Supplemental Table S1: Overview of extracted factors, corresponding statements, and statistics from factor analysis (n = 277).

Item	Factors with statements	FL
BI: Cα = 0.919		
BI1	I am generally willing to provide digital animal welfare data to advisors and veterinarians.	0.901
BI2	I am generally willing to provide digital animal welfare data anonymously for agricultural consultancy.	0.893
BI3	If the conditions are right, I will participate in a future digital animal welfare certification program.	0.841
BI4	I am generally willing to provide digital animal welfare data to private animal welfare programs.	0.817
BI5	I am generally willing to provide digital animal welfare data to state control institutions.	0.745
BI6	I would only provide my digital animal welfare data anonymously.	0.665
ATT: Cα = 0.912		
ATT1	Overall, I think providing digital animal welfare data is advantageous.	0.904
ATT2	In my opinion, it is very desirable to provide digital animal welfare data.	0.895
ATT3	The provision of digital animal welfare data is generally useful for farmers.	0.846
PE F: V = 35.1%; Cα = 0.919		
PE F3	Providing digital animal welfare data saves me time.	0.834
PE F2	Providing digital animal welfare data makes my workday easier.	0.809
PE F1	I find providing digital animal welfare data useful for my farm processes.	0.803
PE F4	Providing digital animal welfare data reduces documentation workload.	0.754
PE F5	Providing digital animal welfare data is fair, as all farms are evaluated equally.	0.628
PE F6	Digital animal welfare data minimize subjective influences compared with human controls.	0.596
PE F7	Digital animal welfare data enable equal evaluation of all farms.	0.507
PE C: V = 4.6%; Cα = 0.896		
PE C1	Providing digital animal welfare data increases consumer trust in agriculture.	0.832
PE C2	Providing digital animal welfare data increases consumer trust in animal welfare standards.	0.788
PE C3	Providing digital animal welfare data increases transparency for consumers.	0.741
EE: V = 16.6%; Cα = 0.915		
EE1	Using technologies for digital animal welfare measurement is easy for me.	0.822
EE6	Providing digital animal welfare data is easy for me.	0.793
EE3	It is easy for me to learn how to use technologies for digital animal welfare measurement.	0.787
EE4	My first impression of using technologies for digital animal welfare measurement is clear and understandable.	0.783
EE2	I have the necessary resources to provide digital animal welfare data.	0.745

EE5	I have the necessary knowledge to provide digital animal welfare data.	0.718
EE7	It is easy for me to learn how to provide digital animal welfare data.	0.699
EE8	I already use technologies to monitor animal health.	0.623
SI: V = 2.5%; Cα = 0.828		
SI3	I think the retail sector would approve if I provided my digital animal welfare data.	0.811
SI2	I think the government would approve if I provided my digital animal welfare data.	0.794
SI1	I think society would approve if I provided my digital animal welfare data.	0.704
TR: V = 3.3%; Cα = 0.914		
TR1	I trust that my digital animal welfare data will not be misused.	0.801
TR2	I trust that my digital animal welfare data will not be shared with third parties.	0.747
TR3	I trust that my digital animal welfare data will be evaluated fairly.	0.608
TR4	I would agree to my digital animal welfare data being accessed at any time.	0.546
AttAw: V = 6.3%; Cα = 0.939		
AttAw1	In my opinion, it is very desirable to participate in an animal welfare program.	0.751
AttAw2	Participation in an animal welfare program is fundamentally reasonable for farmers.	0.688
AttAw3	Overall, I have positive feelings about participating in an animal welfare program.	0.683
AttAw4	Overall, I think that participating in an animal welfare program is advantageous.	0.683

Notes: The model explains 68.48% of the variance; BI = Behavioral intention; ATT = Attitude; PE F = Performance expectancy (farm); PE C = Performance expectancy (consumer); EE = Effort expectancy; SI = Social influence; TR = Trust; AttAw = Attitudes towards animal welfare programs; V = proportion of total variance explained (unrotated solution); Cα = Cronbach's alpha; FL = factor loading; the statements used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = 'Fully disagree' to 5 = 'Fully agree'.

3

Supplemental Table S2: Reliability and validity metrics of the PLS-SEM model for farmers' acceptance of animal welfare-related data sharing (n = 277).

Item	Factors with statements	FL
BI: AVE = 0.715; Cα = 0.919; CR = 0.925		
BI1	I am generally willing to provide digital animal welfare data to advisors and veterinarians.	0.906
BI2	I am generally willing to provide digital animal welfare data anonymously for agricultural consultancy.	0.900
BI3	If the conditions are right, I will participate in a future digital animal welfare certification program.	0.871
BI4	I am generally willing to provide digital animal welfare data to private animal welfare programs.	0.855
BI5	I am generally willing to provide digital animal welfare data to state control institutions.	0.805
BI6	I would only provide my digital animal welfare data anonymously.	0.724
ATT: AVE = 0.851; Cα = 0.913; CR = 0.913; VIF = 4.677		
ATT1	Overall, I think providing digital animal welfare data is advantageous.	0.930
ATT2	In my opinion, it is very desirable to provide digital animal welfare data.	0.927
ATT3	The provision of digital animal welfare data is generally useful for farmers.	0.911
PE F: AVE = 0.674; Cα = 0.919; CR = 0.924; VIF = 3.163		
PE F1	I find providing digital animal welfare data useful for my farm processes.	0.884
PE F2	Providing digital animal welfare data makes my workday easier.	0.874
PE F3	Providing digital animal welfare data saves me time.	0.840
PE F4	Providing digital animal welfare data reduces documentation workload.	0.824
PE F5	Providing digital animal welfare data is fair, as all farms are evaluated equally.	0.813
PE F6	Digital animal welfare data minimize subjective influences compared with human controls.	0.758
PE F7	Digital animal welfare data enable equal evaluation of all farms.	0.741
PE C: AVE = 0.828; Cα = 0.896; CR = 0.896; VIF = 1.596		
PE C1	Providing digital animal welfare data increases consumer trust in agriculture.	0.917
PE C2	Providing digital animal welfare data increases consumer trust in animal welfare standards.	0.913
PE C3	Providing digital animal welfare data increases transparency for consumers.	0.900
EE: AVE = 0.629; Cα = 0.916; CR = 0.927; VIF = 1.408		
EE1	Using technologies for digital animal welfare measurement is easy for me.	0.836
EE2	I have the necessary resources to provide digital animal welfare data.	0.832
EE3	It is easy for me to learn how to use technologies for digital animal welfare measurement.	0.816
EE4	My first impression of using technologies for digital animal welfare measurement is clear and understandable.	0.812
EE6	Providing digital animal welfare data is easy for me.	0.809
EE5	I have the necessary knowledge to provide digital animal welfare data.	0.799

EE7	It is easy for me to learn how to provide digital animal welfare data.	0.715
EE8	I already use technologies to monitor animal health.	0.714
SI: AVE = 0.709; Cα = 0.829; CR = 0.948; VIF = 1.271		
SI1	I think society would approve if I provided my digital animal welfare data.	0.926
SI2	I think the government would approve if I provided my digital animal welfare data.	0.863
SI3	I think the retail sector would approve if I provided my digital animal welfare data.	0.724
TR: AVE = 0.796; Cα = 0.914; CR = 0.915; VIF = 2.977		
TR1	I trust that my digital animal welfare data will not be misused.	0.929
TR3	I trust that my digital animal welfare data will be evaluated fairly.	0.904
TR2	I trust that my digital animal welfare data will not be shared with third parties.	0.903
TR4	I would agree to my digital animal welfare data being accessed at any time.	0.831
AttAw: AVE = 0.845; Cα = 0.939; CR = 0.939; VIF = 2.809		
AttAw1	In my opinion, it is very desirable to participate in an animal welfare program.	0.936
AttAw4	Overall, I think that participating in an animal welfare program is advantageous.	0.914
AttAw3	Overall, I have positive feelings about participating in an animal welfare program.	0.914
AttAw2	Participation in an animal welfare program is fundamentally reasonable for farmers.	0.913

Notes: BI = Behavioral intention; ATT = Attitude; PE F = Performance expectancy (farm); PE C = Performance expectancy (consumer); EE = Effort expectancy; SI = Social influence; TR = Trust; AttAw = Attitudes towards animal welfare programs; AVE = average variance extracted; Cα = Cronbach's Alpha; CR = composite reliability (ρA); VIF = inner variance inflation factor (direct relationship with the dependent variable); FL = factor loading; the statements used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = ‘Fully disagree’ to 5 = ‘Fully agree’.

6

Supplemental Table S3: Detailed results of the PLS-SEM analysis (n = 277).

Hypothesis	Direct structural path	Effect size f^2	Path coefficients	P values	Standard error	Confidence interval[1]	
						0.025	**0.975**
H1+	ATT → BI	**0.107**	**0.333**	<0.001	0.073	0.189	0.476
H2.1+	PE F → BI	**0.108**	**0.276**	<0.001	0.052	0.174	0.380
H2.1a+	PE F → ATT	**0.202**	**0.337**	<0.001	0.057	0.227	0.448
H2.2+	PE C → BI	**0.031**	**-0.105**	0.011	0.041	-0.189	-0.026
H2.2a+	PE C → ATT	0.008	0.051	0.241	0.043	-0.034	0.136
H3-	EE → BI	**0.088**	**-0.165**	<0.001	0.034	-0.232	-0.096
H3a-	EE → ATT	0.004	-0.033	0.344	0.034	-0.097	0.037
H4+	SI → BI	**0.027**	**0.087**	0.025	0.039	0.010	0.161
H4a+	SI → ATT	0.014	0.061	0.077	0.034	-0.008	0.125
H5+	TR → BI	**0.090**	**0.243**	<0.001	0.055	0.137	0.348
H5a+	TR → ATT	**0.278**	**0.372**	<0.001	0.048	0.279	0.466
H6+	AttAw → BI	0.004	0.051	0.371	0.057	-0.060	0.162
H6a+	AttAw → ATT	**0.094**	**0.227**	<0.001	0.063	0.104	0.353

Notes: [1]Bias-corrected confidence intervals; bolded path coefficients indicate a significant impact within the model, with a significance level of $p < 0.05$; bolded f^2 values indicate an effect size of $f^2 > 0.02$; BI = Behavioral intention; ATT = Attitude; PE F = Performance expectancy (farm); PE C = Performance expectancy (consumer); EE = Effort expectancy; SI = Social influence; TR = Trust; AttAw = Attitudes towards animal welfare programs.

Supplemental Table S4: Internal consistency: Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability and average variance extracted of the constructs (n = 277).

Construct	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (ρA)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
BI	0.919	0.925	0.715
ATT	0.913	0.913	0.851
PE F	0.919	0.924	0.674
PE C	0.896	0.896	0.828
EE	0.916	0.927	0.629
SI	0.829	0.948	0.709
TR	0.914	0.915	0.796
AttAw	0.939	0.939	0.845

Notes: BI = Behavioral intention; ATT = Attitude; PE F = Performance expectancy (farm); PE C = Performance expectancy (consumer); EE = Effort expectancy; SI = Social influence; TR = Trust; AttAw = Attitudes towards animal welfare programs.

Supplemental Table S5: Discriminant validity: Fornell–Larcker criterion (n = 277).

	ATT	AttAw	BI	EE	PE F	PE C	SI	TR
ATT	**0.923**							
AttAw	0.761	**0.919**						
BI	0.818	0.700	**0.846**					
EE	-0.311	-0.322	-0.452	**0.793**				
PE F	0.800	0.733	0.769	-0.231	**0.821**			
PE C	0.421	0.393	0.256	0.161	0.366	**0.910**		
SI	0.302	0.277	0.265	0.072	0.271	0.420	**0.842**	
TR	0.791	0.646	0.768	-0.378	0.682	0.369	0.185	**0.892**

Notes: Bolded values indicate square root of average variance extracted (AVE); non-bolded values indicate latent variable correlations; BI = Behavioral intention; ATT = Attitude; PE F = Performance expectancy (farm); PE C = Performance expectancy (consumer); EE = Effort expectancy; SI = Social influence; TR = Trust; AttAw = Attitudes towards animal welfare programs.

Supplemental Table S6: Discriminant validity: HTMT criterion (n = 277).

	ATT	AttAw	BI	EE	PE F	PE C	SI	TR
ATT								
AttAw	0.823							
BI	0.890	0.748						
EE	0.326	0.335	0.487					
PE F	0.871	0.790	0.831	0.231				
PE C	0.465	0.429	0.277	0.196	0.408			
SI	0.267	0.241	0.238	0.115	0.233	0.427		
TR	0.865	0.696	0.833	0.399	0.739	0.406	0.169	

Notes: BI = Behavioral intention; ATT = Attitude; PE F = Performance expectancy (farm); PE C = Performance expectancy (consumer); EE = Effort expectancy; SI = Social influence; TR = Trust; AttAw = Attitudes towards animal welfare programs.

32 **Supplemental Table S7: Cross-loadings of latent variables (n = 277).**

Construct/ Item	ATT	AttAw	BI	EE	PE F	PE C	SI	TR
SI1	0.333	0.317	0.278	0.061	0.297	0.475	**0.926**	0.255
SI3	0.047	-0.010	0.040	0.121	-0.004	0.220	**0.724**	-0.027
EE8	-0.263	-0.246	-0.311	**0.714**	-0.197	0.017	0.068	-0.309
TR2	0.683	0.559	0.650	-0.337	0.568	0.272	0.149	**0.903**
ATT1	**0.930**	0.723	0.746	-0.300	0.730	0.410	0.277	0.725
ATT2	**0.927**	0.703	0.765	-0.327	0.747	0.348	0.242	0.728
TR3	0.752	0.655	0.716	-0.355	0.684	0.399	0.206	**0.904**
TR1	0.714	0.577	0.676	-0.368	0.596	0.281	0.089	**0.929**
ATT3	**0.911**	0.682	0.754	-0.235	0.736	0.408	0.319	0.736
AttAw4	0.715	**0.914**	0.629	-0.277	0.701	0.385	0.282	0.570
AttAw1	0.694	**0.936**	0.655	-0.304	0.673	0.348	0.224	0.592
AttAw3	0.696	**0.914**	0.655	-0.344	0.661	0.351	0.232	0.621
AttAw2	0.695	**0.913**	0.634	-0.257	0.660	0.361	0.280	0.592
PE F4	0.614	0.573	0.605	-0.220	**0.824**	0.269	0.176	0.543
PE F1	0.746	0.645	0.740	-0.261	**0.884**	0.288	0.281	0.653
PE F3	0.627	0.545	0.607	-0.218	**0.840**	0.254	0.191	0.526
PE F2	0.694	0.633	0.704	-0.249	**0.874**	0.238	0.243	0.586
PE F5	0.673	0.611	0.626	-0.153	**0.813**	0.320	0.243	0.583
EE6	-0.189	-0.191	-0.341	**0.809**	-0.069	0.202	0.060	-0.213
EE7	-0.117	-0.152	-0.266	**0.715**	-0.078	0.167	0.126	-0.196
PE F6	0.586	0.555	0.558	-0.108	**0.758**	0.330	0.204	0.461
PE F7	0.636	0.645	0.548	-0.092	**0.741**	0.425	0.202	0.544
PE C3	0.381	0.352	0.253	0.187	0.343	**0.900**	0.435	0.322
PE C2	0.370	0.378	0.235	0.132	0.353	**0.913**	0.353	0.327
PE C1	0.398	0.343	0.210	0.121	0.303	**0.917**	0.358	0.359
EE4	-0.213	-0.221	-0.391	**0.812**	-0.163	0.220	0.024	-0.258
EE1	-0.220	-0.247	-0.325	**0.836**	-0.137	0.206	0.041	-0.285
EE3	-0.234	-0.262	-0.313	**0.816**	-0.157	0.196	0.104	-0.294
BI6	0.518	0.395	**0.724**	-0.487	0.523	0.001	0.080	0.454
BI2	0.712	0.589	**0.900**	-0.454	0.677	0.194	0.187	0.664
TR4	0.668	0.508	0.694	-0.287	0.577	0.359	0.214	**0.831**
BI5	0.733	0.590	**0.805**	-0.289	0.643	0.300	0.231	0.718
BI4	0.727	0.641	**0.855**	-0.295	0.661	0.317	0.321	0.694
BI3	0.752	0.719	**0.871**	-0.311	0.698	0.261	0.262	0.671
BI1	0.686	0.586	**0.906**	-0.480	0.683	0.189	0.239	0.666
EE2	-0.316	-0.326	-0.455	**0.832**	-0.282	0.073	0.036	-0.395
EE5	-0.340	-0.326	-0.396	**0.799**	-0.286	0.013	0.039	-0.371

SI2	0.220	0.195	0.214	0.057	0.208	0.258	**0.863**	0.073

Notes: Bolded loadings indicate loadings of items on the associated construct; BI = Behavioral intention; ATT = Attitude; PE F = Performance expectancy (farm); PE C = Performance expectancy (consumer); EE = Effort expectancy; SI = Social influence; TR = Trust; AttAw = Attitudes towards animal welfare programs.

Supplemental Note 1: Assessment of systematic response behavior

This note provides a detailed description of the procedures used to identify systematic response behavior during data cleaning.
Systematic response behavior was assessed using two conceptually distinct procedures that served complementary purposes in the data cleaning process.

Extreme scale use (primary indicator)

As a primary response quality check, extreme scale use was examined across Likert-type statements measured on a five-point response scale (1–5) that were designed as multi-item measures of theoretical constructs and thus potentially eligible for inclusion in the analytical model.
For each respondent, the proportion of these construct-related Likert statements answered with the lowest (1), middle (3), or highest (5) response category was calculated. Respondents exceeding a threshold of 80% identical responses at one of these scale points were classified as exhibiting extreme response patterns and were excluded from further analysis. Based on this criterion, five responses were removed from the dataset.

Block-wise straightlining (secondary indicator)

In addition, block-wise straightlining was assessed as a secondary indicator to evaluate response behavior within the questionnaire structure. The questionnaire consisted of 11 consecutive question blocks, each presented on a separate page and containing multiple items measured on ordinal response scales (four- or five-point scales). For each respondent and for each block, within-block response variance was calculated. A block was classified as straightlined when all items within that block were answered using the same response category, resulting in a standard deviation of zero (SD = 0). For each respondent, the number and proportion of blocks exhibiting straightlining were computed.

Combined assessment

Extreme scale use served as the primary exclusion criterion. Block-wise straightlining was not associated with a predefined cutoff but was used to further evaluate borderline cases falling below the extreme scale-use threshold. One respondent fell slightly below the primary cutoff for extreme scale use, with 78% identical midpoint responses, but simultaneously exhibited pronounced block-wise straightlining, with 73% of question blocks showing zero within-block variance. This value represented the second-highest straightlining proportion in the screened sample (n = 283). Based on this combined assessment, this response was also excluded.

In total, six responses were excluded due to clearly extreme response behavior.

Supplemental Note 2: Analytical code and reproducibility

1. Overview

This supplemental note provides a complete overview of the analytical framework, software environment, datasets, and code used to process and analyze the data reported in this study. All materials are provided to ensure full transparency and reproducibility of the results.

2. Software environment

The analyses were conducted using the following software:

- Microsoft Excel 365 version 2601 was used as a supplementary tool during data screening and data cleaning, as described in the manuscript, and for the tabular presentation and graphical visualization of results. All substantive statistical analyses and model estimations were conducted in SPSS and SmartPLS. No independent statistical analyses were performed in Excel.
- IBM SPSS Statistics, version: version 28.0.0.0
  Used for descriptive statistics, correlation analyses, and exploratory factor analyses (EFA).
- SmartPLS, version 4.1.1.5
  Used for partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM).

3. Datasets

The datasets provided in the public repository correspond to the analytically relevant data stages described in the manuscript. Details on survey administration, eligibility criteria, and the screening and data cleaning procedures are reported in the Materials and Methods section of the manuscript.

The dataset resulting from the eligibility screening process is referred to as the "Screened Dataset" (n = 283) and includes all respondents who met the predefined inclusion criteria and fully completed the questionnaire. Based on the data cleaning procedures described in the manuscript and Supplemental Note 1, a "Final Dataset" (n = 277) was derived from the Screened Dataset.

Both the Screened Dataset and the Final Dataset are provided in the public repository to ensure transparency of the data preparation process and reproducibility of the reported analyses.

4. SPSS Procedures for correlation and exploratory factor analysis

In the following sections, the SPSS procedures used to conduct the correlation analyses and exploratory factor analysis are documented to ensure reproducibility.

4.1. Correlation analyses (SPSS)

4.1.1. Table 3. Correlation between data collection and behavioral intention

Analytical specification:

- Correlation measure: Spearman's rho
- Rationale: Ordinal measurement level of the data collection variables (scale from 1 to 4)
- Behavioral intention (BI): Arithmetic mean score of the BI items (see below)
- Dataset: Final Dataset (n = 277)
- Missing values: Pairwise deletion
- Significance testing: Two-tailed tests, $\alpha = 0.05$

Variables:

- Behavioral intention (BI_Mean): Arithmetic mean score of the BI items:
  - v_86_Anonymous Provision
  - v_88_Anonymous Consultancy
  - v_90_Provision Control Institutions
  - v_91_Provision AWP
  - v_92_ParticipationProgramDigCertification
  - v_93_ProvisionAdvisorVeterinary
- v_33_CollectionHealth data
- v_34_CollectionHousing conditions
- v_35_CollectionProductivity indicators
- v_36_CollectionClimate parameters
- v_37_CollectionFeed data
- v_38_CollectionBehavioral data

4.1.2. Table 4. Correlation between data sharing willingness (private vs. government) and behavioral intention

Analytical specification:

- Correlation measure: Pearson's correlation (r)
- Rationale: Willingness-to-share variables were measured on a metric Likert scale (1 to 5)
- Behavioral intention (BI): Arithmetic mean score of the BI items (see Section 4.1.1)
- Dataset: Final Dataset (n = 277)
- Missing values: Pairwise deletion
- Significance testing: Two-tailed tests, $\alpha = 0.05$

Variables:

- Behavioral intention (BI_Mean)
- Willingness to share data with the private sector:
  - v_40_Health Data
  - v_41_Housing conditions
  - v_42_Productivity indicators
  - v_43_Climate Parameters
  - v_44_Feed data
  - v_45_Behavioral Data
- Willingness to share data with government sector:
  - v_46_Health data
  - v_47_Housing data
  - v_48_Productivity data
  - v_49_Climate parameters
  - v_50_Feed data
  - v_51_Behavioral Data

4.2. Exploratory factor analysis (SPSS)

Analytical specification:

- Dataset: Final Dataset (n = 277)
- Purpose: Exploratory assessment of the underlying factor structure of the items used in the survey
- Missing values: Listwise deletion
- Extraction method: Principal axis factoring (PAF)
- Rotation method: Varimax rotation (orthogonal)
- Correlation matrix: Factor analysis based on the correlation matrix (METHOD = CORRELATION)
- Sampling adequacy and factorability:
    - Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy
    - Bartlett's test of sphericity
- Factor retention criteria:
    - Eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (Kaiser criterion)
    - Visual inspection of the scree plot
- Iteration settings: Maximum 25 iterations for convergence

Variables (English description; final item set):

Attitudes towards animal welfare programs (AttAw)

- v_24_Animal Welfare ProgramAdvant
- v_25_ParticipationAnimal Welfare Program
- v_29_FeelingAnimal Welfare Program
- v_30_Participation reasonable

Performance expectancy (farm) (PE F)

- v_68_Reduce documentation effort
- v_69_Useful Farm Process
- v_70_Time Saving
- v_71_DailyWork Easier
- v_72_Fairness
- V_76_Minimization Subjective Influences
- V_77_Eligible Evaluation

Performance expectancy (consumer) (PE C)

- v_78_Transparency Consumer
- v_79_Trust Consumer
- v_80_Trust Agriculture

Effort expectancy (EE)

- v_74_Provision Easy
- v_75_Learning Dataprovision
- v_81_Impression Clearly
- v_82_UsageTechnologies Easy
- v_83_Learning Technologies Easy
- v_104_Usage Technologies
- V_97_essential resources
- V_98_necessary knowledge

Social influence (SI)

- v_99_Policy
- v_100_Society
- v_102_Retail

Trust (TR)

- v_108_Third parties
- v_113_TrustFairEvaluation
- v_114_TrustNo misuse
- v_89_Direct access

In addition to the main exploratory factor analysis reported above, separate exploratory factor analyses were conducted for the Behavioral Intention (BI) items and for the Attitude (ATT) items. These analyses were performed to verify that the respective item sets formed single, unidimensional factors and were not split into multiple latent dimensions.

Variables (English description; final item set):

Behavioral intention (BI)

- v_86_Anonymous Provision
- v_88_Anonymous Consultancy
- v_90_Provision Control Institutions
- v_91_Provision AWP
- v_92_ParticipationProgramDigCertification
- v_93_ProvisionAdvisorVeterinary

Attitude (ATT)

- v_109_Advantageous
- v_110_Desirable
- v_116_provisionUsefulFarmers

In addition, internal consistency reliability was assessed for each factor derived from the exploratory factor analyses using Cronbach's alpha. Reliability analyses were conducted separately for each final factor based on the corresponding item sets.

5. SmartPLS procedures for partial least squares structural equation modeling

- The PLS-SEM was estimated using the constructs and indicators documented above (see Section 4.2).
- Dataset: Final Dataset (n = 277)
- No missing values were present in the Final Dataset; therefore, no missing value treatment was applied in any of the SmartPLS procedures.

5.1. PLS-SEM model estimation

- Procedure: Estimation of the PLS-SEM using the specified measurement and structural model.
- PLS algorithm settings:
  - Weighting scheme: Path weighting scheme

    - Maximum number of iterations: 3000
    - Stop criterion: 10^{-7}
    - Initial weights: 1.0
    - Lohmöller settings: Not used
    - Type of results: Standardized
- Outer weighting mode:
    - Construct outer weighting modes were set to AUTOMATIC for all constructs

5.2. Bootstrapping

- Procedure: Bootstrapping was applied to assess the statistical significance of the estimated path coefficients and outer loadings.
- Bootstrapping settings:
    - Complexity: Complete (slower)
    - Number of bootstrap samples: 5,000
    - Test type: Two-tailed
    - Significance level: $\alpha = 0.05$
    - Confidence interval method: Bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) bootstrap
    - Parallel processing: Yes
    - Save results per sample: No
    - Seed: Fixed seed
- The bootstrapping procedure was applied to the PLS-SEM model specified in Section 5.1.

5.3. Predictive model assessment (PLS-Predict)

- Procedure: Out-of-sample predictive assessment was conducted using PLS-Predict.
- PLS-Predict / CVPAT settings:
    - Number of folds: 10
    - Number of repetitions: 10
    - Random seed: Fixed seed
- The predictive assessment was based on the PLS-SEM model specified in Section 5.1.