**Data analyses details**

1. Beekeepers’ perceptions of giant armadillos

i. Free listing of words to describe perceptions about giant armadillos. This exercise was conducted to evaluate which aspects (i.e., positive, negative, neutral) (Weller and Romney, 1988) were most relevant to explain beekeepers' perceptions of giant armadillos. The Smith salience index with Anthropac software, version 4.98 (Analytic Technologies, Kentucky) was calculated. Salience combines information on the frequency an item is reported and the rank order the items were cited by interviewees (Thompson and Juan, 2006). We classified words expressing fear, anguish and anger as negative (e.g. dangerous, violent, destructive), whereas those expressing admiration or enchantment were coded as positive (e.g. beautiful, interesting, powerful). Finally, we categorised items mentioning giant armadillo’s physical attributes (e.g. heavy, light, large) as neutral. The analyses were performed for these three categories (i.e. positive, negative and neutral), obtaining salience, frequency and classification of each one.

ii. Perceived benefits of giant armadillos: we coded different benefits reported by interviewees following Rodrigues *et al.* (2020), who presents material and non-material benefits of armadillos, and then calculated the frequency of each category.

iii. Attitudes towards giant armadillos: we examined the internal consistency of the six statements with Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient (Cronbach, 1951), considering a 0.7 threshold.

iv. Not in my backyard sentiment: we calculated the frequencies of each of the response categories.

v. Understanding of giant armadillos’ needs: by applying Inductive Content Analysis, a qualitative method that allows distilling words into fewer content-related categories (Elo and Kyngäs, 2008), we identified three main response categories: "Because it needs to feed", "Because it's a destructive animal", and "I don't know" and calculated the frequency of each one.

2. The conflict situation

i. Responses on the major limitations to beekeeping were first categorised according to emerging themes. We then calculated the frequency of each category.

ii. Severity of giant armadillos’ damage to beehives: we used descriptive statistics.

iii. Attitudes towards giant armadillos’ persecution: we examined the internal consistency of the scale.

iv. Association between damage and attitudes towards giant armadillos and to their persecution: We tested differences in attitudes among beekeepers who had experienced different magnitudes of damage by giant armadillos in prior 12 months. To do so, we first categorized beekeepers in three groups: no damage (no beehive destroyed in the past 12 months), low damage (<10), and medium to high damage (> = 10). We then compared the three groups on damage x attitudes using non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks (H), followed by Bonferroni corrected post-hoc. To evaluate the association between the amount of damage during the prior 12 months on beekeepers' attitudes towards giant armadillos and towards their persecution, we estimated two multinomial logistic regressions, which are extensions of binary logistic regressions for categorical dependent variables. Our three outcome categorical variables were, in Model 1: negative attitudes (n = 24), neutral (n = 17), and positive attitudes (n = 70). For Model 2, the outcomes were attitudes towards persecution, specifically: unfavorable to persecution (n= 85), neutral (n=15), and favorable to persecution (n=10). In multinomial models, parameter estimates are compared to a baseline-category of the dependent variable. We adopted positive attitudes (Model 1) and unfavorable to persecution (Model 2) as the reference groups.

v. Beekeeper’ tolerance towards giant armadillo damage: based on (Kansky *et al.*, 2014), we computed a tolerance to damage index (TDI), as follows: TDI= proportion of individuals suffering damage – (1 – the proportion of individuals with positive attitudes towards the species). Negative values indicate low tolerance, whereas positive values show high tolerance value equal to 0 indicates neutrality, which means the proportion of respondents with positive attitudes is proportional to the percentage of respondents experiencing damage.

3. History of attempts to solve conflicts: We ranked the effectiveness of strategies beekeepers used to prevent giant armadillo damage in preventing giant armadillo predation as high, medium or low, according to beekeepers’ perception. Effectiveness was considered to be high if every beekeeper who used the method prevented giant armadillo predation, medium if the measures worked only on some occasions, and low if they did not prevent giant armadillo raids in any apiaries. The frequency of each response category was calculated.

4. Willingness to find solutions: We calculated the frequency of each response category.

5. Others involved in the issue: First, the frequency of response categories was calculated. Second, to interpret meaning from the content of interviewee responses we used a conventional qualitative content analysis approach (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005).
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