

## Supplement Materials

Each column presents an overview of all the important statements made per interview across the different topics. These topics are based on the interview guideline. To allocate statements to deductive analytical categories (e.g., subject-related factors, object-related factors, and innovation-process-related factors), we used the analytical framework of acceptability.

**Table S1. Profile matrix of CS1.**

Attitudes	CS1-01	CS1-02	CS1-03	CS1-04
<b>Cultural landscape (stated values)</b>	Importance for region & agricultural use ( <b>public instrumental values</b> )	Importance for regional-cultural identity ( <b>eudemonistic value</b> ), importance for region, agricultural use, species conservation ( <b>mix of instrumental, intrinsic &amp; eudemonistic values</b> )	Importance for regional-cultural identity ( <b>eudemonistic value</b> ), importance for region, agricultural use, species conservation ( <b>mix of instrumental, intrinsic &amp; eudemonistic values</b> )	Beauty of CL, recreation ( <b>eudemonistic values</b> ), important for region, agricultural use and tourism ( <b>instrumental values</b> ), abundant landscape, mosaic of different elements
<b>Degree of appreciation</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>Maintenance of wet meadows</b>	<b>Values:</b> see above; <b>O:</b> wetland as important part of CL, maintenance through agricultural use ( <b>++</b> ); <b>SI:</b> own engagement through mowing the grass ( <b>+</b> ); <b>SA:</b> trust in coordinating actors ( <b>-</b> )	<b>Values:</b> see above; <b>O:</b> maintenance is important ( <b>++</b> ), unbalanced focus on wetlands ( <b>-</b> ), currently no fair payments for maintenance ( <b>-</b> ), need for maintenance programme with monitoring ( <b>-</b> ), <b>SI:</b> high personal relation to wetlands ( <b>++</b> ); <b>SA:</b> lack of trust in coordinating actors ( <b>-</b> ), negative prior experiences ( <b>-</b> ); <b>IP:</b> need for involvement of additional actors ( <b>-</b> )	<b>Values:</b> see above; <b>O:</b> maintenance is important, maintenance through use ( <b>++</b> ), unbalanced focus on wetlands ( <b>-</b> ), currently no fair payments for maintenance ( <b>-</b> ); <b>SI:</b> high personal relation to wetlands ( <b>++</b> ); <b>SA:</b> lack of trust in coordinating actors ( <b>-</b> ), negative prior experiences ( <b>-</b> ); <b>IP:</b> need for involvement of additional actors ( <b>-</b> ), procedural justice ( <b>-</b> )	<b>Values:</b> (agricultural) use of wetlands most important (instrumental value); <b>O:</b> aim generally positive ( <b>+</b> ), unbalanced focus on wetlands, need for include water management ( <b>-</b> ); <b>SI:</b> no expert of the region; <b>SA:</b> negative prior experiences, lack of trust in nature conservational actors, water mismanagement = expropriation ( <b>-</b> ), <b>IP:</b> need for involve land owners ( <b>-</b> ), procedural justice ( <b>-</b> )
<b>Degree of acceptability</b>	<b>High acceptance / engagement</b>	<b>Conditional acceptance / engagement</b>	<b>High acceptance/ conditional acceptance</b>	<b>High acceptance /conditional acceptance</b>
<b>Maintenance of specific wet meadow (CS1)</b>	<b>O:</b> Biased focus on SKG, selection of area ( <b>--</b> ); <b>SI:</b> low relation to SKG, but high relation to other areas; <b>A:</b> trust in coordinating actors ( <b>--</b> )	no specific statements for SGK, <b>SI:</b> low relation to SKG, but high relation to other areas;	<b>O:</b> biased focus on SGK, selection of areas ( <b>-</b> ), <b>O:</b> need for permanent guarantee of maintenance measures ( <b>-</b> ); <b>SI:</b> low relation to SKG, but high relation to other areas;	<b>O:</b> positive to maintain SGK ( <b>+</b> ), area is generally problematic for use ( <b>+</b> ), <b>SI:</b> personal benefit, relief of owner ( <b>+</b> )

Degree of acceptability	Low acceptance /rejection		Conditional acceptance / rejection	High
Land pool (CS1)	<b>O:</b> No clear identification with objective, organisation of maintenance measures (--); entry in the land register, security interests in immovable property = problematic (---); <b>SA:</b> lack of trust in coordinating actors (--); <b>IP:</b> procedural justice (--)	<b>O:</b> No clear identification with objective, organisation of maintenance measures (--), entry in the land register, security interests in immovable property = problematic (--), prefers another solution (-)	<b>O:</b> No clear identification with objective (--), entry in the land register, security interests in immovable property = problematic (---), <b>SI:</b> loss of capacity of agency (-)	<b>O:</b> no clear identification with objective (-), good solution for SGK (+), maintenance measures will conducted (+), fixing the land use, entry in land register = unproblematic (+), financial relief (+), stay in property (+); <b>SA:</b> scepticism concerning coordinating actors (-), currently trust relation is given (+); <b>IP:</b> need for involvement of all actors early in the process
Degree of acceptability	Rejection / conditional acceptance	Rejection / conditional acceptance	Rejection	Conditional acceptance / high acceptance

Table 2. Profile matrix of CS2.

Attitudes	CS2-01	CS2-02	CS2-03	CS2-04	CS2-05	CS2-06	CS2-07	CS2-08	CS2-09
<b>Values concerning the maintenance of the CL</b>	Importance for biodiversity, region & tourism ( <b>mix of instrumental, intrinsic &amp; eudemonistic values</b> )	Importance for nature conservation, regional-cultural identity & region ( <b>mix of intrinsic, eudemonistic &amp; instrumental values</b> )	Recreation; importance for regional-cultural identity ( <b>eudemonistic values</b> ); importance for region, tourism, nature conservation ( <b>mix of instrumental, intrinsic &amp; eudemonistic values</b> )	Economic value of landscape ( <b>individual &amp; public instrumental values</b> )	Economic value of landscape, importance of property saving ( <b>individual &amp; public instrumental values</b> )	Importance for regional-cultural identity ( <b>eudemonistic value</b> ), importance for region & nature conservation ( <b>mix of instrumental, intrinsic &amp; eudemonistic values</b> )	Importance for region and biodiversity conservation ( <b>mix of intrinsic, eudemonistic &amp; instrumental values</b> )	Beauty, recreation ( <b>eudemonistic values</b> ), importance for region & agricultural use ( <b>public instrumental values</b> )	Importance for biodiversity conservation & for region & tourism ( <b>mix of instrumental, intrinsic &amp; eudemonistic values</b> )
<b>Degree of appreciation</b>	High	High	High	Conditional acceptance	Tolerance / conditional a.	High	High	High	High / engagement
<b>Maintenance of wetlands</b>	<b>Values:</b> see above; <b>O:</b> unbalanced focus on wetlands (--); <b>IP:</b> additional actors need to be involved (-); <b>SA:</b> lack of trust in coordinating actors (-)	<b>Values:</b> see above; especially: importance for nature conservation (intrinsic value)	<b>Values:</b> see above; <b>O:</b> meadows as part of CL (+), Similar arguments as concerning specific site	<b>Values:</b> see above, importance of property saving; <b>O:</b> agricultural use of wet meadows important (+); <b>SA:</b> lack of trust (-); negative prior experience (-); <b>P:</b> additional actors need to be involved (-)	<b>Values:</b> see above; <b>O:</b> other elements of CL more important (-); <b>SA:</b> lack of trust (-); negative prior experience (-); <b>IP:</b> lack of transparency; participation (--);	<b>Values:</b> see above; <b>O:</b> maintenance of wet meadows very important (++)	<b>Values:</b> see above; <b>O:</b> objective (+), maintenance for region & biodiversity (++); <b>SI:</b> ownership obligation (+)	<b>Values:</b> see above, maintenance trough agricultural use, <b>O:</b> meadows as part of CL (+), no clear identification with the objective (-),	<b>Values:</b> see above, maintenance trough use; <b>O:</b> meadows as part of CL (++) , objective (+); <b>SA:</b> positive experience (++) , trust in coordinating actors (++)
<b>Degree of acceptability</b>	Rejection /conditional a.	High acceptance	Conditional acceptance	Conditional acceptance	Indifference	High acceptance	High acceptance	Indifference / conditional a.	High / engagement

<b>Maintenance of specific wetland (CS2)</b>	<b>SI:</b> high personal relation, self-identified expert of area development; <b>O:</b> unbalanced focus on wetlands (--), biased focus on KB (--); <b>SA:</b> lack of trust in coordinating actors (-);	<b>SI:</b> low personal relation to area; ownership obligation (+) <b>IP:</b> positive prior experiences (+)	<b>SI:</b> middle - high personal relation to area; loss of capacity of agency (-), ownership obligation (+); <b>O:</b> agricultural use of wet meadows important (++), unbalanced species conservation (-); <b>SA:</b> lack of trust in actors (-); <b>IP:</b> previous experiences (-);	<b>Individual functional value:</b> importance of property saving; <b>SI:</b> very high relation to area (use); <b>O:</b> agricultural use of wet meadows important (+), <b>SA:</b> lack of trust in coordinating actors (-), previous experiences (-); water mismanagement = expropriation (-),	<b>Individual functional value:</b> importance of property saving; <b>SI:</b> low –middle relation to area	<b>Public functional value &amp; intrinsic values:</b> see above; <b>Individual functional value:</b> importance of property saving; <b>SI:</b> low relation to area, low capacity of agency (-);	Same arguments as described in “maintenance of wet meadows”; no differentiation between wet meadows in general and specific site; <b>SI:</b> low personal relation to area	<b>Eudemonistic values:</b> hunting, beauty, wellbeing; <b>public instrumental values:</b> importance for nature conservation; <b>SI:</b> high relation to area (-); <b>O:</b> no clear identification with the objective (--), <b>IP:</b> procedural justice (+)	<b>SI:</b> high personal relation to area; <b>SA:</b> positive experience (++), trust in coordinating actors (++); <b>O:</b> objective (++)
<b>Degree of acceptability</b>	<b>Rejection /conditional a.</b>	<b>High acceptance</b>	<b>Conditional acceptance</b>	<b>Conditional acceptance</b>	<b>Indifference</b>	<b>High acceptance</b>	<b>High acceptance</b>	<b>Indifference / conditional a.</b>	<b>High / engagement</b>
<b>Land pool (CS2)</b>	<b>O:</b> prefers another solution (-), financing through compensation payments (-); <b>SI:</b> loss of capacity of agency (-); <b>SA:</b> lack of trust in coordinating actors (--); <b>IP:</b> participation, procedural	<b>O:</b> security interests in immovable property = unproblematic (+), stay in family (+); <b>SA:</b> trust in coordinating actors (+); <b>IP:</b> participation, procedural justice (+)	<b>O:</b> maintenance through use (+++), security interests in immovable property = unproblematic (+); <b>SA:</b> trust in coordinating actors (+); <b>IP:</b> participation, procedural justice (+++)	<b>O:</b> lack of information (-), low financial compensation (-), prefers another solution (--); planning security is important; <b>SA:</b> lack of trust (-), negative prior experiences (-); <b>IP:</b> participation,	<b>O:</b> security interests in immovable property = problematic (-); <b>SI:</b> loss of capacity of agency (-); <b>SA:</b> lack of trust (-), negative prior experiences (-);	<b>O:</b> security interests in immovable property = problematic (-), preference of existing tenancy agreement (-); <b>IP:</b> participation, procedural justice (+)	<b>O:</b> maintenance through use (+), conservation of biodiversity (++), cost-benefit analysis necessary; <b>IP:</b> procedural justice (+)	<b>O:</b> security interests in immovable property = problematic (---), no clear identification with the objective (--); <b>SA:</b> trust in coordinating actors (+); <b>SI:</b> loss of capacity of agency (---); <b>IP:</b> procedural justice (++)	<b>O:</b> objective (++) , <b>O:</b> security interests in immovable property = unproblematic (+), planned measures (+), sufficient information (+); <b>SA:</b> positive experience (++) , trust in coordinating actors (++) ; <b>SI:</b> professional

	justice is important (+)			procedural justice (+)					interest (++), perceived personal benefit through involvement (+); IP: importance of own participation (+)
<b>Degree of acceptability</b>	<b>Rejection</b>	<b>High acceptance</b>	<b>Conditional a. / high a.</b>	<b>Rejection / conditional a.</b>	<b>Doubt / conditional a.</b>	<b>Doubt / conditional a.</b>	<b>High acceptance</b>	<b>Rejection / conditional a.</b>	<b>High &amp; engagement</b>

SI = subject-related factors are individual-related factors or self-regarding

SA = subject-related factors (related to other actors)

O = object-related factors (regarded to the characteristics of an innovation from the perspective of the interviewed person (e.g., costs, objective, form))

IP = innovation-process-related factors

(+) = positive, (++) = very positive, (+++) extraordinary positive

(-) = negative, (--) = very negative, (---) KO criteria

The intensity/degree of the factor is based on the specific argumentation in the interviews (qualitative evaluation, verbal statement of the interviewee if it is an important and less important argument) and on the stated frequency of the factor during the interview.