Ethnic/Racial Identity Attitudes Associated with Anti-Asian Racism-Related Stress among Asian American Educators

Quennie Dong, Ed.S., Jin Hyung Lim, M.A., Edwin Carlos, M.A., Chunyan Yang, Ph.D.

BACKGROUND

- Asian American demographics are the fastest-growing minority group in the United States (Budiman et al., 2019) and are expected to become the largest immigrant group by 2055 (Chatterjl & Yin, 2022)
- AAPIs are faced with a surging rate of anti-Asian violence in their community which is not a new phenomenon in the United States (Lee, 2015)
- Historically, Asian Americans have been viewed as perpetual foreigners and linked to infectious diseases where the outbreak of the Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) reinvigorated not only anti-Asian hate but also a pan-ethnic Asian American identity and social movement (Tessler et al., 2020)
- The COVID-19 outbreak also brought subsequent social, economic, and public health crisis that has made it difficult for educators, particularly AAPI educators who are disproportionately represented in public education (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.), to navigate professional and personal challenges within and outside of their classrooms.

METHODS

- 242 Asian American educators participated in a survey on ERI attitudes (using the Cross Ethnic-Racial Identity Scale-Adult; Worrell et al., 2016) and RRS (using the Asian American Racism-Related Stress Inventory; Liang et al., 2004).
- We used a latent profile analysis to examine how ERI profile membership may be associated with experiences of RRS.
- We used AIC, BIC, saBIC, entropy, and p-values of an LMR and BLRT to determine the optimal number of latent profiles, and then investigated predictive and explanatory similarities across different latent profiles by using 3-step approaches (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014).

RESULTS

- Results indicate that a 4-profile solution showed the best fit (Low Race Salience, Assimilationist, Multiculturalist, and Conflicted Assimilationist). Gender identity, place of birth, immigration generation, and English language proficiency of participants could predict the profile membership.
- Multiculturalist showed significantly higher socio-historical RRS than other profiles. Multiculturalist and Conflicted Assimilationists experienced significantly higher general RRS than Assimilationist. Multiculturalist had significantly higher perpetual foreigner RRS than Low Race Salience and Assimilationist.

DISCUSSION

- There is significance in different ethnic/racial identity (ERI) and that each profile suggests a distinct characteristic that relate to experienced racism-related stress (RRS)
- These findings underscore the importance of how ERI attitudes relate to RRS as ERI can have a psychological effect on adjustment and how individuals navigate racial stereotypes and discrimination
- Differences in racism-related stress experiences may be related to individuals' level of assimilation and their attitudes toward race and ethnicity

There are **four profiles** of **Ethnic/Racial Identity Attitudes** among **AsAm educators and correlates with different levels of RRS.**

Note. SHR (Socio-Historical Racism), GR (General Racism), PFR (Perpetual Foreigner Racism), ** p < .01, *** p < .001

IMPLICATIONS & FUTURE DIRECTIONS

- The findings can inform educational programs and intercultural communication practices to promote understanding, empathy, and effective communication among individuals with diverse racial backgrounds and attitudes
- There is a need to integrate racial identity and resilience in education to provide a holistic approach for Asian American students' development
- School diversity plays a crucial role in the healthy development of ERI and diversity needs to be considered for promoting healthy development of ERI
- There is a need for longitudinal and comparative studies to better understand the stability and variability of the identified profiles over time and across different contexts
- Implications from these results may inform designing inclusive policies and interventions. The different profiles and their predictors can inform efforts to address racial tensions, promote multiculturalism, and foster social integration

Table 1 Correlation Coefficients and Descriptive Statistics

	AM	MD	SH	ET	MI	ERS	SHR	GR	PFR	ARS
AM	1									
MD	.49***	1								
SH	.33***	.24***	1							
ET	-.01	.02	.21**	1						
MI	-.20**	-.21***	.11	.43***	1					
ERS	-.23** *	-.23***	.18**	.49***	.48***	1				
SHR	-22***	-.24***	.14*	.14*	.23***	.36***	1			
GR	-.09	-.18**	.27***	.16*	.14*	.35***	.46***	1		
PFR	-.14*	-.21**	.27***	.14*	.14*	.38***	.49***	.79***	1	
ARS	-.17**	-.25***	.27***	.17**	.20**	.43***	.76***	.89***	.90***	1
Mean	2.59	3.28	2.87	4.70	6.17	4.58	3.85	2.20	2.77	2.94
SD	1.25	1.06	1.40	1.04	.76	1.22	.90	.94	.98	.80
Skewness	.78	.32	.56	-.21	.93	-.25	-.95	.75	.25	.18
Kurtosis	.41	-.17	-.37	.22	.76	-.56	.64	-.19	-.97	-.50

Note. AM (Assimilation), MD (Mis-Education), SH (Self-Hatred), ET (Ethnocentricity), MI (Multiculturalist Inclusive), ERS (Ethnic/Racial Salience), SHR (Socio-Historical Racism), GR (General Racism), PFR (Perpetual Foreigner Racism), ARS (Anti-Asian Racism-Related Stress), SD (standard deviation), * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 2 Latent Profile Analysis of Asian American Educators' Racial/Ethnic Identity

#profile	LL	fp	AIC	BIC	saBIC	Entropy	aLMR	BLRT
1	-2057.293	12	4138.585	4180.452	4142.414	-	-	-
2	-1980.350	19	3998.701	4064.990	4004.764	.722	.002	<.001
3	-1917.920	26	3887.840	3978.552	3896.137	.817	.010	<.001
4	-1894.178	33	3854.357	3969.492	3864.887	.852	.245	<.001
5	-1878.599	40	3837.198	3976.756	3849.963	.815	.475	<.001
6	-1858.142	47	3810.284	3974.264	3825.283	.781	.267	<.001
7	-1845.368	54	3798.736	3987.138	3815.968	.786	.734	.075

Note. #profile = the number of profiles, LL = Log Likelihood, fp = free parameter, AIC = Akaike Information Criterion, BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion, saBIC = sample-size adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion, aLMR = p-value of adjusted Lo, Mendell, and Rubin's Likelihood Ratio Test, BLRT = p-value of Bootstrap Likelihood Ratio Test

Table 3 Latent Profile Analysis with Covariates

	Low Race Salience vs. Conflicted Assimilationist		Assimilationist vs. Conflicted Assimilationist		Multiculturalist vs. Conflicted Assimilationist		Low Race Salience vs. Multiculturalist		Assimilationist vs. Multiculturalist		Low Race Salience vs. Assimilationist	
	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR
Female	1.01	2.76	1.25	3.51	1.14	3.13	-.13	.88	-1.14	1.12	-.24	.79
Non-binary	-.47** *	.62	-.39** *	.68	20.51* **	>999	-20.99 ***	<.001	-20.51 ***	<.001	-.09* *	.92
US-born	2.18	8.87	18.17* **	>999	18.63* **	>999	-16.45 ***	<.001	-18.63 ***	.631	-15.99 ***	<.001
Third Gen.	.01	1.01	-1.32	.27	-.92	.40	.93	2.54	.92	.673	1.33	3.78
Fourth Gen.	-.62	.54	-17.08 ***	<.001	-17.17 ***	<.001	16.55* **	>999	17.17* **	1.10	16.46* **	>999
ELL	3.60** *	36.74	21.17* **	>999	-.72**	.49	4.32** *	75.40	.72***	>999	-17.56 ***	<.001

Note. OR = odds ratio, The reference group for female was the combination of male and non-binary. The reference group for non-binary was the combination of male and female. The reference group for US-born was those who were born outside of the US. The reference group for the third generation was the second and fourth generations. The reference group for the fourth generation was the second and third generations. The reference group for ELL (English Language Learner) was teachers not identified as ELL.