Northwestern | NSTITUTE FOR POLICY RESEARCH

RESEARCH EXCELLENCE · POLICY IMPACT

IPR Working Paper Series

WP-25-26

Asian Ethnic Subgroup Moderates the Relationship Between Asian American Discrimination Experiences and Solidarity with Black Americans

Aeroelay Chyei Vinluan

Northwestern University

Daniel Sanji

Northwestern University

Michael Kraus Northwestern University and IPR

Version: June 16, 2025

DRAFT

Please do not quote or distribute without permission.

Institute for Policy Research • 2040 Sheridan Rd., Evanston, IL 60208 • 847.491.3395 • ipr@northwestern.edu

Abstract

The Asian American category is an ethnically diverse group, yet research has not examined how Asian ethnic subgroup differences may lead to differences in discrimination experiences and solidarity perceptions. Given that Asian subgroups vary by skin tone, prototypicality, and solidarity history, we would expect these subgroups to differ in their experiences and responses to discrimination. Here, the researchers examine how Asian ethnic subgroup moderates associations between Asian Americans' perceived discrimination events since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic and solidarity with Black Americans. A large, ethnically diverse sample of self-identified Asian Americans (N = 2,309) completed a series of measures as part of an online survey. Overall, Chinese (n = 604), Japanese (n = 148), Korean (n = 244), and Vietnamese participants (n = 311) reported more discrimination events than Indian (n = 333) and Filipino participants (n = 399) during this time period. Critically, all but Korean participants showed a positive relationship between reported discrimination events since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic and perceptions of both linked fate and similarity with Black Americans. The findings demonstrate the ways that Asian subgroups' experiences differ, and how these differences might, in turn, predict responses to discrimination that foster intra-minority solidarity between Asian and Black Americans.

Public Significance Statement: Asian Americans are an ethnically diverse group, and psychological research has yet to consider how ethnic subgroup may play a role in Asian Americans' experiences. This research demonstrates that there are Asian subgroup differences in perceived discriminating events following the COVID-19 pandemic and solidarity perceptions with Black Americans. Thus, researchers and policymakers need to begin considering the diversity of the Asian American category in efforts to promote intra-minority solidarity.

Asian ethnic subgroup moderates the relationship between Asian American discrimination experiences and solidarity with Black Americans

How contexts, histories, and motivations lead social groups to either work with each other in solidarity, or against each other in conflict, is a core question in psychology with significant implications for political coalitions and civic engagement. This question became salient recently when the COVID-19 pandemic led to a rise in violence and discrimination against Asian people in the U.S. (Yellow Horse et al., 2022). Since the start of the pandemic, many people questioned whether experiences of discrimination might lead to solidarity with other marginalized groups in the U.S. who also experienced discrimination during the pandemic. Given that Asian people in the U.S. represent a broad range of cultural, historical, and identitybased characteristics, one important caveat to expectations for solidarity or conflict lies in understanding how different subgroups of Asian people in the U.S. may react to patterns of discrimination. This study was designed to better understand how discrimination experiences are related to solidarity and importantly, how these relationships may differ by subgroup origins.

In our research, we define Asian Americans using the U.S. Census' pan-ethnic definition (U.S. Office of Management and Budget, 1997) which encompasses people having origins in the Far East (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean), Southeast Asia (e.g., Filipino, Vietnamese), or the Indian subcontinent (e.g., Indian). Furthermore, when examining differences among Asian Americans, we are specifically discussing how ethnic subgroups (e.g., Chinese vs. Indian vs. Filipino) differ based on the cultures, characteristics, and/or shared practices within that subgroup (Cooper & Leong, 2008; Markus, 2008). Despite the Asian American category representing more than 20 ethnicities, the diversity of this racial category is often ignored in favor of monolithic generalizations (Lu, 2024; Vinluan & Remedios, 2024). Below, we discuss in more detail how Asian subgroups differ from each other in the context of discrimination experiences and perceptions of solidarity.

Ethnic subgroup differences in discrimination among Asian Americans

Previous research has suggested that within a racial group, differences in race-related discrimination experiences are based on perceived group prototypicality (Eberhardt et al., 2006; Wilkins et al., 2010). Specifically, racial group members who are considered more prototypical of their race (i.e., tend to have features that are more closely associated with the group) tend to be the targets of racial stereotypes more (Maddox, 2004; Maddox & Gray, 2002) and, as a result, tend to be the targets of racial discrimination more compared to less prototypical group members. Thus, we could expect ethnic subgroups with higher perceived Asian American prototypicality to experience more Asian-related discrimination experiences than subgroups perceived as less prototypical. Within the Asian American category, East Asian subgroups (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Americans) are perceived as more prototypical of the Asian American category compared to South (e.g., Indian) and Southeast Asian (e.g., Filipino, Vietnamese) subgroups (Goh & McCue, 2021; Lee & Ramakrishnan, 2020). Additionally, within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, the description of the COVID-19 virus as the "Chinese Virus" in the news due to the virus' origin in Wuhan, China may have led to greater discrimination experiences for Chinese Americans and Asian individuals mistaken to be of Chinese descent (Hswen et al., 2021; Huynh et al., 2022). Indeed, according to some reports (Yellow Horse et al., 2022), Chinese individuals, followed by Korean individuals, reported more hate incidents during the first year of the pandemic compared to other Asian subgroups.

Beyond discrimination incited by the COVID-19 virus's origin in China, Asian Americans face other existing forms of discrimination. On this topic, colorism-based experiences

5

due to ethnic subgroup differences in skin tone bias may be relevant (Hunter, 2007). Specifically, within racial minority groups, racial minority individuals who have darker skin tones tend to experience more discrimination than those with lighter skin tones. We see evidence of this among Black Americans (Eberhardt et al., 2006; Maddox, 2004), Latine Americans (Quiros & Dawson, 2013), and even among Asian Americans (Khanna, 2020; Ryabov, 2016; Sissoko et al., 2024). Indian and Filipino American subgroups tend to have darker skin tones, on average, compared to other Asian ethnic subgroups (Kim, 1999; Ma et al., 2018).

Taken together, the above analysis suggests that discrimination experiences may be heightened during the COVID-19 pandemic due to rising discrimination faced by Chinese Americans and those ethnic subgroups (e.g., Korean and Japanese Americans) with similar characteristics. Alternatively, Asian ethnic subgroups that, on average, have darker skin tones may report more discrimination due to colorism (e.g., Indian and Filipino Americans). We test these competing predictions in this research project.

Ethnic subgroup differences in solidarity among Asian Americans

In addition to Asian subgroup differences in discrimination experiences, we may also expect subgroup differences in perceptions of solidarity with Black Americans due to historical relationships between these groups. Several Asian ethnic subgroups have histories of solidarity with Black Americans. For example, in 1971, Japanese and Black American activists worked together to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, which allowed the U.S. government to incarcerate anyone suspected of engaging in espionage or sabotage (Izumi, 2005). Japanese American experiences of incarceration during World War II were invoked in these efforts to protect Black activists from similar prosecution. Additionally, some Black American troops expressed solidarity during the Philippine-American War (1899-1902), deciding not to fight

Filipino soldiers given their shared mistreatment by White Americans (Wills, 2000). Black American opposition to the Vietnam War (1965-1975) was motivated by similar rationale (Chow & Bates, 2020). Many Asian American activists including Grace Lee Boggs (Chinese American), Yuri Kochiyama (Japanese American), Kiyoshi Kuromiya (Japanese American), and Cecilia Suyat (Filipino American) and others supported the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s alongside Black leaders (Choy, 2022; Fujino, 2005; McFadden, 2015).

In contrast, some historical accounts of Korean American communities in the U.S. were characterized by a lack of cross-group civic engagement, culminating in civil unrest in Los Angeles in 1992 that brought Black and Korean communities into conflict (Eun Sook, 2005). As a result of this history, one may expect Korean Americans to perceive less solidarity with Black Americans than other Asian subgroups.

Though our study is among the first to examine subgroup differences in discrimination and solidarity among Asian Americans, some prior data indicates support for the importance of this endeavor. For instance, there is some evidence that there are differences among Asian ethnic subgroups on perceptions of intergroup relations with Black Americans. Pew Research Center (2012) asked Asian Americans how well they thought their ethnic group got along with Black Americans. Fifty percent of Korean Americans reported that their ethnic subgroup did not get along well with Black Americans, followed by 40% of Vietnamese, 33% of Chinese, 23% of Indian, 18% of Filipino, and 15% of Japanese Americans. In contrast, only 4% of Korean Americans reported that they thought their ethnic group got along very well with Black Americans, followed by 7% of Chinese, 12% of Vietnamese, 17% of Japanese, 21% of Indian, and 27% of Filipino Americans. Based on these findings, we may generally expect that Korean and Vietnamese Americans may hold more negative views or perceptions of Black Americans, while Indian and Filipino Americans may have more positive views.

The Present Research

We used a large sample of Asian Americans from a variety of ethnic subgroups to explore Asian ethnic subgroup differences in perceived discrimination experiences. In our research, we asked participants to recall experiences of discrimination since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. These discrimination experiences range from general (e.g., being subject to slurs or jokes) to more specific experiences of Asian Americans (e.g., someone made a remark that you should go back to your home country). A common discrimination experience that Asian Americans encounter regardless of ethnic subgroup is related to being perceived as perpetual foreigners, or the stereotype that all Asian Americans are immigrants even if they were born in the U.S. (Armenta et al., 2013; Cheryan & Monin, 2005; Goh et al., 2023; Zou & Cheryan, 2017). Additionally, we include a discrimination item that is specific to being blamed for the COVID-19 pandemic. We explored whether Chinese Americans would show levels of discrimination experience that were higher than other Asian origin subgroups, and if so, if other East Asian subgroups would have similar or different discrimination experiences.

We also explored Asian ethnic subgroup differences in perceptions of solidarity with Black Americans. In our research, we operationalize solidarity with Black Americans using perceived linked fate and similarity with Black Americans. Perceived linked fate broadly measures perceptions of a shared history with Black Americans by asking Asian Americans if they think that their racial group doing well in the U.S. depends on how well Black Americans are doing (Dawson, 1994; Sanchez & Masuoka, 2010). Perceived similarity broadly measures perceptions of a common identity between Asian and Black Americans (Gaertner & Dovidio,

2000; Gaertner et al., 1996) as a "stigmatized racial minority in the U.S." (Craig & Richeson, 2012). We explored whether histories of colorism might elicit perceptions of similarity with Black Americans, or rather, if emerging patterns of discrimination experiences for Chinese Americans and other East Asian subgroups might elicit similar patterns of solidarity.

Finally, the present research also explores whether Asian ethnic subgroup moderates the relationship between perceived discrimination experiences and perceptions of solidarity. We expect to show stigma-based solidarity based on previous literature (Craig & Richeson, 2012; 2016; Cortland et al., 2017) and our own scholarship (Kraus & Vinluan, 2023; Vinluan & Kraus, 2025). Specifically, we explore whether all Asian origin subgroups would show the same association between discrimination experiences and solidarity with Black Americans, or if histories of conflict might be a context that complicates those relationships.

Method

Data

The data reported in this paper was collected as part of a larger project focused on experiences of remote work among Asian Americans during the pandemic (Vinluan & Kraus, 2025). The present study's data combines four studies where we were interested in recruiting an ethnically diverse Asian American sample who indicated working during the COVID-19 pandemic. The study procedure and measures were the same across the studies and were conducted in accordance with the Institutional Review Board at Yale University, and all participants consented to the study procedures. After participants confirmed that they selfidentified in one of the Asian subgroups listed, participants were randomly assigned to either a treatment or control condition and then asked to complete items regarding their support for racerelated policies. In the treatment condition, participants watched a video that proposed a policy to address discrimination experiences faced by Asian Americans during the pandemic. In the control condition, participants watched a video reminding participants of the discrimination experiences faced by Asian Americans during the pandemic. Detailed descriptions of the experimental methods and stimuli and the corresponding results are in Vinluan & Kraus (2025). Participants then completed the measures mentioned below. Finally, participants completed a demographic questionnaire and were debriefed. All analyses reported here control for experimental condition.

Data collection started in September 2023 and concluded in February 2024. Participants in three of the four studies were recruited using Prolific and were compensated \$2.00 USD for a 10-minute study. In the fourth study, participants were recruited using Centiment and were compensated \$3.00 USD for a 10-minute study. This is among the first studies of Asian subgroup differences in discrimination and solidarity, and thus, the analyses are exploratory. This study was not pre-registered. However, the data and analysis syntax are available on the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/9gfzt/?view_only=4b526a25843d4826b4e7a4ab10fffb1c).

Participants

The present study consisted of N = 2,039 self-identified Asian Americans ($M_{age} = 33.52$, $SD_{age} = 13.24$; 47.0% men, 51.1% women, and 1.9% non-binary; 30.6% first-generation, 60.0% second-generation, 5.0% third-generation, 2.6% fourth generation, and 1.2% fifth-generation immigrants; 35.2% in-person work, 30.1% remote work, and 34.3% hybrid work during the COVID-19 pandemic). The Asian subgroups included in our sample were 29.6% Chinese (n = 604), 7.3% Japanese (n = 148), 12.0% Korean (n = 244), 16.3% Indian (n = 333), 19.6% Filipino (n = 399), and 15.3% Vietnamese (n = 311)¹. Demographic characteristics by Asian subgroup

¹ Our Asian sample additionally included participants from other Asian subgroups (e.g., Taiwanese, Thai, Pakistani). However, we removed these participants from our final analyses due to their small sample size (n < 90).

are provided in the Supplement. We did not assess participants' socioeconomic status, which limits our ability to contextualize and interpret our research findings. However, we did collect participants' current field of work at the time of data collection, and n = 75 indicated that they were unemployed, looking for work, or did not work.

Measures

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics and correlations between the measures listed below. See Table 2 for descriptive statistics by ethnic subgroup.

Discrimination events since the COVID-19 pandemic

Perceived discrimination events since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic were measured using items from Pew Research Center's American Trends Panel (2021). Participants were asked to indicate how often the following five items have happened since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic: "*People acted as if they were uncomfortable around you*," "*Been subject to slurs or jokes*," "*Feared someone might threaten or physically attack you*," "*Someone made a remark that you should go back to your home country*," and "*Someone made a remark that you are to blame for the COVID-19 pandemic*." Items were measured on a 1(never) – 5(every day) but were converted to binary 0 (never) -1 (at least once), which were then averaged to create a composite score ($\alpha = 0.83$; Landrine, & Klonoff, 1996). Higher scores indicate greater reports of perceived discrimination experiences since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Linked Fate with Black Americans

Perceived linked fate with Black Americans was measured using four items adapted from Sanchez and Masuoka (2010): "*How much does Asian Americans 'doing well' depend on Black Americans also doing well in the categories listed below? In society in general; In jobs; In health and safety; In schools.*" Items were measured on a 1(not at all) – 7(very much) scale and were averaged to create a composite score ($\alpha = 0.96$). Higher scores indicate greater perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans.

Similarity with Black Americans

Perceived similarity with Black Americans was measured using two items (Craig & Richeson, 2012): "*I think I am very similar to many Black people*" and "*I have a lot in common with the average Black person*". Items were measured on a 1(strongly disagree) – 7(strongly agree) scale and were averaged to create a composite score ($\alpha = 0.91$). Higher scores indicate greater perceptions of similarity with Black Americans.

Covariates

In addition to demographic control variables (i.e., age, gender, generation, remote vs. inperson work), we included the following covariates in our regression models.

Feelings towards Black Americans. Previous research has found that general attitudes toward Black Americans predict perceptions of solidarity (Azevedo et al., 2022). To account for this relationship, we used feelings towards Black Americans as a potential covariate, which was measured with a single item: "*How do you feel toward Black Americans?*" on a 0 (very cold) – 100 (very warm) scale. Higher scores indicate warmer feelings toward Black Americans.

Internalization of the Model Minority Myth. Given previous research that suggests the internalization of the model minority myth significantly predicts solidarity perceptions (e.g., Le et al., 2024; Ouch & Moradi, 2022; Yi & Todd, 2021; Yoon et al., 2024), we included a shortened version of the Internalization of the Model Minority Myth (Yoo et al., 2010) as a covariate. We measured both the achievement orientation (MMM-AO) and unrestricted mobility subscales (MMM-UM). For all items, participants were told to answer each item in comparison to other racial minorities (e.g., Black Americans, Latine Americans, Native Americans). MMM-AO was

measured using three items: "Asians have stronger work ethics," "Asians are harder workers," and "Asians get better grades in school because they study harder". MMM-UM was measured using three items: "Asians are less likely to face barriers at work," "Asians are less likely to encounter racial prejudice and discrimination," and "Asians are less likely to experience racism in the United States". Items were measured on a 1(strongly disagree) – 7(strongly agree) scale and were averaged to create composite MMM-AO ($\alpha = 0.91$) and MMM-UM scores ($\alpha = 0.87$). Higher scores indicate greater internalization that Asian Americans have more achievement orientation and unrestricted mobility than other racial minority groups.

Treatment Condition. We included which treatment condition participants were assigned to in their respective studies as a covariate—control versus treatment condition—given that video prime may have affected participants' responses. In our sample, 50.0% of participants were assigned to the control condition (n = 1020), and 50.0% were assigned to the treatment condition (n = 1019). Across our studies, we did not find significant differences between the control versus treatment conditions on our main dependent variables (see Supplement).

Table 1

	M (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Discrimination Events	0.56 (0.38)						
2. Linked Fate with Black Americans	3.54 (1.75)	.164*					
3. Similarity with Black Americans	3.57 (1.46)	.127*	.420*				
4. Feelings towards Black Americans	69.5 (23.5)	.006	.349*	.471*			
5. MMM: Achievement Orientation	4.75 (1.49)	032	169*	184*	322*		
6. MMM: Unrestricted Mobility	3.35 (1.38)	155*	.052*	.033	.067*	.010	

Overall descriptive statistics and correlations for main measures and covariates

Note: MMM = Model Minority Myth, **p*<.05

Table 2

Descriptive statistics by participants' Asian ethnic subgroup

	Chinese	Japanese	Korean	Indian	Filipino	Vietnamese
	n = 604	<i>n</i> = 148	<i>n</i> = 244	<i>n</i> = 333	<i>n</i> = 399	<i>n</i> = 311
	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)	M(SD)
1. Discrimination Events Composite	0.61 (0.36)	0.48 (0.39)	0.61 (0.38)	0.44 (0.38)	0.53 (0.38)	0.60 (0.36)
People act uncomfortable	0.65 (0.48)	0.58 (0.50)	0.65 (0.48)	0.51 (0.50)	0.61 (0.49)	0.66 (0.48)
Subject to slurs or jokes	0.68 (0.47)	0.56 (0.50)	0.66 (0.47)	0.56 (0.50)	0.59 (0.49)	0.70 (0.46)
Fear of threat or attack	0.67 (0.47)	0.51 (0.50)	0.65 (0.48)	0.42 (0.50)	0.63 (0.48)	0.62 (0.49)
Back to home country	0.51 (0.50)	0.38 (0.49)	0.55 (0.50)	0.47 (0.50)	0.43 (0.50)	0.53 (0.50)
Blamed for pandemic	0.54 (0.50)	0.36 (0.48)	0.52 (0.50)	0.23 (0.42)	0.41 (0.49)	0.49 (0.50)
2. Linked Fate with Black Americans	3.24 (1.58)	3.54 (1.82)	3.54 (1.80)	3.91 (1.78)	3.78 (1.85)	3.45 (1.72)
3. Similarity with Black Americans	3.30 (1.35)	3.40 (1.45)	3.47 (1.53)	3.93 (1.50)	3.80 (1.45)	3.58 (1.48)
4. Feelings towards Black Americans	62.9 (22.4)	72.5 (23.3)	68.4 (24.2)	75.5 (22.2)	73.7 (21.2)	70.00 (23.3)
5. MMM: Achievement Orientation	4.84 (1.41)	4.75 (1.44)	4.56 (1.52)	4.97 (1.53)	4.75 (1.52)	4.50 (1.51)
6. MMM: Unrestricted Mobility	3.23 (1.37)	3.54 (1.38)	3.12 (1.36)	3.53 (1.42)	3.43 (1.40)	3.37 (1.31)

Note: MMM = Model Minority Myth

Results

Analysis Plan

To explore our results, we conducted a series of hierarchical linear regression models to test 1) the main effects of Asian subgroup on discrimination events and solidarity perceptions and 2) the interaction between Asian subgroup and discrimination events on solidarity perceptions. The Chinese subgroup served as the reference group given that previous research has suggested that Chinese Americans are rated as the most typical of the Asian American category (Goh & McCue, 2021; Lee & Ramakrishnan, 2020). We conducted these regression models without and with covariates and demographic control variables (e.g., age, gender, generation, work type) to account for alternative sociodemographic and methodological explanations. We additionally conducted pairwise comparisons to examine differences between the other Asian subgroups, correcting for multiple comparisons. In the main manuscript, we report the results for models with covariates and demographic control variables, as well as only significant pairwise comparisons. Any discrepancies between models without and with control variables are discussed in the Supplement.

Perceived Discrimination Events

When examining Asian subgroup differences for the discrimination events composite score, regression results (see Table 3, Model 1) and pairwise comparisons (see Supplement) indicate that Indian participants report the fewest discrimination events since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic compared to the rest of the participants, p's <.007. Additionally, Filipino participants reported fewer discrimination events since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic than Chinese participants, p = .008.

For the individual discrimination events items (see Table 3 and Supplement), Indian participants reported fewer experiences of people acting as if they were uncomfortable around them than the rest of the participants, p's $\leq .005$. Additionally, Indian participants reported fewer experiences of being subjected to slurs or jokes than the rest of the participants, p's $\leq .017$, except for Filipino participants, p = .157, and Filipino participants reported fewer experiences than Chinese and Vietnamese participants, p's $\leq .020$. Furthermore, Indian participants reported fewer experiences of fearing someone might threaten or physically attack them than the rest of the participants, p's $\leq .013$. Moreover, Filipino participants reported fewer experiences of someone remarking that they should go back to their home country than Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese participants, p's $\leq .024$. Finally, Indian participants reported fewer experiences of someone remarking that they were to blame for the COVID-19 pandemic than the rest of the participants, p's $\leq .001$; Filipino participants reported fewer experiences than Chinese and Korean participants, p's $\leq .017$; and Japanese participants reported fewer experiences of being blamed than Chinese participants, p = .026.

Overall, during the COVID-19 pandemic, Asian Americans from Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese subgroups reported more discrimination than Indian and Filipino participants. Although many alternative explanations exist for these patterns, East Asian origin subgroups reporting the most discrimination are consistent with reports on COVID-19 discrimination experiences (Yellow Horse, 2022) and suggests that Chinese phenotypic similarity may play a role in pandemic-related reports of discrimination.

Table 3

Regression results for Asian subgroup differences for perceived discrimination events since the COVID-19 pandemic (N = 2,039).

-	Composite	People act	Subject to slurs	Fear of threat or	Back to home	Blamed for
Predictor Variables —	Composite	uncomfortable	or jokes	attack	country	pandemic
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B (SE)	B (SE)	B (SE)	B (SE)	B (SE)	B (SE)
Intercept	0.79 (0.06)*	0.85 (0.08)*	0.88 (0.07)*	0.81 (0.08)*	0.73 (0.08)*	0.69 (0.08)*
Japanese	-0.05 (0.04)	0.04 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	-0.09 (0.05)	-0.08 (0.05)	-0.12 (0.03)*
Korean	-0.001 (0.03)	-0.001 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.04)
Indian	-0.17 (0.03)*	-0.13 (0.03)*	-0.12 (0.03)*	-0.23 (0.03)*	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.32 (0.03)*
Filipino	-0.06 (0.02)*	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.07 (0.03)*	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.07 (0.03)*	-0.12 (0.03)*
Vietnamese	-0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.05 (0.03)	0.02 (0.03)	-0.05 (0.03)
Feeling Thermometer	0.001 (0.00)*	0.001 (0.00)	0.001 (0.00)	0.000(0.00)	0.001 (0.00)*	0.001 (0.00)*
MMM – AO	0.002 (0.01)	0.003 (0.01)	0.04 (0.01)	-0.000 (0.01)	-0.003 (0.01)	0.004 (0.01)
MMM – UM	-0.04 (0.01)*	-0.05 (0.01)*	-0.04 (0.01)*	-0.05 (0.01)*	-0.04 (0.01)*	-0.02 (0.01)*
Age	-0.003 (0.00)*	-0.002 (0.00)*	-0.004 (0.00)*	-0.001 (0.00)	-0.003 (0.00)*	-0.003 (0.00)*
Gender: Woman	-0.004 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.05 (0.02)*	0.07 (0.02)*	-0.003 (0.02)	-0.04 (0.02)
Gender: Non-binary	-0.001 (0.06)	0.06 (0.08)	-0.001 (0.08)	-0.05 (0.08)	-0.04 (0.08)	0.04 (0.08)
Gender: other identity	-0.05 (0.37)	-0.55 (0.48)	0.41 (0.47)	0.60 (0.48)	-0.47 (0.49)	-0.24 (0.48)
Generation: 2 nd	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.07 (0.03)*	-0.03 (0.03)
Generation: 3 rd	-0.08 (0.04)	-0.09 (0.06)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.09 (0.05)	-0.11 (0.06)	-0.06 (0.06)
Generation: 4 th	-0.10 (0.06)	-0.19 (0.06)*	-0.21(0.08)*	-0.05 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.08)
Generation: 5 th	-0.13 (0.08)	-0.15 (0.10)	-0.16 (0.10)	-0.09 (0.10)	-0.13 (0.10)	-0.11 (0.10)
Work: Remote	-0.07 (0.02)*	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.08 (0.03)*	-0.05 (0.03)	-0.10 (0.03)*	-0.11 (0.03)*
Work: Hybrid	0.02 (0.02)	0.03 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	0.06 (0.03)*	0.01 (0.03)	-0.003 (0.03)
Treatment: Treatment	0.01 (0.02)	-0.000 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.04 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)
	· · ·		. ,		· · ·	. ,
R^2	0.063*	0.030*	0.043*	0.057*	0.034*	0.062*

Note: MMM – AO = Model Minority Myth: Achievement Orientation; MMM – UM = Model Minority Myth: Unrestricted Mobility; **p*<.05

Linked Fate and Similarity with Black Americans

When examining Asian subgroup differences for perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans, regression results (see Table 4, Model 7) and pairwise comparisons (see Supplement) show that Indian participants reported greater linked fate perceptions than Chinese and Vietnamese participants, $p \ s \le .014$. Filipino participants also reported greater linked fate perceptions than Chinese participants, p = .018.

For perceptions of similarity with Black Americans (see Table 4, Model 8 and Supplement), Indian participants reported greater perceptions of similarity than Chinese, Korean, and Japanese Americans, $p \cdot s \le .005$. Filipino participants also reported greater similarity perceptions than Chinese, Japanese, and Korean participants, $p \cdot s \le .048$. Vietnamese participants also reported greater similarity perceptions than Japanese participants, $p \cdot s \le .016$.

Overall, these analyses indicate that Asian American participants from Indian and Filipino subgroups tended to report the greatest linked fate and similarity with Black Americans. Although multiple confounds and alternative explanations persist, this pattern is consistent with our analysis of how shared experiences of colorism might impact perceptions of linked fate, wherein Asian ethnic subgroups with darker skin tones, on average, tended to report greater linked fate and similarity with Black Americans.

Table 4

Regression results with controls for discrimination event and the interaction between Asian subgroup and perceived discrimination on perceptions of linked fate and similarity with Black Americans (N = 2,039).

Pradictor Variables	Linked Fate with	Black Americans	Similarity with Black Americans		
Fledicion variables	Model 7 B (SE)	Model 8 B (SE)	Model 9 B (SE)	Model 10 B (SE)	
Intercept	1.80 (0.26)*	1.07 (0.28)*	1.79 (0.20)*	1.31 (0.22)*	
Japanese	0.08 (0.18)	-0.09 (0.27)	-0.29 (0.14)*	-0.19 (0.21)	
Korean	0.14 (0.12)	0.53 (0.23)*	-0.03 (0.10)	0.42 (0.18)*	
Indian	0.40 (0.11)*	0.53 (0.19)*	0.27 (0.09)*	0.38 (0.15)*	
Filipino	0.25 (0.11)*	0.18 (0.19)	0.18 (0.08)*	0.07 (0.15)	
Vietnamese	0.07 (0.11)	0.31 (0.22)	0.08 (0.09)	0.17 (0.17)	
Discrimination Events (DE)		0.90 (0.18)*		0.61 (0.14)*	
DE x Japanese		0.43 (0.38)		-0.12 (0.30)	
DE x Korean		$-0.63(0.32)^+$		-0.73 (0.26)*	
DE x Indian		0.05 (0.29)		0.005 (0.23)	
DE x Filipino		0.24 (0.27)		0.28 (0.22)	
DE x Vietnamese		-0.37 (0.31)		-0.14 (0.24)	
Feeling Thermometer	0.02 (0.00)*	0.02 (0.00)*	0.03 (0.00)*	0.03 (0.00)*	
MMM - AO	-0.10 (0.03)*	-0.10 (0.03)*	-0.08 (0.02)*	-0.08 (0.02)*	
MMM – UM	0.03 (0.03)	0.07 (0.03)*	-0.003(0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	
Age	0.01 (0.00)*	0.01 (0.00)*	0.01 (0.00)*	0.01 (0.00)*	
Gender: Woman	$0.21(0.08)^{*}$	$0.21(0.07)^{*}$	-0.20 (0.06)*	-0.19 (0.06)*	
Gender: Non-binary	1.03(0.28)*	1.03 (0.27)*	-0.43 (0.22)	-0.43 (0.22)	
Gender: other identity	-0.17 (1.63)	-0.12 (1.59)	-0.17 (1.28)	-0.15 (1.26)	
Generation: 2 nd	-0.04 (0.09)	-0.001 (0.08)	0.01 (0.07)	0.03 (0.07)	
Generation: 3 rd	-0.32 (0.19)	-0.24 (0.18)	-0.08 (0.15)	-0.04 (0.15)	
Generation: 4 th	-0.41 (0.26)	-0.31 (0.26)	-0.11 (0.20)	-0.07 (0.20)	
Generation: 5 th	-0.08 (0.34)	0.08 (0.34)	0.51 (0.27)	0.62 (0.27)*	
Work: Remote	-0.22 (0.09)*	-0.15 (0.09)	-0.15 (0.07)*	-0.10 (0.07)	
Work: Hybrid	-0.06 (0.09)	-0.08 (0.09)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.09 (0.07)	
Treatment: Treatment	0.11 (0.07)*	0.09 (0.07)	0.07 (0.06)	0.06 (0.06)	
R^2	0.142*	0.176*	0.236*	0.258*	

Note: MMM-AO = Model Minority Myth: Achievement Orientation; MMM-UM = Model Minority Myth: Unrestricted Mobility; *p < .05, $^+p < .10$

Asian Subgroup and Discrimination Events on Solidarity Perceptions

Correlational analysis showed that perceived discrimination events significantly and positively correlated with both perceptions of linked fate and similarity with Black Americans (see Table 1). We interpreted this as more frequent perceived discrimination events are associated with greater perceptions of linked fate and similarity with Black Americans, which is consistent with the stigma-based solidarity model (Craig & Richeson, 2012). We examined potential Asian subgroup differences in this relationship next.

We conducted separate moderation analyses using Asian subgroups (reference = Chinese) as moderators for perceived discrimination events and perceptions of linked fate or similarity with Black Americans. Perceived discrimination events significantly predicted perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans for Chinese participants (see Table 6, Model 10), B = 0.90, SE = 0.18, t = 5.04, p < .001. There were no significant interactions between discrimination events and Asian subgroup. However, a nonsignificant interaction between discrimination events and the Korean subgroup prompted additional scrutiny, B = -0.63, SE = -0.63, t = -1.94, p = .053.

We conducted simple slopes analyses and found that perceived discrimination events significantly and positively related to linked fate perceptions for Japanese, B = 1.34, SE = 0.34, t = 3.90, p < .001; Indian, B = 0.95, SE = 0.23, t = 4.06, p < .001; Filipino, B = 1.15, SE = 0.21, t = 5.47, p < .001; and Vietnamese participants, B = 0.54, SE = 0.25, t = 2.15, p = .030; but for Korean participants, discrimination events did not significantly predict linked fate perceptions, B = 0.28, SE = 0.27, t = 1.03 p = .300 (see Figure 1).

Figure 1

The interaction between perceived discrimination events since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic and Asian subgroups on linked fate with Black Americans. Higher numbers indicate greater perceived discrimination events and greater linked fate. Each panel and color represents an Asian subgroup. Each dot represents an individual response, and darker dots demonstrate frequency per response. The linear regression model represents the slope of perceived discrimination events on perceptions of linked fate, with the inclusion of control variables, and the shaded gray area surrounding the linear regression slope represents the 95% confidence interval.



Figure 2

The interaction between perceived discrimination events since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic and Asian subgroups on similarity with Black Americans. Higher numbers indicate greater perceived discrimination events and greater similarity. Each panel and color represents an Asian subgroup. Each dot represents an individual response, and darker dots demonstrate frequency per response. The linear regression model represents the slope of perceived discrimination events on perceptions of similarity with the inclusion of control variables, and the shaded gray area surrounding the linear regression slope represents the 95% confidence interval.



Additionally, perceived discrimination events significantly predict perceptions of similarity with Black Americans for Chinese participants (see Table 4, Model 11), B = 0.61, SE = 0.14, t = 4.33, p < .001. There was only a significant interaction between perceived discrimination events and the Korean subgroup, B = -0.73, SE = 0.26, t = -2.86, p = .004. Simple slopes analysis again showed that perceived discrimination events significantly and positively predicted similarity perceptions for Indian, B = 0.62, SE = 0.19, t = 3.34, p < .001; Filipino, B = 0.89, SE = 0.17, t = 5.37, p < .001; and Vietnamese participants, B = 0.47, SE = 0.20, t = 2.41, p = .020. The slope for Japanese participants was not significant, B = 0.49, SE = 0.27, t = 1.81, p = .070. As well, discrimination events did not significantly predict similarity perceptions for Korean participants, B = -0.12, SE = 0.21, t = -0.56, p = .580 (see Figure 2).

Overall, the results of our examination of how perceived discrimination relates to linked fate and solidarity finds some evidence that Asian Americans from Korean ethnic subgroups do not show the same pattern of associations between discrimination experiences and linked fate and similarity perceptions as other Asian ethnic subgroups. Though more research is needed, and alternative explanations are possible, these patterns are worth further empirical scrutiny and could potentially relate to group histories between these populations within the U.S.

General Discussion

The increase in discrimination experienced by Asian Americans during the COVID-19 pandemic was expected to lead to stronger perceptions of solidarity with other marginalized groups in the U.S., particularly Black Americans. However, it was unclear whether these experiences of discrimination were uniformly felt across the various ethnic subgroups within the Asian American community. Given the diversity of this community, we anticipated ethnic subgroup differences in both the experiences of discrimination and, as a result, perceptions of solidarity. Our study confirmed this expectation. While Indian and Filipino participants reported fewer instances of discrimination compared to participants from other Asian subgroups, they also expressed stronger perceptions of linked fate and similarity with Black Americans. Additionally, we found that greater experiences of discrimination since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic were associated with stronger perceptions of linked fate and similarity with Black Americans across all Asian subgroups, except for Korean Americans.

Interestingly, our findings suggest that Asian subgroups who experienced more discrimination do not necessarily have greater perceptions of solidarity with Black Americans contrary to what the stigma-based solidarity model would predict (Craig & Richeson, 2012; 2016; Cortland et al., 2017). Indeed, while Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese participants reported more discrimination experiences than Indian and Filipino participants, these Asian subgroups reported weaker perceptions of linked fate and similarity with Black Americans than Indian and Filipino participants. Thus, our findings indicate that perceptions of solidarity with Black Americans for Indian and Filipino participants may not be based on COVID-19related discrimination. Instead, our findings suggest that greater perceptions of solidarity with Black Americans may be based on experiences of discrimination based on skin tone, or colorism for these groups (Hunter, 2007). Future research should examine colorism's role in this process more directly to understand why intra-minority solidarity between Black, Indian, and Filipino Americans is greater than between Black Americans and Asian Americans from other subgroups. Additionally, future research could explore whether stronger perceptions of solidarity are reciprocated by Black Americans. Specifically, do Black Americans perceive greater solidarity with Indian and Filipino Americans compared to Asian Americans from other subgroups?

Our findings also show that perceived discrimination events do not predict perceptions of solidarity for Korean participants. In addition to assumptions that this may be the case, given that many consider the Asian American experience to be the same (Lu, 2024; Vinluan & Remedios, 2024), Korean Americans reported more hate incidents during the first year of the pandemic compared to other subgroups and were only second to Chinese Americans (Yellow Horse et al., 2022). Many potential causes of this pattern of results are likely, including sampling error, however, one notable context which requires additional empirical scrutiny is the history of cross-group relations between Korean and Black Americans. The events surrounding the 1992 civil unrest in Los Angeles put Korean and Black Americans in direct conflict, and it is possible that the seeds of this conflict continue to shape intergroup attitudes around linked fate between these communities (Kim, 2012).

Whatever the cause, these findings demonstrate the need to consider the histories of each Asian subgroup in the U.S. and how these histories impact discrimination and perceptions of solidarity. Researchers should attend to these unique histories during their research process (e.g., conceptualization of research question, survey design) in future studies and consider them as they interpret their results (Vinluan & Remedios, 2024).

Overall, these findings highlight the importance of considering the ethnic subgroups within the Asian American community in research. Psychological studies often overlook differences between these subgroups (Vinluan & Remedios, 2024), leading to the assumption that the experiences of more commonly studied Asian Americans—such as Chinese, Japanese, and Korean individuals—represent the entire community. However, our research shows that this assumption is incorrect. Experiences of discrimination and perceptions of solidarity vary across different Asian ethnic subgroups. Therefore, future research on Asian Americans should recognize that participants may interpret and respond to stimuli or survey questions differently based on their ethnic background, rather than assuming that all Asian participants will react in the same way.

Constraints on Generality

Despite our large sample of Asian Americans (N = 2,039) and our ability to examine differences between the six largest Asian subgroups in the U.S., our online samples were not nationally representative and did not fully capture the complexity of this racial category. For example, we decided to focus on the six largest Asian subgroups in the U.S. which only make up around 85% of the Asian American community (Budiman & Ruiz, 2021). There are still more than fourteen ethnic subgroups that comprise the remaining 15% of the Asian American community that were not included in our study. Furthermore, our survey was conducted in English, and therefore, non-English speakers are not represented in our sample who also make up a large part of the Asian American community. These sample characteristics limit our ability to make conclusions to the broader Asian American community. We also did not collect the socioeconomic status of our participants. Therefore, we do not know how the socioeconomic status distribution of our sample compares to the distribution for the U.S. population which further limits our ability to generalize to the overall Asian population.

Our findings are also contextualized in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, we asked participants to consider experiences of discrimination during the COVID-19 pandemic. Given that the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in many major disruptions for not only those living in the U.S. but around the world, this unique context could shape discrimination experiences for Asian subgroups in unique ways. Finally, we measured intra-minority solidarity using perceptions of linked fate and similarity with Black Americans, and as research attests, there are many intervening processes in between stated support and planned behavior (e.g., Brauer, 2023; Kawakami et al., 2019). Thus, future work that examines acts of solidarity is warranted.

Conclusions

Identifying predictors or methods to enhance intra-minority solidarity between Asian and Black Americans is crucial for addressing racial inequalities. When racial minority groups are divided, it hinders racial progress. Our research demonstrates that experiences of discrimination can underscore a shared disadvantaged identity in the U.S., fostering perceptions of linked fate and similarity with Black Americans. But we also show that this is not always true. We discovered differences among Asian ethnic subgroups in perceptions of intra-minority solidarity, which may be related to the unique histories of each Asian ethnic subgroup. Thus, our research underscores the significance of considering ethnic subgroup differences when examining the perceptions and experiences of Asian Americans, instead of viewing them as a homogenous, monolithic group.

References

- Armenta, B. E., Lee, R. M., Pituc, S. T., Jung, K.-R., Park, I. J. K., Soto, J. A., Kim, S. Y., & Schwartz, S. J. (2013). Where are you from? A validation of the Foreigner Objectification Scale and the psychological correlates of foreigner objectification among Asian Americans and Latinos. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 19*(2), 131–142. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031547
- Azevedo, F., Marques, T., & Micheli, L. (2022). In pursuit of racial equality: Identifying the determinants of support for the black lives matter movement with a systematic review and multiple meta-analyses. *Perspectives on Politics*, 20(4), 1305-1327.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592722001098

- Brauer, M. (2024). Stuck on intergroup attitudes: The need to shift gears to change intergroup behaviors. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 19(1), 280–294. https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916231185775
- Budiman, A. & Ruiz, N.G. (2021, April 19). *Key facts about Asian origin groups in the U.S.* Pew Research Center. <u>https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2021/04/29/key-facts-about-asian-origin-groups-in-the-u-s/</u>
- Cheryan, S., & Monin, B. (2005). Where are you really from?: Asian Americans and identity denial. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(5), 717–730. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.5.717</u>
- Chow, A.R., & Bates, J. (2020, June 12). As Da 5 Bloods Hits Netflix, Black Vietnam Veterans Recall the Real Injustices They Faced During and After the War. TIME Magazine. https://time.com/5852476/da-5-bloods-black-vietnam-veterans/

Choy, C. C. (2022). Asian American Histories of the United States (Vol. 7). Beacon Press.

- Cooper, S., & Leong, F. T. L. (2008). Introduction to the special issue on culture, race, and ethnicity in organizational consulting psychology. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60*(2), 133–138. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0736-9735.60.2.133</u>
- Cortland, C. I., Craig, M. A., Shapiro, J. R., Richeson, J. A., Neel, R., & Goldstein, N. J. (2017). Solidarity through shared disadvantage: Highlighting shared experiences of discrimination improves relations between stigmatized groups. *Journal of Personality* and Social Psychology, 113(4), 547–567. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000100</u>
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2012). Coalition or derogation? How perceived discrimination influences intraminority intergroup relations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *102*(4), 759-777. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026481</u>
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2016). Stigma-based solidarity: Understanding the psychological foundations of conflict and coalition among members of different stigmatized groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25(1), 21-27. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721415611252</u>
- Dawson, M. C. (1995). *Behind the mule: Race and class in African-American politics*. Princeton University Press.
- Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., & Johnson, S. L. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of Black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological science*, 17(5), 383-386. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01716.x</u>
- Lee, Eun Sook. 2005 The Political Awakening of Korean Americans In Koreans in the Windy City: 100 Years of Korean Americans in the Chicago Area. Pp. 337-350. Hyock Chun,

Kwang Chung Kim and Shin Kim, eds. New Haven, CT: East Rock Institute for the Centennial Publication Committee of Chicago

- Fujino, D. C. (2005). Heartbeat of struggle: The revolutionary life of Yuri Kochiyama. U of Minnesota Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., & Bachman, B. A. (1996). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The induction of a common ingroup identity. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20, 271–290. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(96)00019-3</u>
- Goh, J. X., & McCue, J. (2021). Perceived prototypicality of Asian subgroups in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 97, 104201. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2021.104201</u>
- Goh, J. X., Lei, R. F., & Zou, L. X. (2023). Positioning Asian Americans in social cognition. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 17(6), Article e12760. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12760
- Hswen, Y., Xu, X., Hing, A., Hawkins, J. B., Brownstein, J. S., & Gee, G. C. (2021). Association of "# covid19" versus "# chinesevirus" with anti-Asian sentiments on Twitter: March 9–23, 2020. *American Journal of Public Health*, *111*(5), 956-964. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2021.306154

Huang, J.T., Krupenkin, M., Rothschild, D. *et al.* The cost of anti-Asian racism during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Human Behavior*, 7, 682–695 (2023).

- Hunter, M. (2007). The persistent problem of colorism: Skin tone, status, and inequality. Sociology compass, 1(1), 237-254. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00006.x</u>
- Izumi, M. (2005). PROHIBITING" AMERICAN CONCENTRATION CAMPS". Pacific Historical Review, 74(2), 165-194. <u>https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2005.74.2.165</u>
- Khanna, N. (Ed.). (2020). Whiter: Asian American women on skin color and colorism. NYU Press.
- Kim, C. J. (1999). The racial triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics & society*, *27*(1), 105-138. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329299027001005</u>
- Kim, R. M. (2012). Violence and trauma as constitutive elements in Korean American racial identity formation: the 1992 LA riots/insurrection/saigu. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 35(11), 1999-2018. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.602090</u>
- Kraus, M. W., & Vinluan, A. C. (2023). Reminders of Japanese redress increase Asian American support for Black reparations. *Communications Psychology*, 1(1), 33. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s44271-023-00033-w</u>
- Kawakami, K., Karmali, F., & Vaccarino, E. (2019). Confronting intergroup bias: Predicted and actual responses to racism and sexism. In *Confronting prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 3-28). Academic Press. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-814715-3.00001-1</u>
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1996). The Schedule of Racist Events: A Measure of Racial
 Discrimination and a Study of Its Negative Physical and Mental Health Consequences.
 Journal of Black Psychology, 22(2), 144-168.

https://doi.org/10.1177/00957984960222002

- Le, T. P., Lee, E. A., Bansal, P., & Shin, R. Q. (2024). Internalized model minority myth, distress, and anti-Black attitudes among low-income Asian Americans. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 15(2), 107-117. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/aap0000332</u>
- Lee, J., & Ramakrishnan, K. (2020). Who counts as Asian. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *43*(10), 1733–1756. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2019.1671600</u>
- Lu, J. G. (2024). "Asian" Is a Problematic Category in Research and Practice: Insights From the Bamboo Ceiling. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 0(0). <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214241283406</u>
- Ma, D. S., Koltai, K., McManus, R. M., Bernhardt, A., Correll, J., & Wittenbrink, B. (2018).
 Race signaling features: Identifying markers of racial prototypicality among Asians,
 Blacks, Latinos, and Whites. *Social Cognition*, *36*(6), 603-625.
 https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2018.36.6.603
- Maddox, K. B. (2004). Perspectives on racial phenotypicality bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(4), 383-401. <u>https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0804_4</u>
- Maddox, K. B., & Gray, S. A. (2002). Cognitive representations of Black Americans:
 Reexploring the role of skin tone. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(2), 250-259. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202282010</u>
- Markus, H. R. (2008). Pride, prejudice, and ambivalence: Toward a unified theory of race and ethnicity. *American Psychologist*, 63(8), 651–670. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-</u> 066X.63.8.651
- Ouch, S., & Moradi, B. (2022). Asian American people's intragroup and intergroup collective action: Identifying key correlates. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 69(4), 430–442. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000606</u>

Pew Research Center (2021). American Trends Panel Wave 87. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-

content/uploads/2021/04/2021AsianAmericans module topline.pdf

- Pew Research Center. (2012, June 19). *The Rise of Asian Americans*. https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2012/06/19/the-rise-of-asian-americans/
- Quiros, L., & Dawson, B. A. (2013). The Color Paradigm: The Impact of Colorism on the Racial Identity and Identification of Latinas. Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 23(3), 287–297. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2012.740342</u>
- Ryabov, I. (2016). Colorism and educational outcomes of Asian Americans: evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19, 303-324. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-015-9327-5</u>
- Sanchez, G. R., & Masuoka, N. (2010). Brown-utility heuristic? The presence and contributing factors of Latino linked fate. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 32(4), 519-531. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986310383129</u>
- Sissoko, D. R. G., Hussain, S., Arevalo, K., Rodriguez, W., Soni, S., Tejeda, E., & Nadal, K. L. (2024). Colorist Microaggressions and Brown Asian Americans: Implications for Behavioral Science. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 0(0). <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642241231318</u>
- U.S. Office of Management and Budget (1997). *Revisions to the Standards for the Classification* of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity. Retrieved from https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/omb/fedreg_1997standards

- Vinluan, A. C., & Remedios, J. D. (2024). Asian American Representation Within Psychology: Who Is Included? Who Is Left Out?. *Collabra: Psychology*, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.117903
- Vinluan, A.C. & Kraus, M.W. (2025). Framing remote work as anti-racist promotes solidarity among Asian Americans. PsyArXiv. <u>https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/2qj9u_v2</u>
- Wilkins, C. L., Kaiser, C. R., & Rieck, H. (2010). Detecting racial identification: The role of phenotypic prototypicality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(6), 1029-1034. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.017</u>
- Wills, M. (2020, February 4). The Jim Crow Army in the Philippine-American War. JSTOR Daily. <u>https://daily.jstor.org/the-jim-crow-army-in-the-philippine-american-war/</u>
- Yellow Horse, A. J., Jeung, R., & Matriano, R. (2022). Stop AAPI hate national report. <u>https://stopaapihate.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/22-SAH-NationalReport-3.1.22-</u> v9.pdf
- Yi, J., & Todd, N. R. (2021). Internalized model minority myth among Asian Americans: Links to anti-Black attitudes and opposition to affirmative action. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 27(4), 569–578. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000448</u>
- Yoon, E., Chang, Y. J., Cheng, Y., & Brown, E. M. (2024). Ideological and Experiential Predictors of Asian Americans' Attitudes Towards Black Americans. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 52(3), 381-409. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/00110000231216111</u>
- Zou, L. X., & Cheryan, S. (2017). Two axes of subordination: A new model of racial position. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 112(5), 696–717. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000080

Supplement

Table S1

Demographic characteristics for the overall sample and by Asian subgroup

Variable	Overall $N = 2,309$	Chinese $n = 604$	Indian $n = 333$	Filipino $n = 399$	Japanese $n = 148$	Korean $n = 244$	Vietnamese $n = 311$
Age M(SD)	33.52 (13.24)	32.65 (12.89)	32.90 (13.92)	34.99 (13.45)	44.73 (16.75)	33.71 (10.63)	28.58 (8.99)
Gender							
Men	959	276	175	176	72	112	148
Women	1041	317	153	212	71	129	159
Non-binary	39	11	4	11	5	3	4
Other identity	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Generation							
1 st generation	628	175	140	142	18	98	55
2 nd generation	1224	397	181	231	37	130	248
3 rd generation	101	23	6	17	42	8	5
4 th generation	54	3	4	5	39	2	1
5 th generation	24	4	0	4	9	6	1
Work							
In-person	717	226	115	139	59	83	95
Remote	614	159	101	132	49	73	100
Hybrid	700	217	115	128	37	88	115
Treatment Conditio	n						
Control	1020	303	183	192	80	104	158
Treatment	1019	301	150	207	68	140	153
Study Number							
Study 1	622	216	82	112	37	83	92
Study 2	387	111	59	71	27	49	70
Study 3	459	99	104	114	59	47	36
Study 4	571	178	88	102	25	65	113

Additional Analyses

T-tests comparing treatment vs. control condition on measures and covariates

We conducted a series of independent samples t-tests to examine whether participants' responses on key measures and covariates significantly differed between the treatment and control conditions. In the treatment condition, participants watched a video that proposed a policy to address discrimination experiences faced by Asian Americans during the pandemic. In the control condition, participants watched a video reminding participants of the discrimination experiences faced by Asian Americans during the pandemic. We did not find a significant difference in participants' responses between conditions for key measures and covariates – see Table S2.

Table S2

T-test results comparing control versus treatment condition on discrimination events, linked fate with Black Americans, similarity with Black Americans, feelings towards Black Americans, model minority myth: achievement orientation subscale, and model minority myth: unrestricted mobility subscale.

Measure	Control Condition <i>M(SD)</i>	Treatment Condition <i>M(SD)</i>	t-test
Discrimination Events	0.55 (0.38)	0.57 (0.38)	t = -1.73, p = .085, d = -0.068
Linked Fate with Black Americans	3.52 (1.73)	3.62 (1.76)	t = -1.45, p = .146, d = -0.058
Similarity with Black Americans	3.59 (1.44)	3.62 (1.47)	t = -0.59, p = .556, d = -0.023
Feelings toward Black Americans	70.47(22.78)	69.45 (23.13)	t = 1.12, p = .262, d = 0.045
MMM: Achievement Orientation	4.69 (1.44)	4.76 (1.51)	t = -1.15, p = .250, d = -0.046
MMM: Unrestricted Mobility	3.38 (1.40)	3.37 (1.40)	t = 0.28, p = .779, d = 0.011
Perceived Discrimination Events: Regression Results and Pairwise Comparisons

We conducted a series of hierarchical linear regression models to test the main effects of Asian subgroup on discrimination events. The Chinese subgroup served as the reference group given that previous research has suggested that Chinese Americans are rated as the most typical of the Asian American category (Goh & McCue, 2021; Lee & Ramakrishnan, 2020). We conducted these regression models without and with covariates and demographic control variables (e.g., age, gender, generation, work type). We additionally conducted pairwise comparisons to examine differences between the other Asian subgroups, correcting for multiple comparisons. We report any discrepancies in results in regression models without and with covariates and demographic control variables

Composite Score

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly greater perceived discrimination events than Japanese, Indian, and Filipino participants, but not Korean and Vietnamese participants – see Table S3. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Chinese and Japanese participants is no longer significant.

Pairwise comparisons also show that Indian participants reported significantly fewer discrimination events than Filipino, Korean, and Vietnamese participants – see Table S4. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Indian and Japanese participants becomes significant. Additionally, Filipino participants reported significantly fewer discrimination events than Korean and Vietnamese participants – however, these comparisons are no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model. Finally, Japanese participants reported significantly fewer discrimination events than Korean and Vietnamese participants - however, these comparisons are no longer significant when controls are included

in the regression model.

Table S3

Regression table for Asian ethnic subgroup predicting perceived discrimination events composite score.

Duadiatan	Mode	1: Without Contr	rols	Moo	Model: With Controls		
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	
Intercept	0.61	0.58, 0.64	< 0.001	0.79	0.68, 0.91	<.001	
Japanese	-0.13	-0.20, -0.06	< 0.001	-0.05	-0.13, 0.03	.227	
Korean	-0.001	-0.06, 0.05	.979	-0.01	-0.06, 0.05	.763	
Indian	-0.17	-0.22, -0.12	< 0.001	-0.17	-0.22, -0.12	<.001	
Filipino	-0.07	-0.12, -0.03	0.002	-0.06	-0.11, -0.02	.008	
Vietnamese	-0.01	-0.06, 0.04	.742	-0.01	-0.06, 0.04	.643	
Feeling Thermometer				0.0001	0.00, 0.00	.052	
MMM – AO				0.002	-0.01, 0.01	.800	
MMM – UM				-0.04	-0.05, -0.03	<.001	
Age				-0.003	-0.00, -0.00	<.001	
Gender: Woman				-0.004	-0.04, 0.03	.829	
Gender: Non-binary				-0.001	-0.13, 0.12	.987	
Gender: other identity				-0.05	-0.77, 0.67	.890	
Generation: 2 nd				-0.03	-0.07, 0.01	.089	
Generation: 3 rd				-0.08	-0.17, 0.00	.052	
Generation: 4 th				-0.10	-0.21, 0.02	.105	
Generation: 5 th				-0.13	-0.28, 0.03	.095	
Work: Remote				-0.07	-0.11, -0.03	<.001	
Work: Hybrid				0.02	-0.01, 0.06	.219	
Treatment: Treatment				0.01	-0.02, 0.04	.528	
R^2	0.027			0.063			
*Nota: CI - Confidence I	ntorvol						

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Contract	W	ithout Controls			With Controls	
Contrast	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Chinese – Indian	0.17	0.12, 0.22	<.001	0.17	0.12, 0.22	<.001
Chinese – Filipino	0.07	0.03, 0.12	.002	0.07	0.02, 0.11	.008
Chinese – Japanese	0.13	0.06, 0.20	<.001	0.05	-0.03, 0.13	.227
Chinese – Korean	0.001	-0.05, 0.06	.979	0.01	-0.05, 0.06	.763
Chinese – Vietnamese	0.01	-0.04, 0.06	.742	0.01	-0.04, 0.06	.643
Indian – Filipino	-0.09	-0.15, -0.04	.001	-0.10	-0.16, -0.05	<.001
Indian – Japanese	-0.04	-0.11, 0.04	.312	-0.11	-0.20, -0.03	.007
Indian – Korean	-0.17	-0.23, -0.11	<.001	-0.16	-0.22, -0.10	<.001
Indian – Vietnamese	-0.16	-0.22, -0.10	<.001	-0.16	-0.21, -0.10	<.001
Filipino – Japanese	0.06	-0.01, 0.13	.117	-0.01	-0.10, 0.07	.725
Filipino – Korean	-0.07	-0.13, -0.01	.016	-0.06	-0.11, 0.00	.066
Filipino – Vietnamese	-0.07	-0.12, -0.01	.021	-0.05	-0.11, 0.00	.067
Japanese – Korean	-0.13	-0.21, -0.05	.001	-0.04	-0.13, 0.05	.359
Japanese – Vietnamese	-0.12	-0.20, -0.05	.001	-0.04	-0.12, 0.05	.398
Korean – Vietnamese	0.01	-0.05, 0.07	.806	0.004	-0.06, 0.07	.911

Pairwise comparisons results between Asian ethnic subgroups predicting perceived discrimination events composite score.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

People acted as if they were uncomfortable around you

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly greater experiences of people acting as if they were comfortable around them than Indian participants– see Table S5.

Pairwise comparisons also show that Indian participants reported significantly fewer experiences of people acting as if they were comfortable around them than Filipino, Korean and Vietnamese participants – see Table S6. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Indian and Japanese participants becomes significant.

Duadiatana	W	ithout Controls			With Controls			
Predictors	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value		
Intercept	0.65	0.61, 0.69	<.001	0.85	0.70, 1.00	<.001		
Japanese	-0.07	-0.16, 0.02	.110	0.04	-0.07, 0.14	.507		
Korean	0.005	-0.07, 0.08	.895	-0.001	-0.07, 0.07	.973		
Indian	-0.13	-0.20, -0.07	<.001	-0.13	-0.19, -0.06	<.001		
Filipino	-0.04	-0.10, 0.02	.228	-0.03	-0.09, 0.04	.417		
Vietnamese	0.01	-0.06, 0.08	.739	0.01	-0.06, 0.08	.755		
Feeling Thermometer				0.001	-0.00, 0.00	.298		
MMM – AO				0.003	-0.01, 0.02	.676		
MMM – UM				-0.05	-0.06, -0.03	<.001		
Age				-0.002	-0.00, -0.00	.009		
Gender: Woman				0.01	-0.04, 0.05	.733		
Gender: Non-binary				0.06	-0.11, 0.22	.499		
Gender: other identity				-0.55	-1.49, 0.39	.253		
Generation: 2 nd				-0.04	-0.09, 0.01	.139		
Generation: 3 rd				-0.09	-0.20, 0.02	.096		
Generation: 4 th				-0.19	-0.34, -0.04	.015		
Generation: 5 th				-0.15	-0.36, 0.05	.129		
Work: Remote				-0.03	-0.08, 0.02	.270		
Work: Hybrid				0.02	-0.03, 0.07	.380		
Treatment: Treatment				-0.000	-0.04, 0.04	.991		
R^2	0.009			0.030				
*Note: CI = Confidence I	Interval							

Regression table for Asian ethnic subgroup predicting perceived discrimination event: People acted as if they were uncomfortable around you.

Control	W	Vithout Controls	5		With Controls			
Contrast	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value		
Chinese – Indian	0.12	0.07, 0.20	<.001	0.13	0.06, 0.19	<.001		
Chinese – Filipino	0.04	-0.02, 0.10	.228	0.03	-0.04, 0.09	.417		
Chinese – Japanese	0.07	-0.02, 0.16	.110	-0.04	-0.14, 0.07	.507		
Chinese – Korean	-0.005	-0.08, 0.07	.895	0.001	-0.07, 0.07	.973		
Chinese – Vietnamese	-0.01	-0.08, 0.06	.739	-0.01	-0.08, 0.06	.755		
Indian – Filipino	-0.10	-0.17, -0.03	.007	-0.10	-0.17, -0.03	.005		
Indian – Japanese	-0.06	-0.16, 0.03	.189	-0.16	-0.27, -0.05	.004		
Indian – Korean	-0.14	-0.22, -0.06	<.001	-0.13	-0.21, -0.04	.002		
Indian – Vietnamese	-0.15	-0.22, -0.07	<.001	-0.14	-0.21, -0.06	<.001		
Filipino – Japanese	0.03	-0.06, 0.13	.473	-0.06	-0.17, 0.05	.261		
Filipino – Korean	-0.04	-0.12, 0.03	.280	-0.02	-0.10, 0.05	.536		
Filipino – Vietnamese	-0.05	-0.12, 0.02	.182	-0.04	-0.11, 0.04	.328		
Japanese – Korean	-0.08	-0.18, 0.02	.133	0.04	-0.08 0.15	.528		
Japanese – Vietnamese	-0.08	-0.18, 0.01	.089	0.02	-0.09, 0.14	.667		
Korean – Vietnamese	-0.01	-0.09, 0.07	.877	-0.01	-0.09, 0.07	.776		

Pairwise comparison results between Asian ethnic subgroups predicting perceived discrimination event: People acted as if they were uncomfortable around you.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Been subject to slurs or jokes

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly greater experiences of being subject to slurs or jokes than Japanese, Indian, and Filipino participants– see Table S7. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Chinese and Japanese participants is no longer significant.

Pairwise comparisons also show that Indian participants reported significantly fewer experiences of being subject to slurs or jokes than Korean and Vietnamese participants – see Table S8. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Indian and Japanese participants becomes significant. Filipino participants also reported significantly fewer experiences of being subject to slurs or jokes than Vietnamese participants. Finally, Japanese participants reported significantly fewer experiences of being subject to slurs or jokes than Vietnamese participants - however, this comparison is no longer significant when controls

are included in the regression model.

Table S7

Regression table for Asian ethnic subgroup predicting perceived discrimination event: Been subject to slurs or jokes

Duadiatan	W	ithout Controls		With Controls			
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	
Intercept	0.68	0.64, 0.71	<.001	0.88	0.74, 1.03	<.001	
Japanese	-0.12	-0.20, -0.03	.009	0.01	-0.09, 0.11	.836	
Korean	-0.01	-0.08, 0.06	.728	-0.02	-0.09, 0.05	.625	
Indian	-0.12	-0.18, -0.06	<.001	-0.12	-0.19, -0.06	<.001	
Filipino	-0.09	-0.15, -0.02	.006	-0.07	-0.13, -0.01	.020	
Vietnamese	0.03	-0.04, 0.09	.428	0.01	-0.05, 0.08	.665	
Feeling Thermometer				0.001	0.00, 0.00	.061	
MMM – AO				0.004	-0.01, 0.02	.637	
MMM – UM				-0.04	-0.05, -0.02	<.001	
Age				-0.004	-0.01, -0.00	<.001	
Gender: Woman				-0.05	-0.09, -0.00	.033	
Gender: Non-binary				-0.001	-0.16, 0.16	.990	
Gender: other identity				0.41	-0.52, 1.33	.392	
Generation: 2 nd				-0.02	-0.07, 0.03	.376	
Generation: 3 rd				-0.06	-0.16, 0.05	.287	
Generation: 4 th				-0.21	-0.33, -0.07	.004	
Generation: 5 th				-0.16	-0.36, 0.03	.100	
Work: Remote				-0.08	-0.13, -0.03	.003	
Work: Hybrid				0.04	-0.01, 0.09	.105	
Treatment: Treatment				0.02	-0.02, 0.06	.330	
R^2	0.011			0.043			
*Nota: CI = Confidence I	ntorvol						

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Contract	V	Vithout Controls	5		With Controls	
Contrast	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Chinese – Indian	0.12	0.06, 0.18	<.001	0.12	0.06, 0.19	<.001
Chinese – Filipino	0.09	0.02, 0.15	.006	0.07	0.01, 0.13	.021
Chinese – Japanese	0.12	0.03, 0.20	.009	-0.01	-0.11, 0.09	.836
Chinese – Korean	0.01	-0.06, 0.08	.728	0.02	-0.05, 0.09	.625
Chinese – Vietnamese	-0.03	-0.09, 0.04	.427	-0.01	-0.08, 0.05	.665
Indian – Filipino	-0.03	-0.10, 0.04	.336	-0.05	-0.12, 0.02	.157
Indian – Japanese	-0.004	-0.10, 0.09	.926	-0.13	-0.24, -0.02	.017
Indian – Korean	-0.11	-0.19, -0.03	.008	-0.10	-0.18, -0.03	.010
Indian – Vietnamese	-0.15	-0.22, -0.07	<.001	-0.14	-0.21, -0.06	<.001
Filipino – Japanese	0.03	-0.06, 0.12	.520	-0.08	-0.19, 0.02	.120
Filipino – Korean	-0.07	-0.15, 0.00	.063	-0.06	-0.13, 0.02	.159
Filipino – Vietnamese	-0.11	-0.18, -0.04	.002	-0.09	-0.16, -0.02	.017
Japanese – Korean	-0.10	-0.20, -0.00	.041	0.03	-0.08, 0.14	.617
Japanese – Vietnamese	-0.14	-0.24, -0.05	.003	-0.004	-0.11, 0.11	.949
Korean – Vietnamese	-0.04	-0.12, 0.04	.338	-0.03	-0.11, 0.05	.433

Pairwise comparisons results between Asian ethnic subgroups predicting perceived discrimination event: Been subject to slurs or jokes.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Feared someone might threaten or physically attack you

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly greater experiences of fearing someone might threaten or physically attack them than Japanese and Indian participants – see Table S9. When controls are added in the regression model, the comparison between Chinese and Japanese participants is no longer significant.

Pairwise comparisons also show that Indian participants reported significantly fewer experiences of fearing someone might threaten or physically attack them than Filipino, Korean, and Vietnamese participants – see Table S10. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Indian and Japanese participants also becomes significant. Finally, Japanese participants reported significantly fewer experiences of fearing someone might threaten or physically attack them than Filipino, Korean, and Vietnamese participants – however, these comparisons are no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model.

Predictor -	Without Controls			With Controls			
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	
Intercept	0.67	0.63, 0.71	<.001	0.81	0.66, 0.96	<.001	
Japanese	-0.16	-0.25, -0.08	<.001	-0.10	-0.20, 0.01	.077	
Korean	-0.02	-0.09, 0.05	.617	-0.02	-0.09, 0.05	.530	
Indian	-0.25	-0.31, -0.18	<.001	-0.23	-0.30, -0.17	<.001	
Filipino	-0.04	-0.10, 0.02	.164	-0.03	-0.09, 0.03	.382	
Vietnamese	-0.05	-0.12, 0.01	.111	-0.05	-0.12, 0.02	.148	
Feeling Thermometer				0.000	-0.00, 0.00	.702	
MMM – AO				0.000	-0.02, 0.02	.964	
MMM – UM				-0.05	-0.06, -0.03	<.001	
Age				0.001	-0.00, 0.00	.440	
Gender: Woman				0.07	0.02, 0.11	.003	
Gender: Non-binary				-0.05	-0.21, 0.11	.513	
Gender: other identity				0.60	-0.34, 1.54	.211	
Generation: 2 nd				-0.01	-0.06, 0.04	.686	
Generation: 3 rd				-0.09	-0.20, 0.02	.105	
Generation: 4 th				-0.05	-0.20, 0.10	.487	
Generation: 5 th				-0.09	-0.29, 0.10	.350	
Work: Remote				-0.04	-0.10, 0.01	.102	
Work: Hybrid				0.06	0.01, 0.11	.029	
Treatment: Treatment				-0.01	-0.05, 0.03	.599	
R^2	0.029			0.057			

Regression table for Asian ethnic subgroup predicting perceived discrimination event: Feared someone might threaten or physically attack you.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Control	W	Vithout Controls	5		With Controls	
Contrast	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Chinese – Indian	0.25	0.18, 0.31	<.001	0.23	0.17, 0.30	<.001
Chinese – Filipino	0.04	-0.02, 0.10	.164	0.03	-0.03, 0.09	.382
Chinese – Japanese	0.16	0.08, 0.25	<.001	0.09	-0.01, 0.20	.077
Chinese – Korean	0.02	-0.05, 0.09	.617	0.02	-0.05, 0.09	.530
Chinese – Vietnamese	0.05	-0.01, 0.12	.111	0.05	-0.02, 0.12	.148
Indian – Filipino	-0.20	-0.27, -0.13	<.001	-0.21	-0.28, -0.14	<.001
Indian – Japanese	-0.08	-0.18, 0.01	.087	-0.14	-0.25, -0.03	.013
Indian – Korean	-0.23	-0.31, -0.15	<.001	-0.21	-0.29, -0.13	<.001
Indian – Vietnamese	-0.19	-0.27, -0.12	<.001	-0.18	-0.26, -0.11	<.001
Filipino – Japanese	0.12	0.03, 0.21	.011	0.07	-0.04, 0.17	.218
Filipino – Korean	-0.03	-0.10, 0.05	.523	-0.004	-0.08, 0.07	.911
Filipino – Vietnamese	0.01	-0.06, 0.08	.775	0.02	-0.05, 0.09	.558
Japanese – Korean	-0.14	-0.24, -0.05	.004	-0.07	-0.18, 0.04	.220
Japanese – Vietnamese	-0.11	-0.20, -0.01	.024	-0.04	-0.16, 0.07	.432
Korean – Vietnamese	0.04	-0.05, 0.12	.390	0.03	-0.06, 0.11	.532

Pairwise comparisons results between Asian ethnic subgroups predicting perceived discrimination event: Feared someone might threaten or physically attack you.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Someone made a remark that you should go back to your home country

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly greater experiences of someone remarking that they should go back to their home country than Japanese and Filipino participants – see Table S11. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Chinese and Japanese participants is no longer significant.

Pairwise comparisons also show that Filipino participants reported significantly fewer experiences of someone remarking that they should go back to their home country than Korean and Vietnamese participants – see Table S12. Finally, Japanese participants reported significantly fewer experiences of someone remarking that they should go back to their home country than Korean and Vietnamese participants - however, the comparison between Japanese and Vietnamese participants is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model.

Duadiatan	W	ithout Controls			With Controls			
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value		
Intercept	0.51	0.47, 0.55	<.001	0.73	0.58, 0.88	<.001		
Japanese	-0.13	-0.22, -0.04	.005	-0.08	-0.19, 0.03	.145		
Korean	0.04	-0.03, 0.12	.252	0.03	-0.05, 0.10	.491		
Indian	-0.03	-0.10, 0.03	.334	-0.04	-0.10, 0.03	.298		
Filipino	-0.08	-0.14, -0.01	.016	-0.07	-0.14, -0.01	.024		
Vietnamese	0.02	-0.05, 0.09	.566	0.02	-0.05, 0.09	.605		
Feeling Thermometer				0.001	0.00, 0.00	.035		
MMM – AO				-0.003	-0.02, 0.01	.741		
MMM – UM				-0.04	-0.06, -0.03	<.001		
Age				-0.003	-0.00, -0.00	.005		
Gender: Woman				-0.003	-0.05, 0.04	.895		
Gender: Non-binary				-0.04	-0.21, 0.12	.621		
Gender: other identity				-0.47	-1.44, -0.50	.344		
Generation: 2 nd				-0.07	-0.12, -0.01	.012		
Generation: 3 rd				-0.11	-0.22, 0.00	.053		
Generation: 4 th				-0.01	-0.16, 0.15	.931		
Generation: 5 th				-0.13	-0.33, 0.08	.227		
Work: Remote				-0.10	-0.15, -0.05	<.001		
Work: Hybrid				0.01	-0.05, 0.06	.850		
Treatment: Treatment				0.04	-0.01, 0.08	.105		
R^2	0.007			0.034				
*Note: CI = Confidence I	Note: CI = Confidence Interval							

Regression table for Asian ethnic subgroup predicting perceived discrimination events: Someone made a remark that you should go back to your home country.

Contract	W	Vithout Controls	5	,	With Controls	
Contrast	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Chinese – Indian	0.03	-0.03, 0.10	.334	0.04	-0.03, 0.10	.298
Chinese – Filipino	0.08	0.01, 0.14	.016	0.07	0.01, 0.14	.024
Chinese – Japanese	0.13	0.04, 0.22	.005	0.08	-0.03, 0.19	.145
Chinese – Korean	-0.04	-0.12, 0.03	.252	-0.03	-0.10, 0.05	.491
Chinese – Vietnamese	-0.02	-0.09, 0.05	.566	-0.02	-0.09, 0.05	.605
Indian – Filipino	0.04	-0.03, 0.12	.231	0.04	-0.04, 0.11	.319
Indian – Japanese	0.10	-0.00, 0.19	.052	0.04	-0.07, 0.16	.453
Indian – Korean	-0.08	-0.16, 0.01	.070	-0.06	-0.15, 0.02	.142
Indian – Vietnamese	-0.05	-0.13, 0.02	.179	-0.05	-0.13, 0.02	.172
Filipino – Japanese	0.05	-0.04, 0.15	.282	0.01	-0.10, 0.12	.904
Filipino – Korean	-0.12	-0.20, -0.04	.003	-0.10	-0.18, -0.02	.014
Filipino – Vietnamese	-0.10	-0.17, -0.02	.010	-0.09	-0.17, -0.02	.016
Japanese – Korean	-0.17	-0.27, -0.07	.001	-0.11	-0.22, 0.01	.076
Japanese – Vietnamese	-0.15	-0.25, -0.05	.003	-0.10	-0.21, 0.02	.098
Korean – Vietnamese	0.02	-0.06, 0.11	.584	0.01	-0.08, 0.09	.853

Pairwise comparisons results between Asian ethnic subgroups predicting perceived discrimination events: Someone made a remark that you should go back to your home country.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Someone made a remark that you are to blame for the COVID-19 pandemic

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly greater experiences of someone remarking that they are to blame for the COVID-19 pandemic than Japanese, Indian, and Filipino participants – see Table S13.

Pairwise comparisons also show that Indian participants reported significantly fewer experiences of someone remarking that they are to blame for the COVID-19 pandemic than Japanese, Korean, Filipino, and Vietnamese participants – see Table S14. Additionally, Filipino participants reported significantly fewer experiences of someone remarking that they are to blame for the COVID-19 pandemic than Korean and Vietnamese participants – however, the comparison between Filipino and Vietnamese participants is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model. Finally, Japanese participants reported significantly fewer experiences of someone remarking that they are to blame for the COVID-19 pandemic than Korean and Vietnamese participants - however, these comparisons are no longer significant when

controls are included in the regression model.

Table S13

Regression table for Asian ethnic subgroup predicting perceived discrimination events: Someone made a remark that you are to blame for the COVID-19 pandemic.

Without Controls			With Controls			
Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	
0.54	0.50, 0.58	<.001	0.69	0.55, 0.84	<.001	
-0.17	-0.26, -0.09	<.001	-0.12	-0.22, -0.01	.026	
-0.02	-0.09, 0.05	.570	-0.03	-0.10, 0.05	.473	
-0.31	-0.37, -0.24	<.001	-0.32	-0.38, -0.25	<.001	
-0.13	-0.19, -0.06	<.001	-0.12	-0.18, -0.06	<.001	
-0.05	-0.11, 0.02	.166	-0.05	-0.12, 0.01	.109	
			0.001	0.00, 0.00	.044	
			0.004	-0.01, 0.02	.636	
			-0.02	-0.04, -0.01	.005	
			-0.003	-0.00, -0.00	.001	
			-0.04	-0.09, 0.00	.059	
			0.04	-0.13, 0.20	.667	
			-0.24	-1.19, 0.71	.619	
			-0.03	-0.08, 0.02	.245	
			-0.06	-0.17, 0.05	.256	
			0.01	-0.17, 0.14	.848	
			-0.11	-0.31, 0.09	.278	
			-0.11	-0.16, -0.05	<.001	
			-0.003	-0.05, 0.05	.903	
			0.01	-0.04, 0.05	.744	
0.045			0.062			
	Estimate 0.54 -0.17 -0.02 -0.31 -0.13 -0.05 0.045	Estimate 95% CI 0.54 0.50, 0.58 -0.17 -0.26, -0.09 -0.02 -0.09, 0.05 -0.31 -0.37, -0.24 -0.13 -0.19, -0.06 -0.05 -0.11, 0.02	Estimate 95% CI p-value 0.54 0.50, 0.58 <.001	Estimate 95% CI p-value Estimate 0.54 0.50, 0.58 <.001	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Pairwise comparisons results between Asian ethnic subgroups predicting perceived discrimination events: Someone made a remark that you are to blame for the COVID-19 pandemic.

Contract	Without Controls			With Controls			
Contrast	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	
Chinese – Indian	0.31	0.24, 0.37	<.001	0.32	0.25, 0.38	<.001	
Chinese – Filipino	0.13	0.06, 0.19	<.001	0.12	0.06, 0.18	<.001	
Chinese – Japanese	0.17	0.09, 0.26	<.001	0.12	0.01, 0.22	.026	
Chinese – Korean	0.02	-0.05, 0.09	.570	0.03	-0.05, 0.10	.473	
Chinese – Vietnamese	0.05	-0.02, 0.11	.166	0.05	-0.01, 0.12	.109	
Indian – Filipino	-0.18	-0.25, -0.11	<.001	-0.20	-0.27, -0.13	<.001	
Indian – Japanese	-0.13	-0.23, -0.04	.005	-0.20	-0.31, -0.08	<.001	
Indian – Korean	-0.29	-0.37, -0.21	<.001	-0.29	-0.37, -0.21	<.001	
Indian – Vietnamese	-0.26	-0.34, -0.19	<.001	-0.26	-0.34, -0.19	<.001	
Filipino – Japanese	0.05	-0.04, 0.14	.306	-0.002	-0.11, 0.10	.970	
Filipino – Korean	-0.11	-0.18, -0.03	.008	-0.09	-0.17, -0.02	.017	
Filipino – Vietnamese	-0.08	-0.15, -0.01	.031	-0.07	-0.14, 0.01	.073	
Japanese – Korean	-0.15	-0.25, -0.05	.003	-0.09	-0.21, 0.02	.112	
Japanese – Vietnamese	-0.13	-0.22, -0.03	.009	-0.06	-0.18, 0.05	.264	
Korean – Vietnamese	0.03	-0.06, 0.11	.530	0.03	-0.05, 0.11	.502	

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Solidarity Perceptions: Regression Results and Pairwise Comparisons

We conducted a series of hierarchical linear regression models to test the main effects of Asian subgroup on solidarity perceptions. The Chinese subgroup served as the reference group. We conducted these regression models without and with covariates and demographic control variables (e.g., age, gender, generation, work type). We additionally conducted pairwise comparisons to examine differences between the other Asian subgroups, correcting for multiple comparisons. We report any discrepancies in results in regression models without and with covariates and demographic control variables

Linked Fate with Black Americans

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly lower perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans than Indian, Filipino, and Japanese participants – see Table S15. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Chinese and Japanese participants is no longer significant.

Pairwise comparisons also show that Indian participants reported significantly greater perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans than Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese participants – see Table S16. When controls are included in the regression model, the Indian-Japanese and Indian- Korean comparisons are no longer significant. Finally, Filipino participants reported perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans than Vietnamese participants – however this comparison is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model.

Predictor -	W	ithout Controls			With Controls	
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	3.24	3.10, 3.38	<.001	1.80	1.29, 2.30	<.001
Japanese	0.30	-0.01, 0.62	.057	0.08	-0.28, 0.43	.656
Korean	0.30	0.04, 0.56	.023	0.14	-0.10, 0.38	.263
Indian	0.66	0.43, 0.90	<.001	0.40	0.17, 0.62	<.001
Filipino	0.53	0.32, 0.75	<.001	0.25	0.04, 0.46	.018
Vietnamese	0.21	-0.02, 0.45	.078	0.07	-0.15, 0.30	.516
Feeling Thermometer				0.02	0.02, 0.03	<.001
MMM – AO				-0.10	-0.15, -0.04	<.001
MMM – UM				0.03	-0.02, 0.09	.186
Age				0.01	0.00, 0.02	.001
Gender: Woman				0.21	0.06, 0.36	.001
Gender: Non-binary				1.03	0.48, 1.58	.005
Gender: other identity				-0.17	-3.36, 3.02	.917
Generation: 2 nd				-0.04	-0.21, 0.13	.646
Generation: 3 rd				-0.32	-0.68, 0.05	.089
Generation: 4 th				-0.41	-0.92, 0.09	.110
Generation: 5 th				-0.08	-0.76, 0.60	.815
Work: Remote				-0.22	-0.40, -0.44	.014
Work: Hybrid				-0.06	-0.23, 0.11	.459
Treatment: Treatment				0.11	-0.03, 0.25	.136
R^2	0.017			0.142		
* <i>Note</i> : CI = Confidence	[nterva]					

Regression table for Asian ethnic subgroup predicting perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans.

Note: CI = Confidence Interval

Contract	W	ithout Controls		With Controls			
Contrast	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	
Chinese – Indian	-0.66	-0.90, -0.43	<.001	-0.40	-0.62, -0.17	<.001	
Chinese – Filipino	-0.53	-0.75, -0.32	<.001	-0.25	-0.45, -0.04	.018	
Chinese – Japanese	-0.30	-0.62, 0.01	.057	-0.08	-0.43, 0.27	.656	
Chinese – Korean	-0.30	-0.56, -0.04	.023	-0.14	-0.38, 0.10	.263	
Chinese – Vietnamese	-0.21	-0.45, 0.02	.078	-0.07	-0.30, 0.15	.516	
Indian – Filipino	0.13	-0.12, 0.38	.312	0.14	-0.09, 0.38	.235	
Indian – Japanese	0.36	0.03, 0.70	.035	0.32	-0.06, 0.69	.098	
Indian – Korean	0.37	0.08, 0.65	.013	0.26	-0.02, 0.53	.066	
Indian – Vietnamese	0.45	0.18, 0.72	.001	0.32	0.06, 0.58	.014	
Filipino – Japanese	0.23	-0.10, 0.56	.167	0.17	-0.19, 0.53	.350	
Filipino – Korean	0.24	-0.04, 0.51	.096	0.11	-0.15, 0.37	.399	
Filipino – Vietnamese	0.32	0.06, 0.58	.015	0.18	-0.07, 0.42	.157	
Japanese – Korean	0.004	-0.35, 0.36	.983	-0.06	-0.44, 0.33	.763	
Japanese – Vietnamese	0.09	-0.25, 0.43	.605	0.01	-0.38, 0.39	.977	
Korean – Vietnamese	0.09	-0.21, 0.38	.563	0.06	-0.21, 0.34	.646	

Pairwise comparisons results between Asian ethnic subgroups predicting perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Similarity with Black Americans

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly lower perceptions of similarity with Black Americans than Indian, Filipino, and Vietnamese participants – see Table S17. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Chinese and Vietnamese is no longer significant, but the comparison between Chinese and Japanese becomes significant.

Pairwise comparisons also show that Indian participants reported significantly greater perceptions of similarity with Black Americans than Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese participants – see Table S18. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Indian and Vietnamese participants is no longer significant. Additionally, Filipino participants reported significantly greater perceptions of similarity with Black Americans than Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese participants – however, the comparison between Filipino and Vietnamese is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model. Finally,

the comparison between Japanese and Vietnamese participants becomes significant when

controls are included in the regression model.

Table S17

Regression table for Asian ethnic subgroup predicting perceptions of similarity with Black Americans.

Predictor	W	ithout Controls			With Controls	
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	3.30	3.19, 3.42	<.001	1.79	1.40, 2.19	<.001
Japanese	0.10	-0.16, 0.36	.459	-0.29	-0.58, -0.01	.042
Korean	0.17	-0.05, 0.38	.123	-0.03	-0.22, 0.16	.742
Indian	0.63	0.44, 0.83	<.001	0.27	0.10, 0.45	.002
Filipino	0.50	0.32, 0.68	<.001	0.18	0.01, 0.34	.037
Vietnamese	0.28	0.08, 0.48	.005	0.08	-0.10, 0.26	.381
Feeling Thermometer				0.03	0.03.0.03	< 001
MMM – AO				-0.08	-0.12, -0.04	<.001
MMM – UM				-0.003	-0.04, 0.04	.872
Age				0.01	0.00, 0.01	.002
Gender: Woman				-0.20	-0.31, -0.08	.001
Gender: Non-binary				-0.43	-0.86, 0.01	.053
Gender: other identity				0.17	-2.68, 2.34	.892
Generation: 2 nd				0.01	-0.13, 0.14	.928
Generation: 3 rd				-0.08	-0.36, 0.21	.609
Generation: 4 th				-0.11	-0.51, 0.29	.581
Generation: 5 th				0.51	-0.02, 1.05	.059
Work: Remote				-0.15	-0.29, -0.01	.037
Work: Hybrid				-0.08	-0.21, 0.06	.256
Treatment: Treatment				0.07	-0.04, 0.19	.195
R^2	0.024			0.236		
*Nota: CI = Confidence I	nterval					

Note: CI = Confidence Interval

Contract	V	Vithout Controls	5		With Controls	
Contrast	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Chinese – Indian	-0.63	-0.83, -0.44	<.001	-0.27	-0.45, -0.10	.002
Chinese – Filipino	-0.50	-0.68, -0.32	<.001	-0.18	-0.34, -0.01	.037
Chinese – Japanese	-0.10	-0.36, 0.16	.459	0.29	0.01, 0.57	.042
Chinese – Korean	-0.17	-0.38, 0.05	.123	0.03	-0.16, 0.22	.742
Chinese – Vietnamese	-0.28	-0.48, -0.08	.005	-0.08	-0.26, 0.10	.381
Indian – Filipino	0.13	-0.08, 0.34	.210	0.10	-0.09, 0.29	.303
Indian – Japanese	0.54	0.26, 0.82	<.001	0.56	0.27, 0.85	<.001
Indian – Korean	0.46	0.23, 0.70	<.001	0.31	0.09, 0.52	.005
Indian – Vietnamese	0.35	0.13, 0.58	.002	0.19	-0.01, 0.40	.060
Filipino – Japanese	0.40	0.13, 0.67	.004	0.46	0.18, 0.75	.001
Filipino – Korean	0.33	0.10, 0.56	.005	0.21	-0.00, 0.41	.048
Filipino – Vietnamese	0.22	0.00, 0.43	.047	0.10	-0.10, 0.29	.330
Japanese – Korean	-0.07	-0.37, 0.23	.639	-0.26	-0.56, 0.05	.097
Japanese – Vietnamese	-0.18	-0.47, 0.10	.204	-0.37	-0.67, -0.07	.016
Korean – Vietnamese	-0.11	-0.36, 0.13	.361	-0.11	-0.33, 0.11	.316

Pairwise comparisons results between Asian ethnic subgroups predicting perceptions of similarity with Black Americans.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Asian Subgroup x Perceived Discrimination Events on Solidarity: Regression Results and Simple Slopes Analysis

We conducted a series of hierarchical linear regression models to test the interaction between perceived discrimination events and Asian subgroup on solidarity perceptions. The Chinese subgroup served as the reference group. We conducted these regression models without and with covariates and demographic control variables (e.g., age, gender, generation, work type). We additionally conducted simple slopes analysis to determine if the slopes for each Asian subgroup were significant. We report any discrepancies in results in regression models without and with covariates and demographic control variables

Linked Fate with Black Americans

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly lower perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans than Indian, Filipino, and Korean participants – see Table S19. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Chinese and Filipino participants is no longer significant. Perceived discrimination events significantly and positively predict perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans for Chinese participants. There was only a significant interaction between perceived discrimination events and Korean participants – however, this interaction is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model.

Simple slopes analysis (see Table S20) shows perceived discrimination significantly and positively predicts perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans for Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Filipino, and Vietnamese participants. The slope for Korean participants is not significant.

Duadiatan	W	ithout Controls		,	With Controls	
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	2.69	2.42, 2.95	<.001	1.07	0.51, 1.62	<.001
Japanese	0.14	-0.37, 0.65	.588	-0.09	-0.61, 0.44	.741
Korean	0.72	0.24, 1.20	.003	0.53	0.07, 0.98	.023
Indian	0.85	0.46, 1.24	<.001	0.53	0.16, 0.90	.005
Filipino	0.45	0.06, 0.84	.023	0.18	-0.19, 0.55	.337
Vietnamese	0.38	-0.07, 0.83	.099	0.31	-0.12, 0.73	.156
Discrimination Events	0.92	0.54, 1.29	<.001	0.90	0.55, 1.25	<.001
DE x Japanese	0.53	-0.27, 1.34	.192	0.43	-0.32, 1.19	.262
DE x Korean	-0.70	-1.38, -0.02	.043	-0.63	-1.26, 0.01	.053
DE x Indian	-0.09	-0.70, 0.53	.780	0.05	-0.53, 0.62	.873
DE x Filipino	0.27	-0.30, 0.85	.348	0.24	-0.29, 0.78	.375
DE x Vietnamese	-0.27	-0.92, 0.37	.404	-0.37	-0.97, 0.23	.230
Feeling Thermometer				0.02	0.02, 0.03	<.001
MMM – AO				-0.10	-0.15, -0.05	<.001
MMM - UM				0.07	0.02, 0.12	.008
Age				0.01	0.01, 0.02	<.001
Gender: Woman				0.21	0.07, 0.36	.004
Gender: Non-binary				1.03	0.50, 1.57	<.001
Gender: other identity				-0.12	-3.25, 3.00	.940
Generation: 2 nd				-0.00	-0.17, 0.16	.993
Generation: 3 rd				-0.24	-0.60, 0.12	.195
Generation: 4 th				-0.31	-0.81, 0.19	.226
Generation: 5 th				0.08	-0.58, 0.75	.810
Work: Remote				-0.15	-0.33, 0.02	.081
Work: Hybrid				-0.08	-0.25, 0.09	.351
Treatment: Treatment				0.09	-0.04, 0.23	.184
R^2	0.054			0 176		
	0.007			0.170		

Regression table for the interaction between Asian ethnic subgroup and perceived discrimination events composite score on perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval, DE = Discrimination Events

Subgroup	Without Controls			With Controls		
	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Chinese	0.92	0.54, 1.29	<.001	0.90	0.55, 1.25	<.001
Japanese	1.45	0.74, 2.16	<.001	1.34	0.66, 2.01	<.001
Korean	0.22	-0.35, 0.78	.450	0.28	-0.25, 0.81	.300
Indian	0.83	0.34, 1.32	<.001	0.95	0.49, 1.41	<.001
Filipino	1.19	0.75, 1.63	<.001	1.15	0.74, 1.56	<.001
Vietnamese	0.64	0.12, 1.16	.020	0.54	0.05, 1.02	.030

Results for simple slopes analysis the interaction between Asian ethnic subgroup and perceived discrimination events composite score on perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval

Similarity with Black Americans

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly lower perceptions of similarity with Black Americans than Indian, Filipino, and Korean participants – see Table S21. When controls are included in the regression model, the comparison between Chinese and Filipino participants is no longer significant. Perceived discrimination events significantly and positively predict perceptions of similarity with Black Americans for Chinese participants. Finally, there was a significant interaction between perceived discrimination events and Korean participants.

Simple slopes analysis (see Table S20) shows that perceived discrimination significantly and positively predicts perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans for Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Filipino, and Vietnamese participants. However, the slope for Japanese participants is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model. Finally, the slope for Korean participants is not significant.

Duadiatan	W	ithout Controls		,	With Controls	
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	2.89	2.67, 3.11	<.001	1.31	0.88, 1.74	<.001
Japanese	0.20	-0.23, 0.62	.367	-0.19	-0.60, 0.23	.375
Korean	0.71	0.30, 1.11	<.001	0.42	0.06, 0.78	.023
Indian	0.80	0.48, 1.12	<.001	0.38	0.09, 0.67	.011
Filipino	0.43	0.11, 0.76	.010	0.07	-0.22, 0.36	.651
Vietnamese	0.32	-0.06, 0.70	.623	0.17	-0.17, 0.50	.325
Discrimination Events	0.69	0.38, 1.00	<.001	0.61	0.34, 0.89	<.001
DE x Japanese	-0.06	-0.73, 0.61	.868	-0.13	-0.72, 0.48	.691
DE x Korean	-0.89	-1.46, -0.33	.002	-0.73	-1.23, -0.23	.004
DE x Indian	-0.13	-0.64, 0.38	.623	0.005	-0.45, 0.46	.984
DE x Filipino	0.21	-0.27, 0.69	.381	0.28	-0.15, 0.71	.199
DE x Vietnamese	-0.08	-0.61, 0.46	.780	-0.14	-0.61, 0.34	.567
Feeling Thermometer				0.03	0.03, 0.03	<.001
MMM – AO				-0.08	-0.12, -0.04	<.001
MMM - UM				0.02	-0.02, 0.06	.371
Age				0.01	0.00, 0.01	<.001
Gender: Woman				-0.19	-0.31, -0.18	<.001
Gender: Non-binary				-0.43	-0.85, 0.00	.051
Gender: other identity				-0.15	-2.62, 2.32	.905
Generation: 2 nd				0.03	-0.10, 0.16	.608
Generation: 3 rd				-0.04	-0.33, 0.24	.775
Generation: 4 th				-0.07	-0.47, 0.32	.714
Generation: 5 th				0.62	0.09, 1.14	.022
Work: Remote				-0.10	-0.24, 0.04	.149
Work: Hybrid				-0.09	-0.22, 0.05	.205
Treatment: Treatment				0.06	-0.05, 0.17	.260
p ²	0.050			0.050		
	0.050	<u></u>		0.258		

Regression table for the interaction between Asian ethnic subgroup and perceived discrimination events composite score on perceptions of similarity with Black Americans.

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval, DE = Discrimination Events

Subgroup	Without Controls			With Controls		
	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Chinese	0.69	0.38, 1.00	<.001	0.61	0.34, 0.89	<.001
Japanese	0.63	0.04, 1.23	.040	0.49	-0.04, 1.02	.070
Korean	-0.20	-0.68, 0.27	.400	-0.12	-0.54, 0.30	.580
Indian	0.56	0.15, 0.97	.010	0.62	0.25, 0.98	<.001
Filipino	0.90	0.54, 1.27	<.001	0.89	0.57, 1.22	<.001
Vietnamese	0.61	0.17, 1.05	.010	0.47	0.09, 0.86	.020

Results for simple slopes analysis the interaction between Asian ethnic subgroup and perceived discrimination events composite score on perceptions of similarity with Black Americans.

Asian Groupings x Perceived Discrimination Events on Solidarity: Regression Results

We additionally examined Asian subgroup differences based on perceived Asian prototypicality, the extent to which they were blamed for the COVID-19 pandemic, and skin tone. Therefore, we grouped the Asian subgroups into the following groups: 1) East (i.e., Chinese, Japanese, Korean) vs non-East Asian (i.e., Indian, Filipino, Vietnamese); 2) more (i.e., Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese) vs. less blamed for the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., Indian, Filipino, Japanese); and 3) dark (i.e., Indian, Filipino) vs. light skin tone (i.e., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese). We conducted a series of hierarchical linear regression models to test the interaction of perceived discrimination events and these groupings on solidarity perceptions. East Asians, more blame for the pandemic, and darker skin-toned groups served as the reference group. We conducted these regression models without and with covariates and demographic control variables (e.g., age, gender, generation, work type). We report any discrepancies in results in regression models without and with covariates and demographic control variables

East vs. Non-East Asian Subgroups

Linked Fate with Black Americans. The regression results indicate that non-East Asian subgroups reported greater perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans than East Asian subgroups (see Table S23). However, this effect is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model. Additionally, perceived discrimination events significantly and positively predict perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans. There was not a significant interaction between perceived discrimination events and non-East Asian subgroups.

Regression table for the interaction between East Asian (Chinese, Japanese, Korean) vs. non-East Asian (Indian, Filipino, Vietnamese) subgroups and perceived discrimination events composite score on perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans.

Duadiatan	W	ithout Controls			With Controls	
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	2.89	2.70, 3.09	<.001	1.14	0.61, 1.66	<.001
Non-East Asian	0.39	0.13, 0.66	.004	0.24	-0.01, 0.50	.062
Discrimination Events	0.79	0.50, 1.07	<.001	0.81	0.54, 1.08	<.001
DE X Non-East Asian	0.03	-0.36, 0.43	.865	0.02	-0.35, 0.39	.901
Feeling Thermometer				0.02	0.02, 0.03	<.001
MMM – AO				-0.09	-0.14, -0.04	.001
MMM – UM				0.07	0.02, 0.12	.009
Age				0.01	0.01, 0.02	<.001
Gender: Woman				0.20	0.06, 0.35	.007
Gender: Non-binary				1.03	0.49, 1.57	<.001
Gender: other identity				0.10	-3.03, 3.23	.950
Generation: 2 nd				-0.06	-0.22, 0.11	.501
Generation: 3 rd				-0.26	-0.60, 0.08	.132
Generation: 4 th				-0.31	-0.76, 0.14	.178
Generation: 5 th				0.03	-0.62, 0.69	.927
Work: Remote				-0.16	-0.37, 0.01	.068
Work: Hybrid				-0.08	-0.25, 0.08	.323
Treatment: Treatment				0.09	-0.05, 0.23	.188
R^2	0.039			0.170		

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval, DE = Discrimination Events

Similarity with Black Americans. The regression results indicate that non-East Asian subgroups reported greater perceptions of similarity with Black Americans than East Asian subgroups (see Table S24). However, this effect is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model. Additionally, perceived discrimination events significantly and positively predict perceptions of similarity with Black Americans. There was not a significant interaction between perceived discrimination events and non-East Asian subgroups.

SOLIDARITY AND ASIAN SUBGROUPS

Table S24

Regression table for the interaction between East Asian (Chinese, Japanese, Korean) vs. non-East Asian (Indian, Filipino, Vietnamese) subgroups and perceived discrimination events composite score on perceptions of similarity with Black Americans.

Predictor -	W	ithout Controls			With Controls	
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	3.10	2.93, 3.26	<.001	1.43	1.01, 1.84	<.001
Non-East Asian	0.35	0.12, 0.57	.002	0.13	-0.07, 0.33	.213
Discrimination Events	0.44	0.20, 0.68	<.001	0.41	0.20, 0.63	<.001
DE X Non-East Asian	0.19	-0.14, 0.52	.253	0.22	-0.07, 0.51	.144
Feeling Thermometer				0.03	0.03, 0.03	<.001
MMM – AO				-0.08	-0.12, -0.03	<.001
MMM - UM				0.02	-0.02, 0.06	.421
Age				0.01	0.00, 0.01	<.001
Gender: Woman				-0.20	-0.31, -0.09	<.001
Gender: Non-binary				-0.46	-0.88, -0.03	.036
Gender: other identity				0.001	-2.48, 2.48	1.00
Generation: 2 nd				-0.01	-0.13, 0.12	.929
Generation: 3 rd				-0.15	-0.42, 0.12	.267
Generation: 4 th				-0.26	-0.62, 0.09	.149
Generation: 5 th				0.47	-0.05, 0.98	.077
Work: Remote				-0.11	-0.25, 0.02	.105
Work: Hybrid				-0.09	-0.22, 0.04	.177
Treatment: Treatment				0.07	-0.04, 0.18	.236
R^2	0.039			0.252		

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval, DE = Discrimination Events

Light vs. Dark skin toned Subgroups

Linked Fate with Black Americans. The regression results indicate that darker skin toned subgroups reported greater perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans than lighter skin toned subgroups (see Table S25). However, this effect is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model. Additionally, perceived discrimination events significantly and positively predict perceptions of similarity with Black Americans. There was not a significant interaction between perceived discrimination events and lighter skin toned subgroups.

Regression table for the interaction between dark (Indian, Filipino) vs. light skin-toned subgroups (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese) and perceived discrimination events composite score on perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans.

Duadiatan	W	ithout Controls			With Controls	
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	3.34	3.14, 3.55	<.001	1.43	0.89, 1.97	< 0.001
Light skin-tone	-0.41	-0.68, -0.14	.003	-0.20	-0.45, 0.06	0.128
Discrimination Events	0.99	0.67, 1.32	<.001	1.02	0.71, 1.32	< 0.001
DE X Light skin-tone	-0.24	-0.65, 0.17	.254	-0.28	-0.66, 0.11	0.155
Feeling Thermometer				0.02	0.02, 0.03	< 0.001
MMM – AO				-0.10	-0.15, -0.04	< 0.001
MMM – UM				0.07	0.02, 0.12	0.008
Age				0.01	0.01, 0.02	< 0.001
Gender: Woman				0.20	0.06, 0.35	0.006
Gender: Non-binary				0.99	0.45, 1.52	< 0.001
Gender: other identity				-0.003	-3.13, 3.12	0.999
Generation: 2 nd				-0.02	-0.19, 0.14	0.777
Generation: 3 rd				-0.26	-0.60, 0.08	0.128
Generation: 4 th				-0.32	-0.77, 0.13	0.160
Generation: 5 th				0.04	-0.62, 0.69	0.912
Work: Remote				-0.15	-0.33, 0.02	0.085
Work: Hybrid				-0.08	-0.25, 0.09	0.348
Treatment: Treatment				0.09	-0.04, 0.23	0.181
R^2	0.047			0.174		

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval, DE = Discrimination Events

Similarity with Black Americans. The regression results indicate that darker skin-toned subgroups reported greater perceptions of similarity with Black Americans than lighter skin-toned subgroups (see Table S26). However, this effect is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model. Additionally, perceived discrimination events significantly and positively predict perceptions of similarity with Black Americans. Finally, there was not a significant interaction between perceived discrimination events and lighter skin toned subgroups when no controls were in the regression model. However, this interaction becomes significant when controls are included in the regression model. For participants who perceived fewer discrimination experiences, similarity perceptions between darker and lighter skin-toned groups

were similar. In contrast, for participants who perceived more frequent discrimination

experiences, similarity perceptions were greater for darker skin-toned groups than lighter skin-

toned groups (see Figure S1).

Table S26

Regression table for the interaction between dark (Indian, Filipino) vs. light skin-toned subgroups (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese) and perceived discrimination events composite score on perceptions of similarity with Black Americans.

Predictor -	W	ithout Controls			With Controls	
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	3.51	3.34, 3.68	<.001	1.59	1.16, 2.01	<.001
Light skin tone	-0.38	-0.60, -0.16	<.001	-0.11	-0.32, 0.09	.264
Discrimination Events	0.72	0.45, 0.99	<.001	0.74	0.50, 0.99	<.001
DE X Light skin tone	-0.24	-0.58, 0.11	.176	-0.32	-0.62, -0.02	.039
Feeling Thermometer				0.03	0.03, 0.03	<.001
MMM – AO				-0.08	-0.12, -0.04	<.001
MMM - UM				0.02	-0.02, 0.06	.374
Age				0.01	0.00, 0.01	.001
Gender: Woman				-0.20	-0.32, -0.09	.001
Gender: Non-binary				-0.49	-0.91, -0.06	.025
Gender: other identity				-0.08	-2.56, 2.40	.950
Generation: 2 nd				0.02	-0.11, 0.15	.759
Generation: 3 rd				-0.16	-0.43, 0.11	.252
Generation: 4 th				-0.27	-0.63, 0.08	.132
Generation: 5 th				0.46	-0.06, 0.98	.080
Work: Remote				-0.10	-0.24, 0.03	.136
Work: Hybrid				-0.09	-0.22, 0.05	.201
Treatment: Treatment				-0.07	-0.04, 0.18	.242
R^2	0.043			0.254		

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval, DE = Discrimination Events

Figure S1

The interaction between phenotype and perceived discrimination events on perceived similarity with Black Americans. Higher numbers indicate more frequent discrimination events and more perceived similarity with Black Americans. Red represents Asian subgroups categorized as darker phenotype (i.e., Indian, Filipino), and blue represents Asian subgroups categorized as lighter phenotype (i.e., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese).



More vs. Less Blame for the Pandemic Subgroups

Linked Fate with Black Americans. The regression results indicate that subgroups that were blamed less for the COVID-19 pandemic reported greater perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans than subgroups that were blamed more for the pandemic (see Table S27). However, this effect is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model. Additionally, perceived discrimination events significantly and positively predict perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans. Finally, there was not a significant interaction between perceived discrimination events and subgroups blamed less for the pandemic when no controls were in the regression model. However, this interaction becomes significant when controls are included in the regression model. For participants who perceived fewer discrimination experiences, linked fate perceptions between more and less blame for the pandemic groups were similar. In contrast, for participants who perceived more frequent discrimination experiences, linked fate perceptions were greater for groups that were blamed more for the pandemic than groups blamed less for the pandemic (see Figure S2).

Table S27

Regression table for the interaction between subgroups more (Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese) vs. less likely blamed (Indian, Filipino, Japanese) for the COVID-19 pandemic) and perceived discrimination events composite score on perceptions of linked fate with Black Americans.

Dradiator	W	ithout Controls		With Controls			
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	
Intercept	2.95	2.76, 3.14	<.001	1.32	0.80, 1.83	<.001	
Less blame	0.31	0.04, 0.57	.023	0.10	-0.15, 0.35	.442	
Discrimination Events	0.68	0.42, 0.95	<.001	0.65	0.40, 0.91	<.001	
DE X Less blame	0.39	-0.01, 0.79	.055	0.41	0.04, 0.79	.029	
Feeling Thermometer				0.02	0.02, 0.03	<.001	
MMM – AO				-0.10	-0.15, -0.04	<.001	
MMM – UM				0.07	0.02, 0.12	.009	
Age				0.01	0.01, 0.02	<.001	
Gender: Woman				0.20	0.05, 0.34	.007	
Gender: Non-binary				0.96	0.42, 1.49	.001	
Gender: other identity				0.02	-3.11, 3.14	.991	
Generation: 2 nd				-0.03	-0.20, 0.13	.679	
Generation: 3 rd				-0.38	-0.71, -0.04	.027	
Generation: 4 th				-0.53	-0.98, -0.08	.021	
Generation: 5 th				-0.07	-0.72, 0.59	.842	
Work: Remote				-0.15	-0.33, 0.02	.082	
Work: Hybrid				-0.08	-0.24, 0.09	.361	
Treatment: Treatment				0.10	-0.04, 0.24	.162	
R^2	0.048			0.174			

**Note:* CI = Confidence Interval, DE = Discrimination Events

Figure S2

The interaction between phenotype and perceived discrimination events on perceived linked fate with Black Americans. Higher numbers indicate more frequent discrimination events and more perceived linked fate with Black Americans. Red represents Asian subgroups categorized as being blamed more for the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese) and blue represents Asian subgroups categorized as being blamed less for the COVID-19 pandemic. (i.e., Japanese, Indian, Filipino).



Similarity with Black Americans. The regression results indicate that subgroups that were blamed less for the COVID-19 pandemic reported greater perceptions of similarity with Black Americans than subgroups that were blamed more for the pandemic (see Table S27). However, this effect is no longer significant when controls are included in the regression model. Additionally, perceived discrimination events significantly and positively predict perceptions of similarity with Black Americans. Finally, there was not a significant interaction between perceived discrimination events and subgroups blamed less for the pandemic when no controls were in the regression model. However, this interaction becomes significant when controls are included in the regression model. For participants who perceived fewer discrimination experiences, similarity perceptions between more and less blame for the pandemic groups were similar. In contrast, for participants who perceived more frequent discrimination experiences, similarity perceptions were greater for groups that were blamed more for the pandemic than groups blamed less for the pandemic (see Figure S3).

Table S28

Regression table for the interaction between subgroups more (Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese) vs. less likely blamed (Indian, Filipino, Japanese) for the COVID-19 pandemic) and perceived discrimination events composite score on perceptions of similarity with Black Americans.

Dradiator	W	ithout Controls		With Controls				
Predictor	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value		
Intercept	3.13	2.97, 3.29	<.001	1.51	1.10, 1.92	<.001		
Less blame	0.30	0.08, 0.52	.007	0.04	-0.16, 0.24	.696		
Discrimination Events	0.46	0.24, 0.69	<.001	0.40	0.20, 0.60	<.001		
DE X Less blame	0.24	-0.09, 0.58	.152	0.30	0.002, 0.59	.049		
Feeling Thermometer				0.03	0.03, 0.03	<.001		
MMM – AO				-0.08	-0.12, -0.03	<.001		
MMM – UM				0.02	-0.02, 0.06	.378		
Age				0.01	0.00, 0.01	<.001		
Gender: Woman				-0.20	-0.32, -0.09	.004		
Gender: Non-binary				-0.50	-0.92, -0.07	.022		
Gender: other identity				-0.03	-2.52, 2.45	.979		
Generation: 2 nd				0.01	-0.12, 0.14	.932		
Generation: 3 rd				-0.24	-0.51, 0.03	.081		
Generation: 4 th				-0.41	-0.77, -0.06	.024		
Generation: 5 th				0.38	-0.14, 0.90	.149		
Work: Remote				-0.11	-0.24, 0.03	.134		
Work: Hybrid				-0.08	-0.22, 0.05	.209		
Treatment: Treatment				0.07	-0.04, 0.18	.232		
R^2	0.037			0.250				
* <i>Note:</i> CI = Confidence Interval, DE = Discrimination Events								

Figure S3

The interaction between phenotype and perceived discrimination events on perceived similarity with Black Americans. Higher numbers indicate more frequent discrimination events and more perceived similarity with Black Americans. Red represents Asian subgroups categorized as being blamed more for the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese) and blue represents Asian subgroups categorized as being blamed less for the COVID-19 pandemic. (i.e., Japanese, Indian, Filipino).



Feelings towards Black Americans: Regression Results and Pairwise Comparisons

The regression results indicate that Chinese participants reported significantly colder feelings towards Black Americans than Japanese, Korean, Indian, Filipino, and Vietnamese participants – see Table S29. These comparisons remain significant when controls are included in the regression model.

Pairwise comparisons also show that Indian participants reported significantly warmer feelings towards Black Americans than Korean and Vietnamese participants – see Table S30. When controls are included in the regression model, these comparisons remain significant. Finally, Filipino participants reported warmer feelings towards Black Americans than Korean and Vietnamese participants, and these comparisons remain significant when controls are included in the regression model.

SOLIDARITY AND ASIAN SUBGROUPS

Table S29

Duadiatau	W	/ithout Controls		With Controls			
Predictor	Estimate	<i>Estimate 95% CI p-value</i>		Estimate	95% CI	p-value	
Intercept	62.90	61.09, 64.70	<.001	76.89	71.32, 82.47	<.001	
Japanese	9.57	5.50, 13.64	<.001	6.64	2.08, 11.20	.004	
Korean	5.46	2.10, 8.82	.001	4.33	1.18, 7.49	.007	
Indian	12.56	9.53, 15.59	<.001	13.52	10.67, 16.36	<.001	
Filipino	10.79	7.93, 13.64	<.001	9.83	7.16, 12.51	<.001	
Vietnamese	7.08	3.99, 10.17	<.001	5.67	2.76, 8.57	<.001	
Feeling Thermometer							
MMM – AO				-4.81	-5.48, -4.15	<.001	
MMM – UM				0.99	0.32, 1.65	.004	
Age				0.08	0.00, 0.16	.004	
Gender: Woman				6.72	4.83, 8.60	<.001	
Gender: Non-binary				5.42	-1.67, 12.51	.134	
Gender: other identity				20.46	-20.80, 61.72	.331	
Generation: 2 nd				1.08	-1.09, 3.25	.330	
Generation: 3 rd				5.20	0.47, 9.94	.031	
Generation: 4 th				1.47	-5.11, 8.04	.662	
Generation: 5 th				-3.63	-12.38, 5.11	.415	
Work: Remote				-1.70	-3.99, 0.58	.144	
Work: Hybrid				-1.86	-4.06, 0.34	.097	
Treatment: Treatment				0.29	-1.55, 2.12	.759	
R^2	0.041			0.170			

Regression table for Asian ethnic subgroup predicting perceptions of similarity with Black Americans.

SOLIDARITY AND ASIAN SUBGROUPS

Table S30

Pairwise	comparisons	results	between 1	Asian e	ethnic	subgroups	predicting	feelings	towards	Black
American	ıs.									

Contract	W	vithout Contro	ls	With Controls			
Contrast	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	Estimate	95% CI	p-value	
Chinese – Indian	-12.56	-15.6, -9.5	<.001	-13.52	-16.4, -10.7	<.001	
Chinese – Filipino	-10.79	-13.6, -7.9	<.001	-9.83	-12.5, -7.2	<.001	
Chinese – Japanese	-9.57	-13.6, -5.5	<.001	-6.64	-11.2, -2.1	.004	
Chinese – Korean	-5.46	-8.8, -2.1	.001	-4.33	-7.5, -1.2	.007	
Chinese – Vietnamese	-7.08	-10.2, -4.0	<.001	-5.67	-8.6, -2.8	<.001	
Indian – Filipino	1.77	-1.5, 5.1	.290	3.68	0.60, 6.8	.019	
Indian – Japanese	2.99	-1.4, 7.4	.182	6.87	2.0, 11.7	.005	
Indian – Korean	7.10	3.4, 10.8	<.001	9.18	5.7, 12.7	<.001	
Indian – Vietnamese	5.49	2.0, 9.0	.002	7.85	4.5, 11.2	<.001	
Filipino – Japanese	1.21	-3.1, 5.5	.577	3.19	-1.5, 7.8	.178	
Filipino – Korean	5.33	1.7, 8.9	.004	5.50	2.1, 8.9	.001	
Filipino – Vietnamese	3.71	0.36, 7.1	.030	4.17	1.0, 7.3	.010	
Japanese – Korean	4.11	-0.51, 8.7	.081	2.31	-2.7, 7.3	.364	
Japanese – Vietnamese	2.50	-1.9, 6.9	.270	0.97	-4.0, 5.9	.699	
Korean – Vietnamese	-1.61	-5.4, 2.2	.403	-1.34	-4.9, 2.2	.465	
References

- Goh, J. X., & McCue, J. (2021). Perceived prototypicality of Asian subgroups in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 97, 104201. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2021.104201</u>
- Lee, J., & Ramakrishnan, K. (2020). Who counts as Asian. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 43(10), 1733–1756. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2019.1671600</u>