

Study 1 Supplementary Information

Table S1

Intergroup dyad sample sizes

Social Identity	<i>n</i>	% of social identity category
Religious Identity		
Christian	269	34.27
Muslim	516	65.73
Other	31	3.80
Regional/Ethnic Group		
Moro	387	47.43
Lumad	207	25.37
Christian Settler	221	27.08
Other	1	0.12
Political Identity		
UBJP	471	57.7
BAPA	64	7.84
Other	281	65.56

Table S2

Mean (SD) for variables by fusion status to religion, regional group, and political party.

	All Participants	Religion		Regional Group		Political Party	
		Fused	Not Fused	Fused	Not Fused	Fused	Not Fused
Intergroup Cooperation	6.56(0.71)	6.59(0.71)	6.47(0.71)	6.63(0.67)	6.33(0.79)	6.71(0.59)	6.46(0.76)
Trust of outgroup							
Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)	5.45(1.20)	5.51(1.22)	5.28(1.12)	5.53(1.21)	5.21(1.16)	5.82(1.14)	5.21(1.18)
Regional Group (Moro vs. Lumad)	5.36(1.38)	5.33(1.49)	5.45(0.97)	5.42(1.41)	5.03(1.16)	5.73(1.36)	5.10(1.34)
Regional Group (Moro vs. CS)	5.29(1.28)	5.32(1.34)	5.15(1.01)	5.38(1.35)	5.03(1.04)	5.72(1.25)	5.00(1.23)
Regional Group (Lumad vs. CS)	5.57(1.20)	5.70(1.20)	5.34(1.17)	5.63(1.29)	5.41(0.90)	5.95(1.16)	5.32(1.16)
Political Party (UBJP vs. BAPA)	5.11(1.38)	5.16(1.43)	4.92(1.19)	5.15(1.42)	4.93(1.20)	5.71(1.29)	4.67(1.28)
Outgroup Perceptions (i.e., cold-warm)							
Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)	68.32 (23.83)	72.07 (21.36)	57.11 (27.14)	71.82 (21.65)	57.04 (26.91)	75.61 (21.33)	63.46 (24.19)
Regional Group (Moro vs. Lumad)	71.10 (22.16)	73.30 (20.19)	64.24 (26.35)	73.37 (20.40)	59.32 (26.86)	75.80 (20.48)	67.83 (22.73)
Regional Group (Moro vs. CS)	67.79 (23.17)	71.42 (21.36)	53.63 (24.56)	71.05 (21.48)	58.66 (25.26)	72.63 (22.25)	64.56 (23.23)
Regional Group (Lumad vs. CS)	64.65 (26.14)	68.88 (23.77)	56.97 (28.47)	67.90 (24.02)	55.91 (29.50)	71.14 (23.70)	60.33 (26.83)
Political Party (UBJP vs. BAPA)	66.71 (22.66)	70.07 (21.18)	54.43 (23.71)	68.75 (21.47)	57.60 (25.53)	74.16 (21.37)	61.26 (22.04)
Outgroup threat perception							
Religion (Muslims vs. Christians)	1.35(0.79)	1.35(0.81)	1.35(0.70)	1.31(0.76)	1.49(0.84)	1.32(0.80)	1.37(0.78)
Regional Group (Moro vs. Lumad)	1.29(0.76)	1.32(0.80)	1.20(0.58)	1.28(0.77)	1.36(0.67)	1.24(0.74)	1.33(0.77)
Regional Group (Moro vs. CS)	1.39(0.80)	1.35(0.78)	1.52(0.87)	1.30(0.73)	1.62(0.93)	1.30(0.73)	1.45(0.84)
Regional Group (Lumad vs. CS)	1.21(0.60)	1.15(0.51)	1.32(0.73)	1.10(0.39)	1.51(0.90)	1.15(0.51)	1.25(0.65)
Political Party (UBJP vs. BAPA)	1.19(0.54)	1.19(0.53)	1.19(0.58)	1.14(0.45)	1.45(0.81)	1.15(0.55)	1.23(0.54)
Desire for social distance (relationships) from outgroup							
Regional Group (Moro vs. Lumad)	2.32(1.22)	2.39(1.29)	2.13(0.96)	2.28(1.26)	2.57(0.98)	2.02(1.22)	2.54(1.18)
Regional Group (Moro vs. CS)	2.33(1.12)	2.37(1.19)	2.16(0.78)	2.32(1.18)	2.33(0.88)	1.96(1.09)	2.58(1.07)
Regional Group (Lumad vs. CS)	1.83(0.97)	1.65(0.94)	2.11(0.96)	1.81(1.05)	1.90(0.50)	1.51(0.86)	2.06(0.99)

Desire for social distance (land sharing) from outgroup

Regional Group (Moro vs. Lumad)	3.53(2.06)	3.31(2.05)	4.22(1.94)	3.47(2.07)	3.82(1.98)	3.22(2.04)	3.75(2.05)
Regional Group (Moro vs. CS)	2.97(1.79)	2.92(1.81)	3.19(1.71)	2.99(1.84)	2.93(1.61)	2.57(1.76)	3.26(1.77)
Regional Group (Lumad vs. CS)	3.75(2.13)	3.53(2.18)	4.11(2.01)	3.85(2.12)	3.34(2.17)	3.23(1.97)	4.14(2.17)

Table S3

The relationship between identity fusion and outgroup trust moderated by threat, controlling for group membership

Terms	<i>df</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Adj. R²</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>CI</i> s	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<u>Model 1: Muslim & Christian Filipinos</u>	780	24.35	<.001	0.11				
Intercept					5.59	[5.4, 5.78]	58.59	<.001
Fusion to religion					0.29	[0.11, 0.48]	3.1	.002
Religious group [Reference = Christians]					-0.54	[-0.71, -0.37]	-6.16	<.001
Outgroup threat					-0.33	[-0.51, -0.15]	-3.53	<.001
Fusion*Threat					0.04	[-0.17, 0.24]	0.38	.703
<u>Model 2: Lumad & CS</u>	415	2.53	.028	0.01				
Intercept					5.53	[5.29, 5.77]	45.48	<.001
Fusion to regional group					0.16	[-0.12, 0.44]	1.14	.253
Regional group [Reference = CS]					-0.2	[-0.44, 0.05]	-1.58	.115
Outgroup threat					-0.16	[-0.31, -0.01]	-2.1	.036
Fusion*Threat					0.01	[-0.24, 0.27]	0.1	.919
<u>Model 3: Moro & CS</u>	603	19.19	<.001	0.11				
Intercept					5.44	[5.23, 5.66]	49.34	<.001
Fusion to regional group					0.46	[0.23, 0.69]	3.9	<.001
Regional group [Reference = CS]					-0.76	[-0.97, -0.55]	-7.16	<.001
Outgroup threat					-0.3	[-0.46, -0.13]	-3.55	<.001
Fusion*Threat					0.16	[-0.05, 0.37]	1.53	.126
<u>Model 4: Moro & Lumad</u>	585	25.98	<.001	0.15				
Intercept					5.66	[5.36, 5.96]	36.7	<.001
Fusion to regional group					0.28	[0, 0.56]	1.95	.052
Regional group [Reference = Lumad]					-0.82	[-1.04, -0.6]	-7.36	<.001
Outgroup threat					-0.6	[-0.89, -0.3]	-3.98	<.001
Fusion*Threat					0.39	[0.07, 0.7]	2.42	.016

<u>Model 5: UBJP & BAPA</u>	530	26.83	<.001	0.16				
Intercept					5.02	[4.69, 5.34]	30.42	<.001
Fusion to regional group					1.02	[0.8, 1.24]	9.19	<.001
Political group [Reference = BAPA]					-0.38	[-0.71, -0.04]	-2.23	.026
Outgroup threat					-0.26	[-0.41, -0.12]	-3.64	<.001
Fusion*Threat					0.23	[0.01, 0.44]	2.03	.043

Notes: CS is the abbreviation of “Christian Settler”. The reference group for the fusion term in all models was non-fused group members. Significant values at the .05 level are bolded.

Supplementary Note 1:

Identity fusion and outgroup perceptions on social distance

We examined whether identity fusion positively predicted a desire for social distance (both relational and land sharing) when threat was high, or outgroup perceptions were positive. Given that much of the intergroup conflict in the BARMM is related to land disputes, examining the role of threat in influencing land sharing was especially intriguing. Interaction analyses suggested that the explicit measure of threat typically moderated the relationship between fusion and *land sharing* social distance (see Table 4), whereas outgroup perceptions moderated the relationship between fusion and *relational* social distance (see Table 5). Fused participants generally desired more relational social distance (e.g., an unwillingness to accept outgroup members as close relations) than unfused participants when outgroups were perceived less positively, and more land sharing social distance (i.e., an unwillingness to sell or rent land to the outgroup) than unfused participants when outgroups were perceived as more of a threat. The only exception to this trend was the lack of a significant threat moderation of fusion on land sharing in the Lumad-Christian Settler dyad, which may be explained by the unusually low number of Lumads that perceived Christian Settlers as a threat (94% Lumads reported the minimum score). This model was also slightly underpowered for a small interaction effect size¹ ($n = 317$).

¹ This was due to a programming error in which only slightly more than half of all Christian Settler participants were shown the social distance items, affecting the Lumad-Christian Settler Social Distance models.

Table S4

The relationship between identity fusion and social distance [relational] moderated by outgroup threat and outgroup perceptions, controlling for group membership

Terms	<i>df</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Adj. R²</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>Cis</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Threat Models</i>								
<u>Model 1: Lumad & CS</u>	312	3.35	.006	0.03				
Intercept					1.72	[1.45, 1.98]	12.92	<.001
Fusion to regional group					-0.19	[-0.47, 0.09]	-1.36	.173
Regional group [Reference = CS]					0.42	[0.19, 0.65]	3.61	<.001
Outgroup threat					0.03	[-0.23, 0.29]	0.21	.837
Fusion* Threat					-0.01	[-0.34, 0.32]	-0.05	.964
<u>Model 2: Moro & CS</u>	495	33.96	<.001	0.21				
Intercept					2.27	[2.08, 2.46]	23.07	<.001
Fusion to regional group					-0.09	[-0.31, 0.13]	-0.79	.431
Regional group [Reference = CS]					0.5	[0.4, 0.6]	9.61	<.001
Outgroup threat					0.28	[0.08, 0.48]	2.77	.006
Fusion*Threat					0.02	[-0.21, 0.24]	0.15	.883
<u>Model 3: Moro & Lumad</u>	585	32.46	<.001	0.18				
Intercept					1.91	[1.65, 2.17]	14.24	<.001
Fusion to regional group					-0.19	[-0.44, 0.05]	-1.54	.123
Regional group [Reference = Lumad]					0.89	[0.7, 1.09]	9.22	<.001
Outgroup threat					0.26	[0.01, 0.52]	2.03	.043
Fusion*Threat					-0.04	[-0.31, 0.23]	-0.29	.771
<i>Outgroup Perceptions Models</i>								
<u>Model 1: Lumad & CS</u>	315	22.75	<.001	0.21				
Intercept					1.66	[1.38, 1.93]	11.92	<.001
Fusion to regional group					0.02	[-0.27, 0.31]	0.14	.885
Regional group [Reference = CS]					0.31	[0.11, 0.52]	2.98	.003
Outgroup perceptions					-0.16	[-0.37, 0.05]	-1.47	.143

Fusion*Perceptions					-0.35	[-0.6, -0.11]	-2.84	.005
<u>Model 2: Moro & CS</u>	495	33.9	<.001	0.21				
Intercept					2.25	[2.04, 2.46]	20.88	<.001
Fusion to regional group					-0.03	[-0.27, 0.2]	-0.28	.781
Regional group [Reference = CS]					0.51	[0.41, 0.61]	9.67	<.001
Outgroup perceptions					-0.11	[-0.29, 0.08]	-1.15	.25
Fusion*Perceptions					-0.24	[-0.46, -0.03]	-2.19	.029
<u>Model 3: Moro & Lumad</u>	589	57.38	<.001	0.28				
Intercept					1.88	[1.61, 2.14]	13.89	<.001
Fusion to regional group					-0.09	[-0.34, 0.15]	-0.74	.46
Regional group [Reference = Lumad]					0.86	[0.68, 1.04]	9.49	<.001
Outgroup perceptions					-0.11	[-0.29, 0.06]	-1.30	.195
Fusion* Perceptions					-0.42	[-0.62, -0.22]	-4.11	<.001

Notes: CS is the abbreviation of “Christian Settler”; SD is the abbreviation of “Social Distance”. The reference group for the fusion term in all models was non-fused group members. Significant values at the .05 level are bolded.

Table S5

The relationship between identity fusion and social distance [land sharing] moderated by outgroup threat and outgroup perceptions, controlling for group membership

Terms	<i>df</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Adj. R²</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>Cis</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Threat Models</i>								
<u>Model 1: Lumad & CS</u>	312	14.34	<.001	0.14				
Intercept					2.65	[2.11, 3.18]	9.68	<.001
Fusion to regional group					-0.03	[-0.6, 0.55]	-0.09	.929
Regional group [Reference = CS]					1.64	[1.17, 2.11]	6.81	<.001
Outgroup threat					-0.34	[-0.88, 0.2]	-1.24	.214
Fusion* Threat					-0.06	[-0.74, 0.63]	-0.16	.871
<u>Model 2: Moro & CS</u>	495	4.56	<.001	0.03				
Intercept					2.68	[2.26, 3.11]	12.41	<.001
Fusion to regional group					-0.03	[-0.41, 0.36]	-0.13	.893
Regional group [Reference = CS]					0.44	[0.06, 0.82]	2.3	.022
Outgroup threat					-0.39	[-0.74, -0.03]	-2.16	.031
Fusion*Threat					0.64	[0.24, 1.04]	3.15	.002
<u>Model 3: Moro & Lumad</u>	585	15.28	<.001	0.09				
Intercept					4.7	[4.23, 5.17]	19.81	<.001
Fusion to regional group					-0.47	[-0.91, -0.04]	-2.14	.033
Regional group [Reference = Lumad]					-1.19	[-1.53, -0.86]	-6.95	<.001
Outgroup threat					-0.44	[-0.89, 0.02]	-1.9	.058
Fusion*Threat					0.7	[0.21, 1.18]	2.84	.005
<i>Outgroup Perceptions Models</i>								
<u>Model 1: Lumad & CS</u>	315	29.18	<.001	0.26				
Intercept					2.17	[1.59, 2.75]	7.34	<.001
Fusion to regional group					0.78	[0.16, 1.39]	2.5	.013
Regional group [Reference = CS]					1.49	[1.05, 1.93]	6.72	<.001
Outgroup perceptions					-0.78	[-1.24, -0.33]	-3.4	<.001

Fusion*Perceptions					-0.06	[-0.58, 0.46]	-0.22	.830
<u>Model 2: Moro & CS</u>	495	11.14	<.001	0.08				
Intercept					2.62	[2.17, 3.08]	11.34	<.001
Fusion to regional group					0.13	[-0.28, 0.53]	0.62	.535
Regional group [Reference = CS]					0.44	[0.07, 0.81]	2.34	.020
Outgroup perceptions					-0.03	[-0.35, 0.29]	-0.16	.872
Fusion*Perceptions					-0.6	[-0.97, -0.22]	-3.09	.002
<u>Model 3: Moro & Lumad</u>	589	33.18	<.001	0.18				
Intercept					4.43	[3.95, 4.9]	18.26	<.001
Fusion to regional group					-0.09	[-0.53, 0.35]	-0.4	.687
Regional group [Reference = Lumad]					-1.24	[-1.56, -0.92]	-7.63	<.001
Outgroup perceptions					-0.55	[-0.86, -0.24]	-3.48	<.001
Fusion*Perceptions					-0.2	[-0.56, 0.16]	-1.09	.275

Study 2 Supplementary Information

Table S6

Mean (SD) for key variables overall and by country.

	All Participants	Gambia	Tanzania	Pakistan	Uganda
Identity Fusion	6.06(1.00)	5.75(1.03)	6.17(0.88)	5.92(1.13)	6.27(0.83)
Willingness to Cooperate	5.20(1.83)	5.14(1.62)	5.38(1.98)	5.42(1.64)	4.89(1.94)
Outgroup Threat	3.28(1.91)	3.52(1.69)	3.44(2.28)	3.67(1.73)	2.65(1.76)
Outgroup Perceptions	4.57(1.19)	4.84(1.19)	4.52(1.40)	4.79(1.03)	4.27(1.13)
Historical Threat	3.94(1.97)	4.92(1.68)	3.61(2.17)	4.36(1.73)	3.28(1.88)
Ingroup Benefit	4.81(2.05)	1.91(1.33)	5.43(1.67)	5.58(1.49)	4.98(1.86)
Zero-Sum Perceptions	3.22(1.93)	2.98(1.67)	3.74(2.28)	3.51(1.76)	2.69(1.80)

Table S7

The relationships between identity fusion, identification, and willingness to cooperate moderated by outgroup threat, outgroup perceptions, historical threat, ingroup benefit, and zero-sum perceptions.

Terms	Marginal R^2	Conditional R^2	df	B	CI	t	p
<u>Model 1: Threat</u>	0.1	0.15					
Intercept			3.07	5.22	[4.79, 5.66]	26.57	<.001
Identity fusion			1503.71	-0.05	[-0.16, 0.06]	-0.86	.389
Identification			1501.49	0.28	[0.17, 0.39]	4.98	<.001
Threat			1503.98	-0.48	[-0.57, -0.39]	-10.66	<.001
Fusion*Threat			1501.96	0.05	[-0.05, 0.16]	0.99	.323
ID*Threat			1501.36	-0.22	[-0.33, -0.11]	-3.89	<.001
<u>Model 2: Perceptions</u>	0.24	0.26					
Intercept			2.85	5.21	[4.94, 5.47]	43.28	<.001
Identity fusion			1489.65	0.01	[-0.09, 0.11]	0.12	.906
Identification			1488.92	0.15	[0.05, 0.25]	2.84	.005
Perceptions			1482.21	0.85	[0.77, 0.93]	20.29	<.001
Fusion* Perceptions			1488.44	0.05	[-0.05, 0.14]	0.98	.328
ID* Perceptions			1487.60	0.09	[-0.01, 0.18]	1.73	.083
<u>Model 3: Hist. Threat</u>	0.05	0.08					
Intercept			3.11	5.22	[4.86, 5.58]	32.04	<.001
Identity fusion			1506.90	-0.05	[-0.16, 0.07]	-0.82	.414
Identification			1504.83	0.30	[0.18, 0.41]	5.15	<.001
Hist. Threat			1469.59	-0.20	[-0.29, -0.11]	-4.23	<.001
Fusion*Hist. Threat			1506.31	< .01	[-0.11, 0.11]	0.02	.984
ID*Hist. Threat			1504.70	-0.21	[-0.32, -0.09]	-3.48	<.001
<u>Model 4: Benefit</u>	0.38	0.61					
Intercept			2.97	5.42	[4.25, 6.61]	10.1	.002
Identity fusion			1508.31	-0.02	[-0.11, 0.07]	-0.4	.687
Identification			1508.24	0.13	[0.04, 0.22]	2.76	.006
Benefit			1507.80	1.36	[1.27, 1.45]	29.42	<.001
Fusion*Benefit			1508.60	0.10	[0.02, 0.19]	2.32	.020
Identification*Benefit			1508.11	0.01	[-0.08, 0.1]	0.28	.783
<u>Model 5: Zero-Sum</u>	0.11	0.16					
Intercept			3.05	5.22	[4.79, 5.65]	26.63	<.001

Identity fusion	1503.49	< 0.01	[-0.11, 0.1]	-0.08	.936
Identification	1501.54	0.23	[0.12, 0.34]	4.15	<.001
Zero-sum	1503.82	-0.52	[-0.61, -0.43]	-11.48	<.001
Fusion*Zero-sum	1501.59	-0.07	[-0.19, 0.04]	-1.28	.200
ID*Zero-sum	1501.96	-0.13	[-0.24, -0.02]	-2.22	.027

Notes: Significant values at the .05 level are bolded.