



“I’m Not Prejudiced, but . . .”: Compensatory Egalitarianism in the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primary

Corinne Moss-Racusin
Rutgers University

Julie Phelan
Rutgers University

Laurie Rudman
Rutgers University

The historic 2008 Democratic presidential primary race between Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton posed a difficult choice for egalitarian White voters, and many commentators speculated that the election outcome would reflect pitting the effects of racism against sexism (Steinem, 2008). Because self-reported prejudices may be untrustworthy, we used the Implicit Association Test (IAT) to assess White adults’ (1) condemnation of prejudices, and (2) attitudes toward the candidates in relation to voting decisions, as part of an online survey. Results supported the proposed compensatory egalitarianism process, such that Whites’ voting choice was consistent with their implicit candidate preference, but in an effort to remain egalitarian, participants compensated for this preference by automatically condemning prejudice toward the other candidate’s group. Additional findings showed that this process was moderated by participants’ ethnicity and level of prejudice, as expected. Specifically, compensatory egalitarianism occurred primarily among Whites and individuals low in explicit prejudice. Implications for candidate support, aversive racism theory, and implicit compensation processes are discussed.

KEY WORDS: Compensatory Egalitarianism, Implicit Attitudes, Implicit Prejudice, Voting Intentions and Behavior

“2008 was the most astounding primary season in American history because of who the candidates were—more precisely, because of what they were. The first woman and the first man of color to have a serious chance of victory contended for the right to represent America’s party of progressive change in the contest for the most powerful office on earth, and they fought each other very nearly to a draw.”—Henrik Hertzberg (2008)

The 2008 Democratic presidential primary was a historic election, in that the close race between Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton reflected the evolving state of Americans’ racial and gender attitudes. However, while many Americans voiced their support and enthusiasm for both candidates (e.g., Reuters, 2008), the uniqueness of their campaigns underscored persistent stereotypic beliefs about who is fit to hold our government’s highest office. Because Americans have historically elected only White male Presidents, competitive female and African American politicians bring to light many complex issues impacting leadership perception.

Scholars and pundits alike argued that the outcome of the primary would be influenced not just by lingering discrimination, but also by the *condemnation* of historic discrimination against women and African Americans (Kaye, 2008; Parks & Rachlinski, 2010; Steinem, 2008; Williams, 2008). This argument suggests that there may be an effect of *antiracism* and *antisexism* on voters’ decisions. Indeed, many polls suggested that Americans believed they would not allow their political decisions to be swayed by racism or sexism (Polman, 2007; Scripps, 2007). Given that large numbers of voters professed support for nontraditional candidates, how would having to choose between a Black male and a White female candidate impact their cognitions in one of the closest primary races in history? The goal of the current research was to investigate the interplay of implicit candidate preference, implicit condemnation of racism and sexism, and voting choice in the context of political decision making.

Egalitarian Goals

From the outset, egalitarian goals dominated the political discourse surrounding the primary campaigns. Many commentators attempted to ensure that their analyses were not perceived as discriminatory. Claims of “I’m not sexist, but . . .” often preceded negative remarks about Clinton’s campaign, and critiques of Obama’s policy were frequently accompanied by a similar caveat (Pensito Review, 2008). However, there were some examples of clear-cut racism or sexism as the campaign wore on; an effigy of Obama was “lynched” and hung from a tree in suburban Ohio (DeArmond, 2008), and MSNBC commentator Tucker Carlson responded to reports of Clinton “nutcracker” dolls with the remark, “As I have often said, when she comes on television I involuntarily cross my legs” (Women’s Media Center, 2008). Although this type of overt prejudice occasionally surfaced, a desire to appear nonprejudiced was more normative among both voters and pundits.

It is axiomatic that many Whites resist the outright expression of prejudice (Monteith, Ashburn-Nardo, Voils, & Czopp, 2002), particularly with respect to racism (Czopp & Monteith, 2003). Indeed, egalitarian norms have become so prevalent over time (Devine, 1989; Fiske, 1998; McConahay, 1986) that Whites' fears of appearing prejudiced have been likened to the experience of stereotype threat for stigmatized groups (Goff, Steele, & Davies, 2008). Because Whites are the group most at risk for being perceived as prejudiced (Inman & Baron, 1996), they may be particularly motivated to avoid this perception by adhering to egalitarian norms (Monteith et al., 2002; Parks & Rachlinski, 2010). However, although egalitarian goals diminish overt expressions of prejudice (Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink & Elliot, 1991; McConahay, Hardee & Batts, 1981), they may not completely eradicate prejudicial attitudes and beliefs at the automatic level (e.g., Amodio, Harmon-Jones, Devine, Curtin, Hartley, & Covert, 2004).

Aversive Racism

Previous research has demonstrated that even for Whites with strong egalitarian goals, subtle forms of prejudice can linger (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). Although many Whites report low levels of racism, empathize with historically disadvantaged groups, and espouse social justice and equality ideals, they may still hold negative implicit beliefs and attitudes towards Blacks, likely as a product of sociocultural influences, including lifelong exposure to persistent racial hierarchies (Devine, 1989; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2005; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998; Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann, & Banaji, 2009). This phenomenon has been termed *aversive racism*, in order to distinguish it from "old-fashioned" (i.e., overt) racism (Kovel, 1970).

Central to the present research is the idea that aversive racists express anxiety over being perceived as racist and avoid the impression of being prejudiced at all costs (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). As Gaertner and Dovidio (2005) note, the "aversion" many Whites feel is not only a residue of discomfort felt towards Blacks, but is also directed towards themselves, if there is "any thought or indication that they might be racist" (p. 619). Thus, aversive racism reflects the fact that egalitarian Whites experience tension between their stated values and implicit prejudices and are wary of behaving in a prejudiced manner.

Compensatory Egalitarianism

Given that many Whites strive to be nonprejudiced, the 2008 Democratic primary posed a dilemma in that supporting either candidate necessitated rejecting the other. A forced choice between qualified candidates from historically low-status groups (here, African Americans and women) should cause tension for those whose egalitarian goals would be at odds with having to make such a choice. In

essence, a vote for Obama could be attributed to sexism directed against Clinton, whereas a vote for Clinton could be attributed to racism directed against Obama.

We predicted that this tension would be addressed with a compensatory process designed to defend Whites' egalitarian values. Specifically, the preference for and selection of one candidate should be related to implicit condemnation of prejudice toward the *unselected* candidate's group, through a process termed *compensatory egalitarianism*. This compensatory process should restore perceptions of egalitarianism, because individuals may reassure themselves that although they did not select a minority candidate, they "repaid" this candidate with implicit antiprejudice attitudes on their behalf. Thus, their choice was not due to prejudice, and egalitarian goals may be maintained.

In keeping with past research, we expected that implicit candidate preference would be linked to voting choice (e.g., Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002). New to this research, we tested the compensatory egalitarianism process, which predicts that implicit candidate preference would be linked to condemnation of prejudice against the *other* candidate's group. For example, people with a strong implicit preference for Obama will likely vote for him, while also automatically compensating for this preference by revealing associations showing that sexism is worse than racism (antisexist attitudes). In this way, preferring (and voting for) Obama and thus, rejecting Clinton, avoids the implications of being a sexist. Similarly, implicit preference (and voting) for Clinton should be compensated for by condemning racism. The compensatory egalitarianism process underscores political commentators' repeated claims: "I'm *not* sexist, but . . ." [I preferred Obama].

The Utility of Implicit Measurement of Political Attitudes

In keeping with the egalitarian norms discussed above, polling data often demonstrate that Americans claim that race and gender are not important to them when making political decisions (e.g., Frankovic, 2008). For example, a February 2008 Gallup poll found that 94% of Americans said they would vote for a Black presidential candidate, 88% would support a woman, and 92% indicated that "a candidate's race and gender are not important to me" (Joyner, 2008). However, normative pressures to appear unprejudiced may be masking the effects of subtler forms of discrimination (Frankovic, 2008; Greenwald et al., 2009).

Indeed, researchers are often more likely to tap subtle biases when they ask participants about views held by "the average American," rather than the views of participants themselves (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993). For example, a CBS/New York Times poll found that although 90% of registered voters indicated they would vote for an African American presidential candidate and 81% would vote for a woman, only 54% believed that the "average American" would do so (Frankovic, 2008). These findings underscore the desire of many people to appear nonprejudiced, but also suggest that directly asking people about the impact of race and gender on their political preferences may not yield the most accurate responses.

To address these concerns, the present research utilized the Implicit Association Test (IAT) in addition to explicit (self-report) measures. The IAT bypasses normative pressures to edit responses by relying on response latencies rather than asking people to report their attitudes. The IAT has been used extensively to measure implicit attitudes (Lane, Banaji, Nosek, & Greenwald, 2007), including attitudes toward political candidates (e.g., Greenwald et al., 2009; Nosek, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2005; Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002). In addition, considerable research has shown that implicit attitudes are often more predictive of behavior than explicit attitudes, particularly when prejudices are involved (e.g., Rudman & Ashmore, 2007; for reviews, see Greenwald et al., 2009; Jost et al., 2010). We therefore used IATs to assess condemnation of prejudice and candidate preference. However, because avowed egalitarianism is a necessary precondition of the proposed compensatory egalitarianism process, we also employed traditional self-report measures of prejudice to assess their proposed moderating effect on compensatory egalitarianism.

Overview of the Current Research and Hypotheses

Our primary aim was to test the compensatory egalitarianism process by examining the relationships among Whites' implicit candidate preference, implicit antiprejudice attitudes, and voting choice. To do so, we administered a forced-choice voting measure, an antiprejudice IAT, a candidate preference IAT, and measures of explicit egalitarianism and prejudice (to establish participants' egalitarian goals). The proposed compensatory egalitarianism process generated the following specific hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Implicit candidate preference and implicit condemnation of prejudice will be negatively related, such that implicit preference for one candidate (Obama or Clinton) will be related to implicit condemnation of prejudice against the other candidate's group (sexism or racism, respectively).

Hypothesis 2: Explicit voting choice will be linked to both implicit candidate preference and implicit condemnation of prejudice, such that voting for the implicitly preferred candidate will be related to expressing condemnation of prejudice against the other candidate's group. Thus, people who vote for Obama will implicitly prefer him, but will also condemn sexism more than racism, and people who vote for Clinton will implicitly prefer her, but will also condemn racism more than sexism.

Hypothesis 3: Compensatory egalitarianism will be particularly strong for Whites low on explicit prejudice, because only those with egalitarian concerns will experience sufficient tension to necessitate compensating for behavior that might appear to be racist or sexist. Therefore, Whites

low on explicit prejudice should support Hypotheses 1 and 2 more so than Whites high on explicit prejudice.

Hypothesis 4: Black participants should not exhibit compensatory egalitarianism because they are relatively immune from having to establish their nonprejudiced credentials (Inman & Baron, 1996). Specifically, the antiprejudice IAT should not be related to implicit candidate preference or voting decisions for Black participants.

Method

Participants

A total of 513 participants were recruited between March 9 and April 23, 2008, to take part in the study in one of two ways. Some participants ($N = 360$) were Introductory Psychology students, who completed the full set of measures online for credit. The rest ($N = 153$) were adult volunteers recruited online (e.g., via advertisements on the Social Psychology Network and Google AdWords) to complete an abridged set of measures, in order to reduce attrition. For the full sample, 60% were White, 21% were Asian, 6% were African American, 6% were Latino, and the remaining 7% were either multiracial, identified as an unspecified other ethnicity, or did not report an ethnicity. Because the focal analyses largely concerned Whites, participant demographics are reported separately for White and Black participants.

White Participants. Among White participants, 40% were adults recruited over the Internet (M age = 34, range 18–76; 60% female), and 60% were students (M age = 19, range 18–49; 42% female). The majority of adults identified themselves as Democrat (60%), followed by Independents (21%), those unaffiliated with a particular party (12%), Republicans (5%), and those affiliated with another unspecified party (2%). The student sample was also majority Democrat (33%), followed by unaffiliated (31%), Republican (21%), Independent (13%), and affiliated with an unspecified party (2%).

Black Participants. Among Black participants, 21% were adults (M age = 35, range 19–61; 86% female), and 79% were recruited from the student population (M age = 18.42, range 17–20; 65% female). The adult sample was majority Democrat (72%), followed by unaffiliated (14%) and Independent (14%). None identified as Republican or supported another party. The student sample was also majority Democrat (80%), followed by unaffiliated (19%), and Independent (4%). None identified as Republican.

Materials

Antiprejudice IAT. To measure implicit antiprejudice attitudes, the target categories “Sexism” and “Racism” (using the words, *sexism*, *gender bias* or

racism, racial bias) were categorized with both good words (*calm, paradise, trust, peace, good, safe, happy, smile*) and bad words (*disaster, awful, bad, grief, agony, pain, tragedy, fear*) to determine which category was automatically associated more strongly with negativity (see Greenwald et al., 1998, for a full description of IAT methodology). The antiprejudice IAT effect was computed by subtracting response latencies for the antiracist pairings (racism + bad/sexism + good) from the antisexist pairings (sexism + bad/racism + good), such that high scores reflected stronger condemnation of racism than sexism.

Candidate Preference IAT. The implicit candidate preference IAT obliged participants to categorize Obama and Clinton (using the words *Barack, Obama* and *Hillary, Clinton*) with the same good and bad words used in the antiprejudice IAT. The candidate preference IAT effect was computed by subtracting response latencies for the pro-Obama pairings (Obama + good/Clinton + bad) from the pro-Clinton pairings (Hillary + good/Obama + bad). Thus, high scores reflect an implicit preference for Obama over Clinton. The IATs were scored such that we expected egalitarian Whites to show a negative relationship between them.

Support for Equal Rights. Participants responded to two items asking, "To what extent do you believe that Blacks should have equal rights?" and "To what extent do you believe that women should have equal rights?" using a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 10 (*very much so*).

Explicit Sexism. Only students completed the eight-item Modern Sexism Scale (MSS; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995), on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much*). Sample items include "Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in the United States" and "Women often miss out on good jobs due to sexual discrimination" (reverse coded). Responses were averaged to form the MSS index, on which high scores reflect stronger sexism ($\alpha = .79$).

Explicit Racism. Using the same scale, students also completed the six item Modern Racism Scale (MRS; McConahay, 1986). Sample items include "Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve" and "It is easy to understand the anger of Black people in America" (reverse coded). Responses were averaged to form the MRS index, on which high scores reflect stronger racism ($\alpha = .78$).

Voting Choice and Demographics. All participants indicated the candidate they supported in the Democratic primary (*Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, undecided, or neither*). For analyses involving voter choice, we selected only participants who chose either Obama or Clinton ($N = 235$ for the White sample, $N = 33$ for the Black sample). Participants also reported their age, gender, race, and political party affiliation.

Procedure

All participants completed the study online. To minimize attrition, adults completed the abridged version of the study (without the MSS or MRS). After

reporting their demographic information, participants indicated how they would vote (or how they had voted already for participants whose primary had already passed), because we expected that the necessity of having to choose between candidates would invoke compensatory egalitarianism. Following this, they completed the antiprejudice IAT. We then administered the support for equal rights measures and the candidate preference IAT. Students then completed the MSS and MRS. All participants were then given the results of their democratic candidate preference IAT. The promise of feedback on this IAT was used to entice the adult sample to participate in the study, and it was placed last to limit attrition rates. Finally, participants were debriefed and thanked for their time.

Results

Analytic Strategy

Because compensatory egalitarianism should primarily influence Whites, we used this group for our focal analyses. Hypothesis 4 states that Blacks should not feel tension over the choice between nontraditional candidates because they are not typically viewed as the perpetrators of prejudice (e.g., Inman & Baron, 1996). If correct, results for Blacks should provide known groups validity for the compensatory egalitarian hypotheses. We therefore split the sample and examined White participants ($N = 307$) for hypotheses 1–3, and Black participants ($N = 33$) for Hypothesis 4.

Voting Choice

Because results were similar for the White adult and student samples, we began our analyses by combining the two samples to increase statistical power. Chi-square analyses revealed a large gender difference in willingness to vote for Clinton, $\chi^2 = 25.78$, $p < .001$. Only 21 men (17%) voted for Clinton, whereas women were evenly split (48% voted for her). Table 1 shows results by political party and gender. As shown, not all participants who selected either Obama or Clinton were Democrats. As a side note, even men who were Democrats were significantly less likely to vote for Clinton than Obama, $\chi^2 = 9.63$, $p < .01$.

Implicit Measures

Following recommended procedures, we computed the D statistic to analyze the implicit measures (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003). The D statistic is similar to Cohen's d , but it is based on each individual's variance, rather than the pooled standard deviation. Results for the antiprejudice IAT indicated more condemnation of racism than sexism ($M = .20$, $SD = .34$), and the candidate

Table 1. Voting Choice by Gender and Political Party for White Participants

Political Party	Voting Choice	Male	Female	Total
Democrat	Clinton	11	35	46
	Obama	38	34	72
Republican	Clinton	2	1	3
	Obama	14	5	19
Independent	Clinton	2	5	7
	Obama	20	6	26
Other	Clinton	0	1	1
	Obama	3	2	5
Unaffiliated	Clinton	6	11	17
	Obama	28	11	39
Total	Clinton	21	53	74
	Obama	103	58	161

Note. Data represent simple tallies of votes for each candidate.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations by Gender and Voting Choice and Gender Effect Sizes for Implicit Measures (White Participants)

Voting Choice	Gender	Anti-Prejudice IAT				Candidate Preference IAT			
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Gender effect (d)</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Gender effect (d)</i>
Clinton	Male	.30	.24	21	.07	-.27	.31	21	.00
	Female	.28	.30	53		-.27	.29	53	
Obama	Male	.10	.33	103	-.44	.01	.36	103	-.21
	Female	.25	.32	58		.08	.29	58	
Undecided	Male	.36	.35	21	.00	-.24	.36	21	-.37
	Female	.36	.32	22		-.13	.24	22	
Neither	Male	-.09	.34	11	-.50	-.12	.29	11	.38
	Female	.10	.39	18		-.23	.29	18	
Total	Male	.15	.34	156	-.32	-.07	.37	156	.12
	Female	.26	.33	151		-.11	.32	151	

Note. IAT effects are shown in *D* statistic form, an effect size similar to Cohen’s *d*. Small, medium, and large effect sizes correspond to .15, .35, and .60, respectively (Lane et al., 2007). High scores on the anti-prejudice IAT reflect condemning racism more than sexism. High scores on the candidate preference IAT reflect a preference for Obama over Clinton. A positive gender effect (*d*) indicates higher scores for men relative to women. Small, medium, and large effect sizes correspond to .20, .50, and .80, respectively (Cohen, 1988).

preference IAT reflected preference for Clinton over Obama ($M = -.09, SD = .34$). Both means differed significantly from zero; $ts > 4.66, ps < .001$.

Table 2 displays descriptive statistics for the implicit measures by participant gender and voting choice. In contrast with results on the explicit voting measure, there was no gender difference for the candidate preference IAT, $t(304) = 1.13, ns$ ($Ms = -.11$ and $-.07$ for women and men, respectively). However, women scored higher than men on the antiprejudice IAT, $t(307) = 2.90, p < .01$ ($Ms = .26$ and $.15$,

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations by Gender and Gender Effect Sizes for Explicit Measures (White Participants)

	Men			Women			Gender effect	Total		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Equal Rights for Blacks	9.68	.91	156	9.68	1.04	151	0	9.68	.97	307
Equal Rights for Women	9.65	.10	156	9.78	.83	151	-.11	9.72	.92	307
MSS	3.04	.60	103	2.57	.61	77	.72	2.84	.65	180
MRS	2.29	.64	103	2.30	.75	77	-.01	2.29	.69	180

Note. High scores reflect greater levels of support for equal rights and MRS and MSS. A positive gender effect (*d*) indicates higher scores for men relative to women. Small, medium, and large effect sizes correspond to .20, .50, and .80, respectively (Cohen, 1988). Only students completed the MRS and MSS scales.

respectively). That is, women expressed greater condemnation of racism over sexism than men. In support of the antiprejudice IAT as a measure of implicit compensation, this finding suggests that women (who are not likely to be accused of sexism) may be more concerned with avoiding the charge of racism.

Table 2 also shows results of the candidate preference IAT by participant gender and voting choice. Surprisingly, implicit preference for Obama was weak even among his voters ($M = .03$, $SD = .34$) and did not differ reliably from zero, $t(160) = 1.23$, *ns*.¹ In contrast, implicit preference for Clinton was strong among her supporters ($M = -.27$, $SD = .29$, $t(72) = 8.03$, $p < .001$), but was also significant for undecided participants ($M = -.18$, $SD = .30$, $t(42) = 4.01$, $p < .001$), and for those who said they supported neither candidate ($M = -.19$, $SD = .29$, $t(28) = 3.48$, $p < .01$). A possible interpretation of this pattern is that implicit preference for women is generally stronger than it is for men (Rudman & Goodwin, 2004), as is implicit preference for Whites over Blacks (e.g., Greenwald et al., 1998; Nosek et al., 2002). It is also possible that undecided voters might have eventually cast their vote for Clinton. Recent research demonstrated that a candidate preference IAT predicted actual voting and policy endorsement even among undecided voters—in other words, on an implicit level, voters may not be as uncertain as they claim (Galdi, Arcuri, & Gawronski, 2008; Arcuri, Castelli, Galdi, Zogmaister, & Amadori, 2008).

Explicit Measures

Results for the explicit measures are shown in Table 3. As can be seen, support for the equal rights of women and Blacks was robust (overall M s = 9.68 and 9.72, respectively), suggesting a ceiling effect. In fact, only 18 participants chose a

¹ These findings are similar to those obtained with a large online population utilizing Project Implicit. Specifically, Obama's voters showed a null IAT effect ($D = .04$, $d = .09$), whereas Clinton's voters showed a stronger Clinton preference ($D = .43$, $d = 1.16$), and the correlation between the IAT and voting choice was .40 (Y. Bar-Anon, personal communication, July 9, 2009).

number lower than 9 on a 10-point scale. There were no gender differences on either equal rights measure, both $t_s < 1.22$, *ns*. Because our combined sample of Whites consisted of strong egalitarians, the predicted compensatory processes should emerge.

Also shown in Table 3 are the student sample's MRS and MSS scores. Not surprisingly, men scored higher than women on the MSS, $t(178) = 5.21$, $p < .001$. In contrast, there were no gender differences on the MRS, $t(178) = -.04$, *ns*.

Compensatory Egalitarianism

To test support for hypotheses 1 and 2, we selected Whites who said they would vote (or had voted) for either Clinton or Obama ($N = 235$). Table 4 shows the correlations among all measures, controlling for participant age and political party. As can be seen, the IATs were negatively related, $r(228) = -.25$, $p < .001$, in support of Hypothesis 1. As predicted, implicit preference for one candidate was related to condemnation of prejudice against the other candidate's group. Hypothesis 2 was also supported, such that the candidate preference IAT was positively related to voting choice, $r(228) = .41$, $p < .001$, whereas the antiprejudice IAT was negatively related to voting choice, $r(228) = -.18$, $p < .01$. Thus, people who voted for Obama implicitly preferred him, but also condemned sexism more than racism, and people who voted for Clinton implicitly preferred her, but also condemned racism more than sexism.

The only other variables significantly related to voting choice were gender (as already shown, women supported Clinton more so than men), support for women's equal rights (if high, Clinton was endorsed), and the MSS (if high, Obama was endorsed).

Table 4. Second Order Correlations Among Variables for White Participants (Controlling for Political Party and Age)

	Voting Choice	CP IAT	AP IAT	Equal Rights Women	Equal Rights Blacks	MRS	MSS
Candidate Preference IAT	.41***						
Anti-Prejudice IAT	-.18**	-.25***					
Equal Rights for Women	-.15*	-.06	.04				
Equal Rights for Blacks	-.07	.03	.11	.67***			
MRS	-.15†	-.17†	.07	-.11	-.20*		
MSS	.22*	.06	-.08	-.26**	-.09	.41***	
Gender	-.34**	-.08	.21**	.15*	.09	.01	-.35***

Note. *Ns* range from 307 to 126. Voting choice was coded 0 = Clinton, 1 = Obama. Gender was coded 0 = men, 1 = women. High scores on the candidate preference IAT reflect a preference for Obama over Clinton. High scores on the anti-prejudice IAT reflect condemning racism more than sexism.

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

Prejudice as a Moderator of Compensatory Egalitarianism

Hypothesis 3 states that compensatory egalitarianism should emerge most strongly for nonprejudiced Whites, because they should feel tension between having to choose between a Black man or a White woman as a presidential candidate. Due to the ceiling effect shown on the equal rights measures, there was insufficient variance to use them as potential moderators. We therefore relied on the MRS and MSS scores for the student sample to examine whether only Whites low on explicit prejudice would support hypotheses 1 and 2.

After standardizing all variables, we regressed the candidate preference IAT on the antiprejudice IAT, the MRS, and their interaction. We also included participant age and political party as control variables. Results revealed a main effect for the antiprejudice IAT, $\beta = -.29$, $p < .001$, and the MRS, $\beta = -.23$, $p < .01$. Both age and political party were nonsignificant, $ps > .34$. Of greater importance, the expected two-way interaction emerged, $\beta = .18$, $p < .05$. To interpret the interaction, we conducted a median split on MRS scores. As predicted, when controlling for age and political party, participants low on the MRS showed a reliably negative link between the two IATs, $r(82) = -.39$, $p < .001$, whereas participants high on the MRS did not, $r(92) = -.15$, $p = .14$. The bivariate correlations (i.e., not controlling for age and political party) were similar, $r(86) = -.40$, $p < .001$, and $r(96) = -.14$, *ns*, respectively. Thus, as expected, Hypothesis 1 was supported only on the part of egalitarian Whites.

As a check on the moderation of Hypothesis 2, we conducted a logistic regression using voting choice as the dependent variable (dummy coded such that 0 = Clinton, 1 = Obama); the predictors were age and political party (again, as control variables), the antiprejudice IAT, the MRS, and their interaction. Once again, age and political party were nonsignificant, both $ps > .53$. Results revealed a main effect for the antiprejudice IAT, $B = -1.56$, $p < .05$, Wald = 4.04, and the MRS, $B = -.67$, $p < .05$, Wald = 6.15. These effects were qualified by the expected two-way interaction, $B = 1.90$, $p < .05$, Wald = 5.43. As predicted, when controlling for age and political party, for participants who scored low on the MRS, condemnation of prejudice was negatively related to voting choice, $r(67) = -.32$, $p < .01$, but not for participants who scored high, $r(57) = .03$, *ns*. The bivariate correlations were similar, $r(71) = -.33$, $p < .01$, and $r(61) = .04$, *ns*, respectively.

Finally, we tested whether MSS scores would also moderate our hypotheses. To do so, we controlled for age, political party, and gender (because it predicted the MSS). However, when regressing the candidate preference IAT on the antiprejudice IAT, the MSS, and their interaction, we found only a main effect for the antiprejudice IAT, $\beta = -.22$, $p < .01$. There were no other significant effects and the interaction term was negligible, $\beta = -.10$, *ns*. Further, when we regressed voting choice on the antiprejudice IAT, the MSS, and their interaction, we found only a main effect for gender, $B = -.61$, $p < .01$, Wald = 6.96 (with women more likely to vote for Clinton than men). There were no other reliable effects and the

antiprejudice IAT x MSS interaction was weak, $B = .27$, $p = .66$, $Wald = .10$. Consequently, we found strong support for Hypothesis 3 using the MRS, but not the MSS. We next turned to the African American participants to determine whether they would provide discriminatory validity for compensatory egalitarianism.

Results for Black Participants

The voting choice data revealed that 28 out of 33 Black participants (19 women) endorsed either Clinton or Obama. Blacks were far more likely to vote for Obama than Clinton ($n_s = 25$ vs. 3; $\chi^2 = 17.29$, $p < .001$), and they did not demonstrate a gender gap in support for Clinton, as did Whites.

Central to the present research, Hypothesis 4 states that compensatory egalitarianism should not emerge among Blacks because they are unlikely to be concerned with accusations of being prejudiced (Inman & Baron, 1996). In support of this prediction, Table 5 shows there was no evidence of compensatory egalitarianism for Blacks. Voting choice was unrelated to the antiprejudice IAT (and the candidate preference IAT). These results may be affected by the truncated range of the voting choice variable. However, the IATs each showed normal distributions, and they were also not related, in contrast to the negative association shown for Whites.

Further, Table 5 reveals a main effect for gender on the antiprejudice IAT. Black women were more likely to condemn racism over sexism, whereas Black men showed the opposite pattern ($M_s = .18$ and $-.11$, respectively). This finding echoes the results for Whites and again suggests that women are less motivated to condemn sexism than men because they are not likely to be accused of being

Table 5. Second Order Correlations Among Variables for Black Participants (Controlling for Political Party and Age)

	Voting Choice	CP IAT	AP IAT	Equal Rights Women	Equal Rights Blacks	MRS	MSS
Candidate Preference IAT	.02						
Anti-Prejudice IAT	.05	.04					
Equal Rights for Women	-.11	.09	.31				
Equal Rights for Blacks	-.12	-.14	.33	.94***			
MRS	.16	-.23	-.29	-.52*	-.63**		
MSS	-.01	-.37	-.02	-.24	-.39*	.56**	
Gender	-.01	-.21	.42*	.28	.40*	-.60**	-.65**

Note. N_s range from 33 to 22. Voting choice was coded 0 = Clinton, 1 = Obama. Gender was coded 0 = men, 1 = women. High scores on the candidate preference IAT reflect a preference for Obama over Clinton. High scores on the anti-prejudice IAT reflect condemning racism more than sexism.

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

sexist. Similarly, Blacks on average should have less concern with being charged as racist than Whites, and thus should score lower than Whites on the antiprejudice IAT. Consistent with this view, Blacks scored marginally lower than Whites, $t(338) = 1.83$, $p = .07$ ($M_s = .09$ and $.20$, respectively). Taken together, these results support the validity of the antiprejudice IAT as a measure of prejudice condemnation and provide evidence of known groups validity for the compensatory egalitarianism process.

Discussion

The 2008 Democratic primary pitted a Black man against a White woman as candidates for the highest political office, posing a unique dilemma for Whites invested in egalitarian ideals. Given that many Whites are aversive racists who seek to avoid the appearance of being prejudiced, the need to choose one candidate over the other was likely problematic. The present research found support for compensatory egalitarianism, by which the unchosen candidate's group is "repaid" by viewing prejudice against them in particularly negative terms. In this way, the current research expands our understanding of voters' cognitions and provides a unique demonstration of antiprejudice compensation for implicit candidate preference.

Because this process was evident only for nonprejudiced Whites, and was not observed at all for Blacks, our findings support the argument that compensatory egalitarianism functions to defend nonprejudiced ideals that might otherwise be cast into doubt. To the extent that Blacks are unlikely to be viewed as prejudiced (Inman & Baron, 1996), they likely do not feel compelled to establish their egalitarianism by condemning racism; thus, their voting choice and implicit candidate preference were unrelated to implicit antiprejudice. Finally, explicit racism moderated compensatory egalitarianism, underscoring our reasoning that because modern racists were not concerned with egalitarianism, there was no need to "repay" their unselected candidate's group by distancing themselves from prejudice directed against them ("I'm not racist, but . . ."). Simply put, only those with egalitarian goals should feel the need to defend their egalitarianism.

Because this defense occurred automatically, using measures not likely to be controlled, it suggests that egalitarian motives and ideals are deeply ingrained among low-prejudiced Whites. As such, our findings present a relatively optimistic view of people's ability to guard their egalitarianism when making political decisions. A large amount of past research focuses on Whites' implicit biases and how they may guide discrimination against Blacks and women (e.g., Dovidio et al., 1997; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002; Greenwald et al., 2009; Jost et al., 2010; Rudman & Ashmore, 2007; Rudman & Glick, 2001). In contrast, studies that reveal the impact of potential prejudice on subsequent, implicit cognitions are relatively rare. For example, people who were forced to endorse one of three sexist explanations of a woman's behavior subsequently showed low evidence of

automatic gender stereotypes (Moskowitz, Gollwitzer, Wasel, & Schaal, 1999). Consistent with the present results, this suggests that people can compensate for prejudiced responses—or those that might hint of prejudice—by shoring up their egalitarian credentials, even when responses are automatic. More broadly, the present results add to a growing literature showing that implicit cognitions can serve compensatory functions that defend the self from various threats (e.g., implicit self-esteem compensation; for a review, see Rudman, Dohn, & Fairchild, 2007). The fact that voters' decisions were tied to implicit antiprejudice attitudes both expands our understanding of the political decision-making process and speaks to the power of egalitarian goals.

Limitations and Future Directions

The present research tested compensatory egalitarianism using a novel measure, the antiprejudice IAT. Thus, it is prudent to examine its validity beyond its support for the present hypotheses. To that end, the fact that women were less likely than men to condemn sexism over racism, and Blacks were less likely than Whites to condemn racism over sexism, is heartening. If the measure simply assessed ingroup bias, we would expect a reversed pattern in each case. Nonetheless, future work is needed to increase confidence in the antiprejudice IAT.

On that note, the present research suggests that compensatory egalitarianism operates automatically, but we did not assess whether similar results would have been obtained with the use of explicit measures. Because explicitly, Obama supporters may have reported that racism is worse than sexism—plausibly to defend him as a candidate who has overcome great odds—we suspect that self-reports would not have revealed compensatory egalitarianism. As an initial test of this reasoning, Moss-Racusin, Rudman, & Phelan (2010) obliged White participants to choose between highly qualified Black male and White female CEO candidates. In addition to completing the antiprejudice IAT, they reported their explicit condemnation of prejudice using the question, “When it comes down to it, which is worse, racism or sexism?” Results revealed that participants reported greater condemnation of prejudice against their *selected* candidate's group, while continuing to show the opposite result implicitly. In the context of the current study, this suggests that participants who voted for Clinton would have explicitly reported that sexism is worse than racism, while implicitly condemning racism to protect their egalitarian ideals.

Nonetheless, our usage of the IAT is not meant to equate compensatory egalitarianism with automatic processes. No measure is “process pure,” and our discussion of compensatory egalitarianism as an automatic effect is tempered by the fact that IAT performance is influenced somewhat by controlled processes (Conrey, Sherman, Gawronski, Hugenberg, & Groom, 2005). Specifically, in five studies, Conrey et al. found support for the quadruple process model, which posits that four distinct automatic and controlled processes are tapped by implicit social

cognition measures (including the IAT). These include the activation of automatic bias, the ability to arrive at a correct response, the likelihood of overcoming automatic bias, and a guessing bias in the absence of other relevant information. Thus, despite the fact that we intended the IAT to assess implicit condemnation of prejudice, it may have measured some controlled processes as well. However, given the explicit findings described above, it appears that the compensatory egalitarianism process is primarily implicit.

Additionally, due to methodological constraints, we did not counterbalance the order in which measures were presented. Because online studies typically suffer from high rates of attrition, we administered the candidate preference IAT last for all participants so that discovering their implicit candidate preference would function as an enticement for completing the study. In effect, by asking participants to report their voting choice immediately prior to completing the antiprejudice IAT, we may have created the ideal circumstances under which to reveal compensatory egalitarianism. Therefore, future research should counterbalance voting choice and IAT administration to investigate potential order effects.

Our finding of mixed support for Hypothesis 3 (such that the MRS, but not the MSS, moderated compensatory egalitarianism for Whites) is somewhat mitigated by the absence of compensatory egalitarianism among Blacks. That is, despite the fact that the MSS did not perform as expected, the lack of evidence for compensatory egalitarianism among Black participants lends support for the process as a whole. Nonetheless, future research is needed to determine why the MSS was unsuccessful as a moderator. It is possible that our participants had less compunction regarding sexism, compared with racism (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Kaye, 2008). Indeed, the absence of men's support for Hillary Clinton is a striking finding, suggestive of the possibility that sexism is a more difficult hurdle for candidates than racism when it comes to presidential politics (cf. Parks & Rachlinski, 2010).

Finally, although we attempted to recruit a diverse sample by using the Internet, our adult participants were comprised of primarily Democrats. Although this was fortunate for our aims, future research should seek to broaden tests of compensatory egalitarianism with a more diverse group of participants, including a larger sample of African Americans and other ethnic groups.

Conclusions

The present study introduced compensatory egalitarianism as a process by which Whites averse to prejudice protect egalitarian ideals by automatically condemning prejudice against an unselected candidate's group. In so doing, our results shed new light on the complex processes underlying candidate support and highlight the importance of implicit egalitarian goals (Glaser & Knowles, 2008; Moskowitz et al., 1999). The findings are promising in their suggestion that Whites may be sufficiently motivated to avoid the charge of being biased that they

automatically defend against it. In contrast to the focus of past aversive racism research, we suggest that the present findings imply a more optimistic view of human cognition by revealing an implicit manifestation of Whites' egalitarianism. As nonprejudiced norms continue to set the tone for many leadership decisions both in and outside of the voting booth, it is critical to generate a greater understanding of the subtle impacts of egalitarian goals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship awarded to the first author, a Jacob K. Javits Fellowship (US Department of Education) awarded to the second author, and NSF grant BCS-0443342 awarded to the third author. Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Corinne Moss-Racusin, Rutgers University, 53 Avenue E, Tillet Hall, Piscataway, NJ 08854. E-mail: cmossrac@eden.rutgers.edu.

REFERENCES

- Amodio, D. M., Harmon-Jones, E., Devine, P. G., Curtin, J. J., Hartley, S. L., & Covert, A. E. (2004). Neural signals for the detection of unintentional race bias. *Psychological Science, 15*, 88–93.
- Arcuri, L., Castelli, L., Galdi, S., Zogmaister, C., & Amadori, A. (2008). Predicting the vote: Implicit attitudes as predictors of the future behavior of decided and undecided voters. *Political Psychology, 29*, 369–387.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conrey, F. R., Sherman, J. W., Gawronski, B., Hugenberg, K., & Groom, C. J. (2005). Separating multiple processes in implicit social cognition: The Quad-Model of implicit task performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 469–487.
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 532–544.
- DeArmond, M. (October 16, 2008). GOP mailing depicts Obama on food stamp. *The Press Enterprise*. Retrieved on October 19, 2008, from http://www.pe.com/localnews/inland/stories/PE_News_Local_S_buck16.3d67d4a.html
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 5–18.
- Devine, P. G., Monteith, M. J., Zuwerink, J. R., & Elliot, A. J. (1991). Prejudice with and without compunction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 817–830.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2004). Aversive racism. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 36, pp. 1–52). San Diego: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 62–28.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., & Howard, A. (1997). On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology, 33*, 510–540.
- Frankovic, K. (March 17, 2008). Race, gender and bias in the electorate. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/03/17/opinion/pollpositions/main3945103.shtml>.

- Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 357–412). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61–89). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2005). Understanding and addressing contemporary racism: From aversive racism to the common ingroup identity model. *Journal of Social Issues, 61*, 615–639.
- Galdi, S., Arcuri, L., & Gawronski, B. (2008). Automatic mental associations predict future choices of undecided decision-makers. *Science, 321*, 1100–1102.
- Glaser, J., & Knowles, E. D. (2008). Implicit motivation to control prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 164–172.
- Goff, P. A., Steele, C. M., & Davies, P. G. (2008). The space between us: Stereotype threat and distance in interracial contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*, 91–107.
- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 197–216.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D., & Schwartz, J. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1464–1480.
- Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*, 17–41.
- Hertzberg, H. (June 23, 2008). Exhilaration. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved on November 10, 2008, from www.newyorker.com/talk/comment/2008/06/23/080623taco_talk_hertzberg.
- Huddy, L., & Terkildsen, N. (1993). Gender stereotypes and the perceptions of male and female candidates. *American Journal of Political Science, 37*, 119–147.
- Inman, M. L., & Baron, R. S. (1996). Influence of prototypes on perceptions of prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 727–739.
- Jost, J. T., Rudman, L. A., Blair, I. V., Carney, D. R., Dasgupta, N., Glaser, J., & Hardin, C. D. (2010). The existence of implicit bias is beyond reasonable doubt: A refutation of ideological and methodological objections and executive summary of ten studies that no manager should ignore. In A. Brief & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*. New York: Elsevier.
- Joyner, J. (February 2, 2008). Black president more likely than Mormon or Atheist. Retrieved on May 9, 2008, from http://www.outsidethebeltway.com/archives/black_president_more_likely_than_mormon_or_atheist/
- Kaye, R. (February 15, 2008). Some voters say sexism less offensive than racism. Retrieved on August 13, 2009, from <http://www.cnn.com/2008/POLITICS/02/15/kaye.ohioracegender/index.html>.
- Kovel, J. (1970). *White racism: A psychohistory*. New York: Pantheon.
- Lane, K. A., Banaji, M. R., Nosek, B. A., & Greenwald, A. G. (2007). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: IV: What we know (so far) about the method. In B. Wittenbrink & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Implicit measures of attitudes: Procedures and controversies* (pp. 59–102). New York: Guilford Press.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). New York: Academic Press.
- McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? It depends on who is asking and what is asked. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 25*, 563–579.
- Moskowitz, G. B., Gollwitzer, P. M., Wasel, W., & Schaal, B. (1999). Preconscious control of stereotype activation through chronic egalitarian goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 167–184.

- Monteith, M. J., Ashburn-Nardo, L., Voils, C. I., & Czopp, A. M. (2002). Putting the brakes on prejudice: On the development and operation of cues for control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 1029–1050.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Rudman, L. A., Phelan, J. E., & Dovidio, J. F. (2010). *The egalitarian's dilemma: A model of implicit compensation and explicit defense*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2002). Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration web site. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 6*, 101–115.
- Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: II. Method variables and construct validity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 166–180.
- Parks, G. S., & Rachlinski, J. J. (2010). *A better metric: Unconscious race and gender bias in the 2008 presidential election*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Pensito Review (May 20, 2008). Note to Hillary: I'm not sexist, I just don't like you. *Pensito Review*. Retrieved on October 19, 2008, from <http://www.pensitoreview.com/2008/05/20/note-to-hillary-im-not-sexist-i-just-dont-like-you/>.
- Polman, D. (January 23, 2007). Barack Obama's race seems to be a second-tier issue in '08 election. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*. Retrieved on August 17, 2009, from [http://www.highbeam.com/The+Philadelphia+Inquirer+\(Philadelphia,+PA\)/publications.aspx?date=200701&pageNumber=7](http://www.highbeam.com/The+Philadelphia+Inquirer+(Philadelphia,+PA)/publications.aspx?date=200701&pageNumber=7).
- Reuters (May 4, 2008). Democrats split in support for Clinton, Obama. Retrieved October 19, 2008, from <http://uk.reuters.com/article/usPoliticsNews/idUKN0429720120080504>.
- Rudman, L. A., Dohn, M. C., & Fairchild, K. (2007). Implicit self-esteem compensation: Automatic threat defense. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 798–813.
- Rudman, L. A., & Ashmore, R. D. (2007). Discrimination and the Implicit Association Test. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10*, 359–372.
- Rudman, L. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2004). Gender differences in automatic ingroup bias: Why do women like women more than men like men? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 494–509.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 743–762.
- Scripps, B. (January 27, 2007). Will women vote for a woman? *Desert News*. Retrieved on October 19, 2008, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qn4188/is_/ai_n17159268.
- Steinem, G. (September 22, 2008). Women are never front-runners. *The New York Times*. Retrieved on October 19, 2008, from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/08/opinion/08steinem.html?_r=1/.
- Swim, J., Aikin, K., Hall, W., & Hunter, B. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 199–214.
- Williams, P. (March 6, 2008). House of cards. *The Nation*. Retrieved on October 19, 2008, from <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20080324/williams>.
- Women's Media Center (May 23, 2008). Sexism sells, but we're not buying it. Video retrieved on June 14, 2008, from http://www.womensmediacenter.com/sexism_sells.html.