Bmp Survey Variables: Notes

1. *Age, Gender, Community Membership, Neighbourhood* were all measured as nominal variables
2. *Residential Time* was measured in years
3. *Residential status* was measured as a series of nominal variables, i.e. (a) I own my own home, (b) I rent my home privately, (c)I rent home through the Housing Association, (d) I rent my home through the Housing Executive, and (e) Other
4. *Annual Income* was measured as an ordinal variable, ranging from (a) Less than £10000 a year to (g) More than £60000 per year.
5. *Positive contact* between communities: This was measured using items 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 2.7 and 2.9 that tapped the frequency of experiences of positive contact on a seven point scale ranging from Never (1) to Very often (7). Higher scores here indicate higher levels of experienced positive contact.
6. *Negative Contact* between communities: This was measured using items 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8 and 2.10, which tapped the frequency of experiences of negative contact on a seven point scale, ranging from Never (1) to Very often (7). Higher scores here indicate higher levels of experienced negative contact.
7. *Outgroup Attitudes*: Outgroup attitudes were measured on a series six semantic differential scales (e.g. Disrespect-Respect), ranging from 1 to 7. In each case, higher scores indicated more positive outgroup attitudes.
8. *Community Identity*: Four items measured strength of social identity on 5 point Likert scales, ranging from1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). Higher scores here indicated higher levels of identification.
9. *Realistic Threat* was measured on 5 point Likert scales, ranging from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). Higher scores here indicated higher levels of Realistic Threat. Note that Responses on items 5.1, 5.2., 5.4 and 5.5 were reverse-scored.
10. *Symbolic Threat* was measured on 5 point Likert scales, ranging from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). Higher scores here indicated

higher levels of Symbolic Threat. Note that Responses on items 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 were reverse coded.

11. *Contact Anxiety* was measured on a 7 point scale, ranging from Not at all (1) to Extremely (7). Higher scores here indicated higher levels of anxiety about contact with members of the other religious community. Note that items 7.3, 7.5 and 7.6 were reverse coded.

12. *Activity Space Attitudes*: Items 8.1 though to 8.6 measured respondents' willingness to use activity spaces beyond their own communities and in outgroup spaces and facilities. All items were measured using 5 point Likert scales, ranging from (1) Strongly Agree to (5) Strongly Disagree, with higher scores indicating a greater willingness to use other group or shared spaces.

13. Item 9.1 measured participants' *residential proximity to the nearest peace wall* on an 8 point ordinal scale, ranging from Less than 100 yards to More than 700 yards.

14. Items 9.2 to 9.5 measured participants' *attitudes towards government proposals to dismantle the peace walls* using 5 point Likert scales, ranging from (1) Strongly Agree to (5) Strongly Disagree. High scores here indicated greater support for dismantling peace walls, with items 9.2 and 9.5 reverse-coded.

15. Items 9.6 a to d measured the *perceived functions of current peace walls* in Belfast using 5 point Likert scales, ranging from (1) Strongly Agree to (5) Strongly Disagree. All items were reverse coded so that higher scores meant that a participant more strongly perceived a given function (e.g. that peace walls help people feel safer, keep communities apart etc.).

16. Items 10.1 to 10.5 measured *perceptions of the degree to which Belfast city centre is now an inclusive space where members of both communities feel they belong*, using 5 point Likert scales, ranging from (1) Strongly Agree to (5) Strongly Disagree. Higher scores here indicated higher levels of perceived inclusivity and collective belonging in the city centre. As such, items 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 and 10.5 were reverse coded.