

Appendix 2

Categories of answers of respondents to indirect questioning within the four subject areas with full descriptions of the categories.

Subject 1. Attitudes to State Forests (questions 4-6 in Annex 1)

Likert scale	Category	Description
1	strongly negative	Respondent indicated State Forests had a strong negative influence on the quality of their life: they did not see any benefits from the activity of State Forests and indicated many limitations, like excessive forest exploitation, difficulties related to access of the forest complex, insufficient recreational development, forest littering, forest road destruction, lack of employment opportunities in forestry, expensive wood, damages from wildlife, or a lack of opportunity to discuss these subjects with foresters.
2	moderately negative	Respondent indicated State Forests had a negative influence on the quality of their life, with many limitations (similar to above), but indicated there were opportunities for casual work in forestry and purchasing wood. Their contacts with foresters were limited to economic transactions
3	slightly negative	Respondent indicated State Forests had a rather negative influence on the quality of their life with some limitations (mainly related to difficulties in accessing the forest complex, and damages from wildlife), but indicated there were opportunities for casual work in forestry and purchasing wood. Their contacts with foresters were limited to economic transactions.
4	ambivalent attitude	Respondent indicated State Forests had no influence on the quality of their life, and generally had no comments or contacts with foresters.
5	slightly positive	Respondent indicated State Forests had a rather positive influence on the quality of their life, did not see many limitations and indicated there were opportunities for purchasing wood. Their contacts with foresters were limited to economic transactions.
6	moderately positive	Respondent indicated State Forests had a positive influence on the quality of their life. State Forests were mainly praised for preserving the value of the forest complex and their role in the local labor market but also criticized for some negative

		impacts, mainly forest road destruction, damages from wildlife and difficulties related to access of the forest complex (although the negative impact of these criticisms was acceptable). They occasionally discussed these subjects with foresters.
7	strongly positive	Respondent indicated State Forests had a strong positive influence on the quality of their life. State Forests were praised mainly for preserving the value of the forest complex and their role in the local labor market. They did not see any negative impact, and often discussed these subjects with foresters

Subject 2. Attitudes to nature protection (questions 7-8 in Annex 1)

Likert scale	Category	Description
1	strongly negative	Respondent indicated nature protection had a strong negative influence. The main indicated threats were road wildlife collisions, vicinity of large predators, and flooding caused by beavers.
2	moderately negative	Respondent indicated nature protection had a negative influence. The main indicated threats were limits to home construction, reclassification and use of land, and increased costs of farming.
3	slightly negative	Respondent indicated nature protection had a rather negative influence. The main indicated threats (but only incidentally) were damages to crops and livestock, and damage to private forest stands.
4	ambivalent attitude	Respondent was ambivalent towards nature protection, and regarded incidental damages to be acceptable.
5	slightly positive	Respondent indicated nature protection had a rather positive influence, and regarded incidental damages to be acceptable.
6	moderately positive	Respondent indicated nature protection had a positive influence, and regarded incidental limitations (mainly the same as in p.2) to be acceptable.
7	strongly positive	Respondent indicated nature protection had a strong positive influence, and did not see any limitations nor threats

Subject 3. Attitudes to the E. bison (questions 9-11 in Annex 1), * answers from forest complexes without E. bison (if different question),** answers from forest complexes with E. bison (if different question)

Likert scale	Category	Description
1	strongly negative	Respondent indicated a strong negative attitude, with threats to health and life. They did not see any benefits, would firmly vote against reintroducing E. bison to the forest complex*, or would vote for strongly reducing the E. bison population**
2	moderately negative	Respondent indicated a negative attitude, with threats to health and life or material losses, but also indicated some benefits. Would vote against reintroducing E. bison to the forest complex*, or would vote for strongly reducing the E. bison population**
3	slightly negative	Respondent indicated a rather negative attitude, with some threats to health and life or material losses, but also indicated some benefits, would rather vote against E. bison reintroduction to the forest complex*, or would vote for weakly reducing the E. bison population**
4	ambivalent attitude	1) Respondent did not indicate any benefits nor threats and avoided answering the question to the theoretical referendum about E. bison reintroduction* , would rather vote for keeping the existing state of the bison population** or 2) Respondent indicated extreme answers about the benefits and threats, and avoided answering the question to the theoretical referendum about E. bison reintroduction
5	slightly positive	Respondent did not indicate specific threats (but took into account threats to health and life and material losses), and indicated some of the benefits, would vote for reintroducing E. bison *, or vote for maintaining the existing state of the E. bison population**
6	moderately positive	Respondent indicated specific threats (but mainly some material losses), and indicated benefits (mainly regarding the attractiveness of the region), would vote for reintroducing E. bison *, or would vote for keeping the existing state of the E. bison population**
7	strongly positive	Respondent indicated only benefits (mainly regarding the attractiveness of the region), would firmly vote for reintroducing E. bison *, or would firmly vote for keeping the existing state of the bison population**