

Online supplement

Table S1.

Confirmatory Factor Analyses, Study 1 (N = 264)

	χ^2 (df)	$\Delta \chi^2$ (df)	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA [90% CI]
Comparison model					
5 Factors	116.68(67)***		.978	.043	.053 [.036, .069]
Nested models					
4 Factors (collective psychological ownership and place attachment combined)	314.99(71)***	195.31(4)***	.892	.087	.114 [.101, .127]
4 Factors (forgiveness and promoting positive relations combined)	275.55(71)***	158.87(4)***	.909	.061	.104 [.092, .118]
4 Factors (place attachment and ingroup identification combined)	316.58(71)***	199.90(4)***	.891	.060	.114 [.102, .127]
4 Factors (collective psychological ownership and ingroup identification combined)	348.95(71)***	232.27(4)***	.877	.092	.122 [.109, .135]
4 Factors (collective psychological ownership and forgiveness combined)	375.77(71)***	259.09(4)***	.865	.102	.128 [.115, .140]
4 Factors (collective psychological ownership and promoting positive relations combined)	413.64(71)***	296.96(4)***	.848	.131	.135 [.123, .148]
4 Factors (ingroup identification and forgiveness combined)	550.95(71)***	434.27(4)***	.787	.145	.160 [.148, .173]
4 Factors (ingroup identification and promoting positive relations combined)	680.87(71)***	564.19(4)***	.729	.162	.180 [.168, .193]
4 Factors (place attachment and forgiveness combined)	530.01(71)***	413.33(4)***	.796	.118	.156 [.144, .169]
4 Factors (place attachment and promoting positive relations combined)	659.94(71)***	543.26(4)***	.738	.158	.177 [.165, .190]

Note. *** $p < .001$.

Table S2.

Correlations between Latent Constructs, Study 1 (N = 264)

	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. Ingroup identification	-			
2. Collective psychological ownership	.44***	-		
3. Place attachment	.66***	.55***	-	
4. Promoting positive relations	-.21**	-.36***	-.32***	-
5. Forgiveness	-.33***	-.44***	-.38***	.72***

Note. ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table S3.

Structural Equation Model Predicting two Aspects of Reconciliation by Ingroup Identification, Collective Psychological Ownership (CPO), and Place Attachment (PA), Standardized Regression Coefficients, Study 1 (N = 264)

	Collective psychological ownership		Place attachment		Promoting positive relations		Forgiveness	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE / [95% CI]	β	SE / [95% CI]
Direct effects								
Ingroup identification	.45***	.08	.66***	.05	.04	.10	-.11	.10
Collective psychological ownership					-.28**	.09	-.32***	.09
Place attachment					-.18	.10	-.14	.10
Indirect effects								
Identification → CPO →					-.13**	[-.23, -.06]	-.15**	[-.26, -.08]
Identification → PA →					-.12	[-.25, .01]	-.09	[-.24, .04]
Total effect								
Ingroup identification					-.21**	.08	-.35**	.07
Control variables								
Age	.05	.06	-.03	.06	.09	.06	.11	.06
Male (ref. Female)	-.12	.06	-.02	.05	-.02	.07	.06	.07
Educational level	-.06	.07	-.05	.07	.05	.06	-.04	.06
Native (ref. one parent non-Serbian/born outside Serbia)	-.01	.06	-.03	.05	.00	.08	.00	.08
Explained variance								
R ²	.21		.44		.17		.24	
Model fit indices								
$\chi^2(df)$	176.21(103)***							
CFI	.968							
SRMR	.040							
RMSEA [90% CI]	.052 [.039, .065]							

Note. The covariance of the two mediators ($b = .38$, $SE = .08$, $p < .001$) and the two dependent variables ($b = .67$, $SE = .06$, $p < .001$) was accounted for. We accounted for covariances between control variables and ingroup identification as well as among the control variables.

** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table S4.

Formulation of Items Measuring Collective Psychological Ownership, per Sample, Study 2

Sample	General introduction	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3
Serbs (Serbia and Kosovo)	Kosovo belongs more to Serbs than to Albanians because Serbs were there first.	... because Serbs have fought for this territory in the past.	... because Serbs have invested the most in building Kosovo into what it is today.
Greek Cypriots	The occupied areas belong more to Greek Cypriots than to Turkish Cypriots because Greek Cypriots were there first.	... because Greek Cypriots have fought for this territory in the past.	... because Greek Cypriots have invested the most in building the occupied areas into what they are today.
Jewish Israelis	Israel belongs more to Jews than to Arabs because Jews were there first.	... because Jews have fought for this territory in the past.	... because Jews have invested the most in building Israel into what it is today.

Table S5.

Confirmatory Factor Analyses, Study 2 (total N = 546)

	χ^2 (df)	$\Delta \chi^2$ (df)	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA [90% CI]
Comparison model					
4 Factors	90.43(38)***		.987	.036	.050 [.037, .064]
Nested models					
3 Factors (collective psychological ownership and place attachment combined)	701.28(41)***	610.85(3)***	.835	.104	.172 [.161, .183]
3 Factors (place attachment and ingroup identification combined)	532.71(41)***	442.28(3)***	.877	.064	.148 [.137, .160]
3 Factors (collective psychological ownership and ingroup identification combined)	751.73(41)***	661.30(3)***	.822	.117	.178 [.167, .189]
3 Factors (collective psychological ownership and reconciliation expectations combined)	919.26(41)***	828.83(3)***	.780	.173	.198 [.187, .209]
3 Factors (ingroup identification and reconciliation expectations combined)	972.92(41)***	882.49(3)***	.767	.159	.204 [.193, .215]
3 Factors (place attachment and reconciliation expectations combined)	1066.69(41)***		.743	.026	.214 [.203, .225]

Note. *** $p < .001$.

Table S6.

Correlations between Latent Constructs, Study 2 (total N = 546)

	1.	2.	3.
Total sample (N = 546)			
1. Ingroup identification	-		
2. Collective psychological ownership	.53***	-	
3. Place attachment	.68***	.54***	-
4. Reconciliation expectations	-.08	-.41***	-.17***
Serbs(Serbia) (N = 173)			
1. Ingroup identification	-		
2. Collective psychological ownership	.65***	-	
3. Place attachment	.62***	.76***	-
4. Reconciliation expectations	-.23***	-.43***	-.32***
Serbs(Kosovo) (N = 129)			
1. Ingroup identification	-		
2. Collective psychological ownership	.66***	-	
3. Place attachment	.54***	.58***	-
4. Reconciliation expectations	-.17	-.26***	-.22*
Greek Cypriots (N = 135)			
1. Ingroup identification	-		
2. Collective psychological ownership	.57***	-	
3. Place attachment	.54***	.66***	-
4. Reconciliation expectations	-.20*	-.48***	-.33***
Jewish Israelis (N = 109)			
1. Ingroup identification	-		
2. Collective psychological ownership	.35**	-	
3. Place attachment	.66***	.35**	-
4. Reconciliation expectations	.03	-.35**	-.11

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table S7.

Multiple-Group Structural Equation Model Predicting Reconciliation Expectations from Ingroup Identification, Collective Psychological Ownership (CPO), and Place Attachment (PA), Unstandardized Regression Coefficients of a Constrained Model (Model 1), and Standardized Regression Coefficients of an Unconstrained Model (Model 2), Study 2 (total N = 546)

	Model 1: Constrained model, unstandardized results				Model 2: Unconstrained model, standardized results					
	Total sample		Serbs(Serbia)		Serbs(Kosovo)		Greek Cypriots		Jewish Israelis	
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i> / [95% <i>CI</i>]	β	<i>SE</i> / [95% <i>CI</i>]	β	<i>SE</i> / [95% <i>CI</i>]	β	<i>SE</i> / [95% <i>CI</i>]	β	<i>SE</i> / [95% <i>CI</i>]
Collective psychological ownership										
<i>Direct effects</i>										
Ingroup identification	.58***	.06	.65***	.05	.65***	.09	.52***	.10	.34	.17
<i>Control variables</i>										
Age	-.02	.01	-.05	.06	.06	.09	-.10	.10	-.12	.10
Male (ref. Female)	-.03	.15	-.08	.07	.03	.08	.09	.08	-.14	.14
Native (ref. Born abroad)	.13	.16	.00	.07	.11	.09	.20*	.09	-.19	.11
Place attachment										
<i>Direct effects</i>										
Ingroup identification	.44***	.05	.62***	.06	.54***	.10	.51***	.09	.62***	.11
<i>Control variables</i>										
Age	.00	.01	.02	.06	.02	.11	.03	.08	.03	.06
Male (ref. Female)	-.14	.12	.01	.07	-.02	.11	-.13	.11	-.16	.08
Native (ref. born abroad)	.13	.16	.06	.07	.10	.09	.26**	.10	-.01	.08
Reconciliation expectations										
<i>Direct effects</i>										
Ingroup identification	.09	.05	.10	.12	.04	.17	.15	.14	.30	.22
Collective psychological ownership	-.31***	.06	-.50***	.16	-.21	.18	-.47**	.14	-.34	.15
Place attachment	-.06	.07	.00	.15	-.11	.17	-.10	.15	-.13	.21
<i>Indirect effects</i>										
Identification → CPO →	-.18***	[-.26, -.12]	-.33**	[-.53, -.13]	-.13	[-.41, .08]	-.25	[-.47, -.09]	-.12	[-.33, .02]
Identification → PA →	-.03	[-.09, .04]	.00	[-.19, .19]	-.06	[-.23, .16]	-.05	[-.25, .10]	-.08	[-.41, .17]
<i>Total effects</i>										
Ingroup identification	-.11**	.04	-.23*	.09	-.16	.10	-.15	.11	.10	.11
<i>Control variables</i>										
Age	.03*	.01	.01	.08	.05	.08	.16	.07	.14	.12
Male (ref. Female)	-.05	.13	-.09	.09	.04	.10	-.12	.11	.17	.13
Native (ref. Born abroad)	.00	.13	.07	.09	-.12	.11	-.01	.09	-.03	.10
Explained variance										
R ² (Collective psychological ownership)			.42		.45		.38		.21	
R ² (Place attachment)			.39		.31		.38		.49	
R ² (Reconciliation)			.21		.10		.28		.21	
Model fit indices										
$\chi^2(df)$	541.82(323)***				491.91(281)***					

CFI	.944	.946
SRMR	.090	.071
RMSEA [90% CI]	.070 [.060, .081]	.074 [.063, .085]

Note. The covariance of the two mediators was accounted for (Model 1: $b_{\text{(Serbs(Serbia))}} = .76$, $SE = .12$, $p < .001$; $b_{\text{(Serbs(Kosovo))}} = .27$, $SE = .10$, $p < .001$; $b_{\text{(Greek Cypriots)}} = .91$, $SE = .22$, $p < .001$; $b_{\text{(Jewish Israelis)}} = .16$, $SE = .14$, $p = .28$; Model 2: $\beta_{\text{Serbs(Serbia)}} = .61$, $SE = .07$, $p < .001$; $\beta_{\text{(Serbs(Kosovo))}} = .35$, $SE = .11$, $p = .002$; $\beta_{\text{(Greek Cypriots)}} = .49$, $SE = .11$, $p < .001$; $\beta_{\text{(Jewish Israelis)}} = .15$, $SE = .17$, $p = .37$. We accounted for covariances between control variables and ingroup identification as well as among the control variables.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.