

**Identity Fusion and Values: Universalism Attenuates the Identity Fusion Effect on Extreme
Pro-Group Behavior**

Basic Values Theory

Table S1 *Definitions of ten values from the theory of basic values*

Value	Definition
Self-direction	Independent thought and action — choosing, creating, exploring.
Stimulation	Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life.
Hedonism	Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself.
Achievement	Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.
Power	Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources.
Security	Safety, harmony, and stability of society, relationships, and self.
Conformity	Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.
Tradition	Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provides.
Benevolence	Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact.
Universalism	Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and nature.

Note. Definitions are taken from Schwartz et al. (2012).

The ten values are organized in a circle divided into two polar dimensions composed of four higher-order values: *openness to change*, *self-transcendence*, *self-enhancement*, and *conservation*. The components include values sharing the same motivational goal. The four components are organized in two polar dimensions that reflect competing or opposite values. Each value is included in one component except for hedonism, which belongs to openness to change and self-enhancement components. The configuration of tradition and conformity values means that the first one has a higher opposition to the values of stimulation and hedonism than conformity (Schwartz, 2012).

Table S2 Descriptive statistical, reliabilities, and correlations between the values

	Conf	Trad	Secu	Bene	Univ	Self	Stim	Hedo	Achie	Pow
Conf										
Trad	.38***									
Secu	.19*	.09								
Bene	-.21**	-.27**	-.29***							
Univ	-.18*	-.24**	-.27**	.48***						
Self	-.37***	-.43***	-.28***	.32***	.39***					
Stim	-.47***	-.27**	-.34***	.03	.04	.16*				
Hedo	-.35***	-.28***	-.28***	-.02	-.05	.09	.41***			
Achie	-.15	-.06	-.06	-.40***	-.51***	-.30***	-.14	-.11		
Pow	-.12	-.01	-.10	-.27**	-.53***	-.22**	-.12	-.10	.43***	
M	-.71	-2.19	-.10	1.26	1.30	1.09	-.15	.46	-.66	-1.44
SD	.96	1.04	.75	.79	.67	.63	1.03	.92	1.00	1.01
α	.70	.56	.62	.76	.73	.56	.77	.82	.87	.74

Note. Conf = conformity. Trad = tradition. Secu = security. Bene =benevolence. Univ = universalism. Self = self direction. Stim = stimulation. Hedо = hedonism. Achie = achievement. Pow = power. Age and sex were controlled. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

Analysis of the Circular System of Values

For tradition value $\alpha = .46$, then we eliminated item 38 because it presented the lowest correlations with the rest of the items, and we obtained a new $\alpha = .56$. Likewise, for benevolence $\alpha = .60$, then we eliminated item 33 and obtained $\alpha = .76$.

We corrected the values' scores and replicated the values' circular structure. The values correlated positively within each component: conservation, openness to change, self-transcendence, and self-enhancement. The exceptions were the no relationship between security and tradition $r = .09, p = .257$, in the conservation component; the no association of hedonism with self-direction $r = .08, p = .312$ in the openness to change component; and the no correlation of hedonism with achievement $r = -.11, p = .162$, and power $r = -.10, p = .209$ in the self-enhancement component. Thus, hedonism was not associated with the values from the self-enhancement component, and only correlated with stimulation in the openness to change component ($r = .41, p < .001$). Those results for hedonism do not necessarily invalidate the circular values model because hedonism could be included in two components. In the present sample, hedonism was more associated with the openness to change component.

As components are organized in two polar dimensions, the relationship for every dimension was evaluated: conservation (tradition, conformity, and security) correlated negatively with openness to change values (stimulation, self-direction, and hedonism). Likewise, self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence) correlated negatively with self-enhancement (achievement, power, and hedonism), except for the no relationship of hedonism with universalism $r = -.05, p = .559$, and benevolence $r = -.02, p = .768$. Factor analyses confirmed the two polar dimensions without hedonism because the matrix is not positive definite (see Table S3). Only benevolence showed crossed loadings but near to the cut-off (.300), which does not invalidate the circular model.

Table S3 Factor analyses for the polar dimensions

Values	Factor	
	1	2
Conformity		-.836
Tradition		-.587
Security		-.388
Stimulation		.508
Self-direction		.468
Power	-.683	
Achievement	-.730	
Universalism	.756	
Benevolence	.468	.307

Note. Pattern matrix. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood. Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 3 iterations. Loadings < .300 were excluded.