relies on its public perception. As a member of the local community, you are an important stakeholder in this operation.

You will be asked to read a text with information about the project to then answer a questionnaire. The approximate time to conduct the survey is about 15-20 minutes. Your responses will be treated anonymously and will only be used for survey purposes.

In case you have any questions about the survey, please contact me at survey@wood-kplus.at

Thank you for your time!

Yours sincerely,

Christine Pichler

WOOD K PLUS | Kompetenzzentrum Holz GmbH
Altenberger Straße 69
4040 Linz
Austria

S2.2: Additional information for survey participants

Dendromass4Europe (D4EU) is a public-private-partnership funded by the European Union. The project partners are comprised of research institutions on the one hand and internationally operating private companies on the other hand. All the information about the project is available on our website:
www.dendromass4europe.eu/

D4EU focuses on securing sustainable wood production by cultivating fast-growing trees in so-called Short Rotation Coppice (SRC) plantations in rural areas of Slovakia. Hereby hybrid poplar trees are planted on marginal or currently unused agricultural land with the goal of producing wood and woody biomass in a short time frame on an overall area of 2500 ha. This biomass is then used to create four new bio-based materials: a functionally adapted lightweight board for furniture production, moulded fibre parts for packaging and wood-plastic composites for fencing panels, decking or siding.

Local jobs growth

Installation of the plantations, their upkeep, protection, harvesting, further processing and transport will create new jobs in rural areas of Slovakia. Plantations on unused agricultural land offer diversification and increase of revenues for farmers and rural landowners. The generated income will remain with local farmers and entrepreneurs that are directly or indirectly involved in the value chains. Local communities are to benefit through value adding processes and marketing activities.

Government Requirements

Public-private-partnerships aim to coordinate public and private resources towards the achievement of shared goals for common good. Constant monitoring and research are conducted to secure quality of the plantations, stable production, optimum poplar variety selection and to minimize risks. Furthermore, the land must not be a designated conservation area, and Slovak law allows SRC plantations only on lands with low or moderate soil quality.

S2.3: Questionnaire

Question Group 1: Background

Q1: Thinking about the following terms, how familiar were you with them before participating in this study?

	Never heard of it before this survey	Heard of it before this survey	Heard of it, and know exactly what it is
Bioeconomy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Short Rotation Coppice (SRC) or Plantation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dendromass for Europe (D4EU)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Bioeconomy: the transition towards a circular economy based on renewable biological resources (e.g. biomass, crops, forests) instead of fossil resources (e.g. oil, gas, coal)

Short Rotation Coppice (SRC) or Plantation: the cultivation of fast-growing tree species on agricultural land to produce woody biomass

Dendromass for Europe (D4EU): a public-private-partnership funded by the European Union with the aim to develop SRC-based value chains in Western Slovakia

Q2: Which of the following statements best matches your view about the environment?

The environment is fragile and will only be protected if there are large changes in human behaviour and society.	<input type="radio"/>
The environment can be managed by the Slovak government, the European Union, and experts if there are clear rules about what is allowed.	<input type="radio"/>
The environment can adapt to changes and technology will solve environmental problems eventually.	<input type="radio"/>
The environment is unpredictable, and we cannot control what will happen in the future.	<input type="radio"/>

Q3: Think about the project D4EU and its proposed short rotation coppice poplar plantations near your community, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Not sure	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I think the project seems open, honest and transparent.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think the project management engages in a genuine two-way dialogue with the community.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Q4: Think about linked sectors to D4EU's plantations near your community: Agriculture, Forestry, wood processing and manufacturing industries as well as research institutions, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Not sure	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I think I can trust these sectors to act in the best interests of society.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think I can trust these sectors to act responsibly.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think I can trust these sectors to do what is right.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Overall, I think I can trust the agricultural sector.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Overall, I think I can trust the involved wood processing/manufacturing industries.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Overall, I think I can trust research institutes.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Overall, I think I can trust the project D4EU.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Q5: Think about the project D4EU and its proposed short rotation coppice poplar plantations near your community, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Not sure	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
People in my community will have opportunities to participate in the decisions made by the involved companies.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
The companies involved are interested in knowing what I think about the project.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think the companies involved will listen to and respect my opinions.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think the companies involved are prepared to change their practices in response to community sentiment.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think the behaviour of the companies involved will be consistent and stable over time.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Q6: Thinking about fairness, how much do you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Not sure	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
The created value will be distributed fairly among all involved stakeholders.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Everyone will be rewarded according to their financial investments.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
The input/output ratio for everyone involved will be the same.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Smaller stakeholders will benefit from the resources of the more powerful private companies involved in this project.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
The local community will receive a fair share of the benefits from this project.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Q7: Think about the role of governance in the project, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Not sure	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I think the Slovak government can hold private business accountable.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think the European Union can hold private business accountable.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think legislation and regulation can be counted on to ensure, that companies do the right thing.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think public-private-partnerships can contribute to public good.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think D4EU will be interested in knowing what I think about the project.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think D4EU will listen to and respect my opinions.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think I can trust the Slovak government to regulate this project responsibly.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think I can trust the European Union to regulate this project responsibly.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I think I can trust D4EU to monitor this project responsibly.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Q8: Thinking about local benefits, how much do you agree that D4EU's project would provide significant

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Not sure	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Positive changes to the local natural environment	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Positive landscape changes	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Local employment	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Opportunities for young people to stay in the region	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Mitigation of rural depopulation	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Local business opportunities	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Benefits for local farmers	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Benefits for landowners	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Additional local services and facilities	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Economic benefits for the region	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Overall, how much do you agree that this project would bring significant benefits to the local community	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Not sure	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Negative changes to the local natural environment	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Dust and noise pollution	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Negative landscape changes	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Soil degradation	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Loss of biodiversity	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Negative health impacts (allergies,...)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Conflict with food or feed production	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Conflict with forestry	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Community division over this project	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Economic risks for local farmers	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Economic risks for other stakeholders	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Overall, how much do you agree that you would be concerned about potential negative impacts	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Considering the balance of benefits and costs of this project, how much do you agree that it is worthwhile to have this project in your local area?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Not sure	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Question Group 6: Attitudes and behaviours

Q12: Thinking about how you would feel about this project, how much do you agree you would feel:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Not sure	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Pleased	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Optimistic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Angry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Worried	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q13: Overall, which of the following statements best describes your attitude towards D4EU's project in your local area:

I would reject it	<input type="radio"/>
I would tolerate it	<input type="radio"/>
I would be OK with it	<input type="radio"/>
I would approve it	<input type="radio"/>
I would embrace it	<input type="radio"/>
Not sure	<input type="radio"/>

Q14: Now thinking about your intentions towards the companies involved in the project near your community, how likely are you to:

	Very unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Not sure	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely
Want more information about the project?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Visit the project's website?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Complain to people you know about this project?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Try and discourage others to participate in this project?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Resist this project?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work with D4EU to make this project a success?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Contribute to this project?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question Group 7: Demographics

Concluding I would like you to answer a few questions about yourself.

Q15: Do you have some connection to Forestry, Agriculture or the wood-processing and -manufacturing industries?

No	<input type="radio"/>
Yes, to Forestry via	
Yes, to Agriculture via	
Yes, to the wood-processing and -manufacturing industries via	

Background: Are you currently employed in one of the respective sectors? Have you been employed in one of the respective sectors? Have you studied a related field? Are you a forest owner or do you own agricultural land? Are you working in the wood-based sector (e.g. paper-, sawmill-, panel industry)?

Q16: Nationality

Slovakia	<input type="radio"/>
other:	

Q17: I live in

Bratislava	<input type="radio"/>
Trnava	<input type="radio"/>
Trenčín	<input type="radio"/>
Nitra	<input type="radio"/>
Žilina	<input type="radio"/>
Banská Bystrica	<input type="radio"/>
Prešov	<input type="radio"/>
Košice	<input type="radio"/>
other:	

Q18: Gender

Female	<input type="radio"/>
Male	<input type="radio"/>
other	<input type="radio"/>

Q19: Most of my life I have lived in

A rural area	<input type="radio"/>
An urban area	<input type="radio"/>

Q20: Highest level of education

Did not finish compulsory education	<input type="radio"/>
Finished compulsory education	<input type="radio"/>
Post-secondary qualification	<input type="radio"/>
Maturita	<input type="radio"/>
Undergraduate degree	<input type="radio"/>
Postgraduate degree	<input type="radio"/>

Q21: Age

≤18	<input type="radio"/>
19-25	<input type="radio"/>
26-35	<input type="radio"/>
36-45	<input type="radio"/>
46-55	<input type="radio"/>
56-65	<input type="radio"/>
≥66	<input type="radio"/>

References

1. McCrea, R.; Walton, A.; Measham, T. *Stakeholder Engagement Processes - Phase 2: Testing the Effects of Benefits and Governance Information on Social Acceptance of Different Mining Activities. A Report Prepared for the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science.*; CSIRO Publishing: Canberra, 2018;
2. Moffat, K.; Pert, P.; McCrea, R.; Boughen, N.; Rodriguez, M.; Lacey, J. *Australian Attitudes toward Mining: Citizen Survey - 2017 Results*; CSIRO: Australia, 2017;
3. Thorpe, J. Procedural Justice in Value Chains Through Public–Private Partnerships. *World Dev* **2018**, *103*, 162–175, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.10.004.
4. Moffat, K.; Zhang, A. The Paths to Social Licence to Operate: An Integrative Model Explaining Community Acceptance of Mining. *Resources Policy* **2014**, *39*, 61–70, doi:10.1016/j.resourpol.2013.11.003.
5. Bloom, J.D.; Hinrichs, C.C. Moving Local Food through Conventional Food System Infrastructure: Value Chain Framework Comparisons and Insights. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems* **2011**, *26*, 13–23, doi:10.1017/S1742170510000384.
6. Janssen, O. How Fairness Perceptions Make Innovative Behavior More or Less Stressful. *J Organ Behav* **2004**, *25*, 201–215, doi:10.1002/job.238.
7. Du, S.; Wei, L.; Zhu, Y.; Nie, T. Peer-Regarding Fairness in Supply Chain. *Int J Prod Res* **2018**, *56*, 3384–3396, doi:10.1080/00207543.2016.1257872.
8. Lindegaard, K.N.; Adams, P.W.R.; Holley, M.; Lamley, A.; Henriksson, A.; Larsson, S.; von Engelbrechten, H.G.; Esteban Lopez, G.; Pisarek, M. Short Rotation Plantations Policy History in Europe: Lessons from the Past and Recommendations for the Future. *Food Energy Secur* **2016**, *5*, 125–152, doi:10.1002/fes3.86.
9. Dockerty, T.; Appleton, K.; Lovett, A. Public Opinion on Energy Crops in the Landscape: Considerations for the Expansion of Renewable Energy from Biomass. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* **2012**, *55*, 1134–1158, doi:10.1080/09640568.2011.636966.
10. Prčík, M.; Marián, K. Targeted Cultivation of the Energy Plants in Conditions of the Slovak Regions. *Scientific Papers Series Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development* **2015**, *15*, 399–404.
11. Ranacher, L.; Pollakova, B.; Schwarzbauer, P.; Liebal, S.; Weber, N.; Hesser, F. Farmers' Willingness to Adopt Short Rotation Plantations on Marginal Lands: Qualitative Study About Incentives and Barriers in Slovakia. *Bioenergy Res* **2021**, *14*, 357–373, doi:10.1007/s12155-020-10240-6.
12. Dendromass4Europe About the Project Available online: <https://www.dendromass4europe.eu/about-the-project> (accessed on 18 January 2022).
13. Pawelzik, P.; Carus, M.; Hotchkiss, J.; Narayan, R.; Selke, S.; Wellisch, M.; Weiss, M.; Wicke, B.; Patel, M.K. Critical Aspects in the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of Bio-Based Materials - Reviewing Methodologies and Deriving Recommendations. *Resour Conserv Recycl* **2013**, *73*, 211–228, doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2013.02.006.
14. Schweier, J.; Becker, G. Economics of Poplar Short Rotation Coppice Plantations on Marginal Land in Germany. *Biomass Bioenergy* **2013**, *59*, 494–502, doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2013.10.020.
15. Warren, C.R.; Burton, R.; Buchanan, O.; Birnie, R. v. Limited Adoption of Short Rotation Coppice: The Role of Farmers' Socio-Cultural Identity in Influencing Practice. *J Rural Stud* **2016**, *45*, 175–183, doi:10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.03.017.