

Supplemental Material

Additional Sample Information

Two cross-sectional nationally representative surveys were conducted within six weeks before and after the July 7th attacks in London (referred to as Survey 1 (pre-7/7), and Survey 2 (post-7/7). They were designed by a team at the Centre for the Study of Group Processes, University of Kent, commissioned and steered by the UK government's Women and Equality Unit to provide evidence for the UK Equalities Review and inform the establishment of the Equality and Human Rights Commission. The data collection using computer aided personal interviews was conducted by TNS Omnimas and therefore was completely independent of the researchers.

Survey 1 ($N = 931$) was conducted at the end of May 2005. It was a variant within a larger survey that assessed a range of societal perceptions and attitudes to a range of different groups (see Abrams & Houston, 2006, for details and descriptive statistics). The sample comprised 435 men (46.7%) and 496 women (53.3%). Age ranged from 16 to 92 years ($M = 44.85$, $SD = 19.05$). The majority of participants (82.5%) were White, 6% were Black, 8.3% were Asian, and 1.8% were of mixed heritage. The majority of participants (93.3%) were non-Muslim. London residents made up 15.3% of respondents.

Survey 2 ($N = 1100$) was conducted at the end of July/early August 2005, was a repeat of Survey 1. Survey 2 was commissioned by the Women and Equality Unit immediately following the 7/7 bombings. Survey 2 comprised 497 men (45.2%) and 603 women (54.8%). Age ranged from 16 to 98 years ($M = 46.54$, $SD = 19.27$). The majority of participants (90.9%) were White, 3.1% were Black, 3.5% were Asian, and 1.4% were of mixed heritage. The majority of participants (97.1%) were non-Muslim. London residents made up 13.6% of respondents.

Table S1

Means, standard deviations, confidence intervals, and correlations among key variables.

<i>Variable</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.Authority	---	.17***	.17***	.07*	.09*	.07*	.07*
2.Harm	.13***	---	.16***	.20***	-.08*	-.04	-.04
3.Ingroup	.15***	.08**	---	.05	.15***	.17***	.14**
4. Fairness	.07*	.20***	.07*	---	-.22***	-.18***	-.13**
5.Immigrant attitudes	.09**	-.05	.17***	-.18***	---	.56***	.19***
6.Muslim Attitudes	.08**	-.01	.19***	-.15***	.57***	---	.20***
7. Political orientation	.10**	.003	.02	.01	.07*	.09*	---
Survey 1 <i>M (SD)</i>	4.11 (1.50)	5.10 (0.99)	3.97 (0.96)	4.04 (0.89)	3.46 (0.90)	3.44 (0.96)	3.44 (1.13)
Survey 1 <i>95CI</i>	4.01, 4.21	5.04, 5.17	3.91, 4.03	3.98, 4.10	3.40, 3.52	3.38, 3.51	3.37, 3.52
Survey 2 <i>M (SD)</i>	4.10 (1.48)	5.07 (0.94)	4.10 (0.86)	3.94 (0.84)	3.52 (0.90)	3.59 (0.91)	3.37 (1.07)
Survey 2 <i>95CI</i>	4.01, 4.18	5.02, 5.13	4.05, 4.15	3.89, 3.99	3.47, 3.58	3.54, 3.65	3.31, 3.43

Note. Survey 1 correlations (pre-7/7, $N = 869$) are provided above the diagonal and Survey 2 correlations (post-7/7, $N = 1068$) are provided below the diagonal. Means, standard deviations, and confidence intervals are provided across pre-7/7 and post-7/7.

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Table S2

Moderation Analyses Testing the Time (Survey 1 (pre-7/7) vs. Survey 2 (post 7/7)) x Political Orientation Interactions on Moral Foundations and Attitudes

Criterion	Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>95CI</i>
Ingroup	Time	0.42	0.13	3.22	.001	0.16/0.67
	Political orientation	0.19	0.06	3.37	< .001	0.08/0.31
	Time x political orientation	-0.09	0.04	-2.49	.013	-0.16/-0.02
Fairness	Time	-0.41	0.13	-3.23	.001	-0.67/-0.16
	Political orientation	-0.19	0.06	-3.32	<.001	-0.30/-0.08
	Time x political orientation	0.10	0.04	2.72	.007	0.03/0.17
Authority	Time	-0.13	0.22	-0.58	> .250	-0.55/0.30
	Political orientation	0.05	0.10	0.47	> .250	-0.15/0.24
	Time x political orientation	0.04	0.06	0.67	> .250	-0.08/0.16
Harm	Time	-0.18	0.14	-1.26	.208	-0.46/0.10
	Political orientation	-0.08	0.06	-1.26	.209	-0.20/0.04
	Time x political orientation	0.04	0.04	1.05	> .205	-0.04/0.12
Attitudes Muslims	Time	0.31	0.13	2.38	.017	0.06/0.57
	Political orientation	0.22	0.06	3.74	< .001	0.10/0.33
	Time x political orientation	-0.08	0.04	-2.12	.034	-0.15/-0.01
Attitudes Immigrants	Time	0.41	0.14	3.05	.002	0.15/0.68
	Political orientation	0.25	0.06	4.09	< .001	0.13/0.37
	Time x political orientation	-0.09	0.04	-2.28	.023	-0.16/-0.01

Note. Political orientation was scored from 1 = *definitely left* to 6 = *definitely right*.

British Social Attitudes Surveys Analyses (2005, 2008)

The use of matched rather than longitudinal samples means that we cannot examine individual change. Indeed it is possible that the findings occurred due to a failure to replicate differences between liberals and conservatives between the pre and post 7/7 surveys. To overcome this limitation we performed additional data analyses on similarly sampled datasets collected at a Time 3 (in 2005; August onwards) and a Time 4 (in 2008). We would expect that the differences between liberals and conservatives that appeared pre 7/7 and reduced post 7/7, would gradually re-emerge and, in the absence of a repeat attack of similar magnitude, remain relatively stable.

We located two samples that were sampled in a very similar manner to our data. Specifically, both samples are nationally representative samples from England, Scotland, and Wales and were collected using face to face computer assisted interviews. These samples are from the *British Social Attitudes Survey (BSAS)* which incorporated comparable items in 2005 and 2008. The 2005 BSAS data was administered to a subsample large enough to analyse to create a post 7/7 (Time 3) window that was approximately equidistant with our Time 1 and Time 2 data points. Our Time 1 (Survey 1) was conducted at the end of May 2005, our Time 2 (Survey 2) was conducted at the end of July/early August. The Time 3 BSAS data are from later in August to early November 2005. A larger sample (Time 4) is available from BSAS 2008 (i.e., three years after the bombings) and it is taken across a 6 month data collection period which covers the summer/autumn months.

Although these datasets do not include items tapping into moral foundations or attitudes towards Muslims they both include comparable items tapping into attitudes towards immigrants (a key dependent variable) and measures of political orientation. Therefore, we were able to test whether differences between liberals and conservatives re-emerged using those measures. We tested whether the Time 1 differences in attitudes towards immigrants between liberals and conservatives were also apparent at Time 3 and persisted in the later sample (Time 4).

The Survey 1 and Survey 2 data show that the strength of association between political orientation and prejudice pre-7/7 (*Cohen's D* = .39, *R* = .19, *N* = 931) significantly reduced post 7/7 (*Cohen's D* = .18, *R* = .09, *N* = 1100). The additional analyses show that, as expected, the association between political orientation and immigration attitudes had strengthened again at Time 3 (*Cohen's D* = .39, *R* = .19, *N* = 289), and at Time 4 it remained consistent with the strength of association at Time 1 and Time 3 (*Cohen's D* = 0.39, *R* = 0.19, *N* = 2072).

The items employed for these analyses were as follows:

Time 3 (BSAS 2005): “Do you think that too many immigrants have been let into the country or not?” (1 = *too many*; 2 = *not too many*) and “If there was a general election tomorrow, which political party do you think you would be most likely to support” (1 = *far left parties*; 5 = *far right parties*).

Time 4 (BSAS 2008): “Do you think the number of immigrants to Britain nowadays should be increased a lot, increased a little, remain the same as it is, reduced a little, or reduced a lot?” (1 = *increased a lot*; 5 = *reduced a lot*) and “Thinking politically and socially, how would you describe your own general outlook; as being very conservative, moderately conservative, middle-of-the-road, moderately liberal, or very liberal?” (1 = *very conservative*; 5 = *very liberal*).

Analyses controlled for ethnicity, whether participants lived in or near London, and their age.