Online supplemental material of the article "The Impact of Social Desirability Pressures on Whites' Endorsement of Racial Stereotypes: A Comparison between Oral and ACASI Reports in a National Survey"

Table A1
Descriptive Statistics of the Criterion Variables (N = 1,009)

Variable	Range	Mean / %	SD	Complete sample	Valid N With valid hardworking values	With valid intelligent values
Candidate thermometer difference scores[a] (pre-election)	0 - 1	0.49	0.23	994	970	972
Candidate thermometer difference scores[a] (post-election)	0 - 1	0.52	0.21	999	970	972
Vote choice for Obama (pre-election)	0 / 1	41.7%		726[b]	720[b]	720[b]
Vote choice for Obama (post-election)	0 / 1	43.3%		775[b]	764[b]	764[b]
Feelings toward a Black president (pre-election)	0 - 1	0.68	0.22	1,007	990	993
Hoping for a Black president (pre-election)	0 / 1	64.5%		865	853	854
U.S. is ready for a Black president (pre-election)	0 / 1	64.3%		958	945	946
Racial policy: socioeconomic position of Blacks (pre-election)	0 - 1	0.31	0.27	873	860	861
Racial policy: fair job treatment of Blacks (post-election)	0 / 1	43.3%		529[c]	520[c]	522[c]
Racial policy: preferential hiring of Blacks (post-election)	0 / 1	10.8%		944	928	930
Implicit pro-Black attitudes (post-election)	0 - 1	0.41	0.15	935	917	922
Positive attitudes toward homosexuals (ACASI) (pre-election)	0 - 1	0.73	0.30	994	979	983

Note. Weighted data. The question wordings and answer choices are presented in the main text.
[a]Feeling thermometer Obama – feeling thermometer McCain, where a score of 0 refers to the most pro-McCain response possible, and 1 refers to the most pro-Obama response possible.
[b]Only respondents who said during the post-election interview that they had voted were included in these analyses.
[c]Only respondents who answered a preceding question by saying that they were interested in this topic were asked the question about governmental effort for fair job treatment of Blacks.

Time between the pre-election and post-election interviews

We explored whether a shorter time interval between the pre-election and post-election interviews was associated with more consistency in reports of racial stereotypes during the two interviews. The dependent variable in this analysis was the difference between the answers to each stereotype question in the pre-election and the post-election interview. We only considered the absolute difference – thus independently of whether the value in the pre-election interview was higher or lower than the value in the post-election interview. This difference could range from 0 (meaning that the exact same answer was given both times) to 1 (meaning that the answers were maximally different at the two time points). In separate analyses, we regressed the difference in the answers to each stereotype question on the number of days between the two interviews.

Table A2 presents the descriptive statistics for the variables involved. On average, there were 54 days between the pre-election and the post-election interview. The differences between answers to the stereotype questions were not normally distributed as indicated by skewness values above 1 and kurtosis values above 4 for each of the four questions. To reduce the non-normality, all dependent variables were transformed according to Turkey's (1977) ladder of powers by taking their square root.

The number of days between the two interviews did not predict the square root of the difference between the answers to each of the four stereotype questions (see Table A3). This suggests that post-election answers were not distorted by memory of answers to the questions asked pre-election.

Table A2
Descriptive Statistics of Days Passed and the Absolute Difference between Answers Provided During the Pre-Election and Post-Election Interviews

Variable	Range	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Valid *N*
Days passed	8 - 116	53.84	19.96	.01	2.60	1,009
Original scale						
Difference: hardworking Whites	0 - 1	0.15	0.16	1.16	4.13	999
Difference: hardworking Blacks	0 - 1	0.15	0.17	1.19	4.41	996
Difference: intelligence Whites	0 - 1	0.13	0.15	1.19	4.77	1,000
Difference: intelligence Blacks	0 - 1	0.15	0.16	1.26	5.11	995
After transformation[a]						
Difference: hardworking Whites	0 - 1	0.28	0.26	0.11	1.63	999
Difference: hardworking Blacks	0 - 1	0.29	0.26	0.08	1.67	996
Difference: intelligence Whites	0 - 1	0.27	0.25	0.14	1.57	1,000
Difference: intelligence Blacks	0 - 1	0.28	0.25	0.09	1.66	995

Note. Weighted data. Standard errors in parenthesis.
[a]Square root transformation to correct for non-normal distribution of the data.
+$p < .10$ *$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Table A3
Unstandardized Regression Coefficients for Days Passed Predicting the Square Root of the Absolute Difference between Answers Given in the Pre-Election and Post-Election Interviews

Predictor	Difference: hardworking Whites[a]	Difference: hardworking Blacks[a]	Difference: intelligence Whites[a]	Difference: intelligence Blacks[a]
Days passed	.0002 (.0005)	.0003 (.0005)	-.0001 (.0005)	-.0002 (.0005)
R^2	.0002	.0005	.0000	.0003
N	999	996	1,000	995

Note. Weighted data. Standard errors in parenthesis.
[a]After square root transformation to correct for non-normal distribution of the data.
+$p < .10$ *$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

References

Tukey, J. W. (1977). *Exploratory Data Analysis*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.