

November 2020

## Asian Male Stereotypes: An Investigation of Current Beliefs About Asian Males and Stereotypes Perpetuated by U.S. Modern Cinema

Noelle Knopp  
*University of South Florida*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd>



Part of the [Mass Communication Commons](#)

---

### Scholar Commons Citation

Knopp, Noelle, "Asian Male Stereotypes: An Investigation of Current Beliefs About Asian Males and Stereotypes Perpetuated by U.S. Modern Cinema" (2020). *USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd/8554>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Graduate Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usf.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usf.edu).

Asian Male Stereotypes: An Investigation of Current Beliefs About Asian Males and  
Stereotypes Perpetuated by U.S. Modern Cinema

by

Noelle Knopp

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
Zimmerman School of Advertising and Mass Communications  
College of Arts and Sciences  
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Kelly Werder, Ph.D.  
Yao Sun, Ph.D.  
Roxanne Watson, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:  
November 10, 2020

Keywords: traits, agenda setting, representation, framing, American

Copyright 2020, Noelle Knopp

## Table of Contents

List of Tables	iii
Abstract	v
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Background	1
Purpose	2
Importance of Study	3
Outline of the Study	3
Chapter Two: Literature Review	4
Theory and Western Asian Representation	4
Framing	4
Agenda Setting	5
Orientalism and Other Mentality	6
Modern Mainstream Representation	8
Study Part 1 Research Questions	9
Media and External Perception of Asian Males	9
Media Impact on Stereotypes	10
Impact of Second-Level Agenda Setting on Asian Males	11
Modern Cinema and the Portrayal of Asian Males	13
Study Part 2 Hypotheses	15
Chapter Three: Methodology	16
Study Part 1	16
Procedure	16
Study Part 1 Research Questions	18
Study Part 2	19
Procedure	19
Manipulation Check Results	19
Procedure Part 2	22
Study Part 2 Hypotheses	23
Chapter Four: Results	24
Study Part 1	24
Common Traits	24

Frames Depicting Subordinate Traits	25
Materialistic Qualities	27
Hyper-Sexualized Traits	29
Flattering physical attributes, Sexual/Romantic adequacies, & Their Counterparts	30
Social Adequacies & Interpersonal Deficits	32
Intense Diligence	34
Physical Ability Distortions	34
Intelligence & Perpetual Foreigner	35
Study Part 2	35
Demographics	35
Descriptive Statistics	37
Variables and Scales	41
Film Exposure Scale (FES)	42
New Categories Defined	45
Hypotheses Testing	48
Chapter Five: Discussion and Implications	70
Study Part 1	70
Study Part 1 Conclusion	77
Study Part 1 Limitations & Future Areas of Study	78
Study Part 2	79
Hypotheses	80
Study Part 2 Conclusion	84
Study Part 2 Limitations & Future Areas of Study	84
References	86
Appendix A: Qualitative Codebook	92
Appendix B: Pretest Instrument	94
Appendix C: Survey Instrument	95
Survey Section 1	95
Survey Section 2	95
Survey Section 3	96
Survey Section 4	96
Survey Section 5	97
Survey Section 6	99
Survey Section 7	100

## **List of Tables**

Table 1	Manipulation Check: Negative Perceptions	20
Table 2	Manipulation Check: Other Perceptions	21
Table 3	Manipulation Check: One-Sample Statistics	21
Table 4	Manipulation Check: One-Sample Test	22
Table 5	Race	36
Table 6	Gender	36
Table 7	Age	36
Table 8	Independent Variables: Raw Means	37
Table 9	Dependent Variables: Raw Means	39
Table 10	Asian Male Interaction Scale (AMIS)	41
Table 11	Perceived Asian Male Traits Rotated Factor Matrix <sup>a</sup>	42
Table 12	Romantic Inadequacies	45
Table 13	Physical Adequacies	45
Table 14	Intense Diligence	45
Table 15	General Unattractive Attributes	45
Table 16	Subordinate Traits	46
Table 17	Social Adequacies	46
Table 18	Materialistic Qualities	47
Table 19	Composite Variables	47

Table 20	FES and Composite Variables – Descriptive Statistics	48
Table 21	FES and Composite Variables	51
Table 22	H1: Group O, X, and Composite Variables – Descriptive Statistics	52
Table 23	H1: Group O, X, and Composite Variables	53
Table 24	H2: AMIS and Composite Variables – Descriptive Statistics	54
Table 25	H2: AMIS and Composite Variables	59
Table 26	H3: MANOVA - AMIS, X/O, and Perceived Traits	60
Table 27	H3: MANOVA - AMIS, FES, and Perceived Traits	61
Table 28	H3: Test of Between-Subject Effects- AMIS, FES, and Perceived Traits	62
Table 29	H3: Test of Between-Subject Effects- AMIS, FES, and Perceived Traits	65
Table 30	Composite Traits: New Perceived Traits Regarding Asian Males	79
Table A1	Wong et. al Defined Stereotypes	92
Table A2	Knopp Defined Stereotypes	93

## **Abstract**

This is a triangulated two-part study with a quasi-experiment design. Study Part 1 performed a textual analysis supported by the theory of framing on the films *Crazy Rich Asians*, *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, *Always Be My Maybe*, and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* to find commonalities among portrayals of prominent East Asian male characters. Using Wong et. al's findings of common perceived stereotypes by Asian American males, the author used the six traits defined by Wong et. al as a base to see if the films corresponded to or deviated from the stereotypes defined in the 2012 study. The researcher found six new traits that were commonalities portrayed among prominent East Asian male characters. These were Materialistic qualities, Subordinate Traits, Hyper-sexualized Tendencies, Flattering physical attributes, Social adequacies, and Sexual/Romantic adequacies. In addition, the author found that all seven of the traits defined in Wong et. al's study, Interpersonal deficits, Unflattering physical attributes, Sexual/Romantic inadequacies, Intense diligence, Physical ability distortions, Intelligence, and Perpetual foreigner, were also portrayed as commonalities among characters (2012).

Study part two uses the foundation of second-level agenda setting driven by framing and Edward Said's concept of orientalism (1979) to perform an exploratory study of traits about Asian men believed by participants and perpetuated by modern cinema. Firstly, the study revealed listed characteristics which statistically combined into seven traits regarding beliefs about Asian males. The study also revealed that exposure to media portrayals of Asian males in modern cinema led to stronger perceptions of Asian men having Materialistic qualities, Physical adequacies, Intense diligence, and Social adequacies, as well as a decrease in beliefs of Asian men having General unattractive attributes. Additionally, the study revealed that among all participants, interactions with Asian males (AMIS) had a palpable effect on believed traits about Asian males, however, AMIS did not mediate traits perceived after media exposure. When participants had been exposed to more modern cinema, where AMIS increased, the belief of Asian males having more Physical adequacies decreased, revealing that the mainstream cinema mediated how viewers perceived Asian males more than their AMIS.



## Chapter One: Introduction

### Background

The release of the 2018 film *Crazy Rich Asians* created a buzz around America, bringing with it new representation as well as a sense of satire which can bring many past stereotypes to light. This film is the first created by mainstream Hollywood in over 25 years, since *The Joy Luck Club*, to feature an entirely Asian primary cast, and for this reason, reviews are calling the film groundbreaking (*Variety*, 2019; *Time*, 2018). Since its release, more modern cinema in the United States has sprung up that feature Asian male characters in roles which have the ability to eradicate or bring to light the stereotypes of past portrayals. Comedies specifically have the ability to address topics that may otherwise go unnoticed and allow the formation of social change (Tracy, 2018). In this way, modern cinema such as *Crazy Rich Asians* has the unique ability to define which stereotypical Asian representations were deemed prominent enough to be included within the film for social commentary through comedic frames, as well as expand on ways in which these representations could be changed to create character depth.

Despite communities praising *Crazy Rich Asians* for its widening of Asian representation (*New York Film Academy*, 2019; *Time*, 2018; *The Verge*, 2018), critics have also commented on the possibility of *Crazy Rich Asians* bringing more stereotypical Asian representation into the already saturated mainstream cinematic world (*The Star*, 2018; *The Atlantic*, 2018; *Flair*, 2018). After *Crazy Rich Asians*, within the last two years three other mainstream comedies in United States have emerged featuring East-Asian Male-speaking roles. Study part 1 focuses on the

representation of prominent East Asian male characters in the films *Crazy Rich Asians*, *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, *To All the Boys: P.S., I Still Love You*, and *Always Be my Maybe* as a whole, and how they may be playing into previously perceived stereotypes from a study by Wong et al. (2012), or, how they may be moving away from previously defined stereotypical representation. Given the recent context of *Crazy Rich Asians* and the three other films, what stereotypes were deemed relevant enough to be highlighted in the film, and are still arguably being perpetuated by United States modern cinema about East Asian males? Study part 1 uses the framing theory to perform a textual analysis of the films *Crazy Rich Asians*, *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, *Always Be My Maybe*, and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* to explore and define which commonalities between prominent East Asian male actors were portrayed by the films, and arguably, are still being perpetuated by U.S. modern cinema.

In Study Part 1, seven stereotypes defined by Asian males from a study by Wong et. al are found as commonalities among East Asian male characters (Interpersonal deficits, Unflattering physical attributes, Sexual/romantic inadequacies, Intense diligence, Physical ability distortions, Intelligence, and Perpetual foreigner). Therefore, Study Part 2 seeks to understand if the films analyzed in the previous study are perpetuating stereotypes of the defined traits found about Asian men (Knopp 2020; 2012). In what ways might modern cinema be influencing the perception of Asian males?

### Purpose

Study Part 1 seeks to determine which traits (if any) are found to be commonalities among East Asian men in modern cinematic portrayals. Study Part 2 seeks to determine whether the portrayals defined in the study above are common traits attributed to Asian American men through public perception, and whether there is a correlation between viewing clips of the films

and traits believed by responding participants. Study Part 2 is a post-test only control group experimental design.

### Importance of study

Although there are many studies outlining how stereotypes negatively impact Asian Americans, there are seldom modern studies determining what common stereotypes are still being perpetuated about Asian men in U.S. media, and additionally, whether modern cinema is perpetuating Asian male stereotypes of the past or perpetuating new portrayals. The present study seeks to fill these gaps.

### Outline of Study

The films being tested for perpetrating viewpoints are the four mainstream modern films: *Crazy, Rich Asians* (2018), *To All the Boys I've Loved Before* (2019), *Always Be My Maybe* (2019), and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* (2020). This study lays a theoretical background in second-level agenda setting, framing, and Edward Said's concept of Orientalism and othering, all of which are outlined in his work (1979). The study then expands on past literature which tested media influence on public perception. The study continues further to discuss methodology and outlines the pretest and survey instrument for Study Part 2.

## **Chapter Two: Literature Review**

### Theory and Western Asian Representation

#### *Framing Theory*

Media framing is arguably one of the most important factors contributing to how the public views certain topics in society. Erving Goffman expands on his concept of framing through his book *Frame analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience* (1974). In his work, Goffman elaborates on what he defines as a “strip,” or the piece of information relative to a frame of access, and the “frame,” which constitutes as how audiences will take information and interpret the information given (Goffman, 1974). Although Ervin Goffman is attributed as the creator of the theory itself, it was Bateson who expanded the idea of the frame into “any message” perpetuated (Bateson, 1977/1972). Through the eyes of Bateson, framing theory is the theory that holds two feature tenets: where the media is defined as having a frame (the media through which and from an audience is viewing), and an audience (those who are doing the viewing and interpreting) (Bateson, 1977/1972). Bateson’s frame is comparatively similar to picture frames due to the nature of audiences only being able to perceive the image by what is confined within its parameters. Study part one applies this concept of framing to analyze how East Asian males are portrayed in the romantic comedy films analyzed. Through this, the author defined the seven key traits outlined in Appendix A.

## *Agenda Setting*

Defined by Cobb and Elder in 1972, agenda setting as a theory consists of the basic principal that the media tell audience members what's important, setting the agenda for what the public sees to be the most prominent issues in society (McCombs, 2018). Where first-level agenda setting describes the political action of telling audiences what should be considered important, second-level agenda setting takes this a step further in describing how the agenda influences the public and their own agenda (Cobb and Elder, 1972; McCombs, 2018). As audiences take in the media that they consume, second-level agenda setting describes how the media begin to alter the perceptions of the audience members through media framing, emphasizing that the media also tell audience members in what ways to perceive the content externally from the media (McCombs, 2018). In this way, audiences can gain their contexts from the frames of messages potentially being unable to use a different train of thinking to interpret information outside of the frame (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). Building off of framing theory, Study Part 2 takes Study Part 1 a step further in testing whether perceptions of Asians in modern cinema match the agenda shown through the frames of the films analyzed.

In a 1992 study by Armstrong, Neuendorf, & Brentar, there was found a large correlation between audience exposures to television content that reinforced stereotypes and real-world racial perceptions outside of the screen (Mastro et. al, 2009). In this way, the films that audiences watch have the ability to change or generate belief systems about race on a large scale, whether positively or negatively. Sarah Tracy writes that creative art has the ability to spur social changes (2018). Specifically, she cites how one film changed the entire social stigma of a medical practice by simply bringing it to light on the big screens (Tracy, 2018). In the same way, and

perhaps on a larger scale, modern cinema through specific genres has the ability to spur movement or allow beliefs to remain stagnant.

### *Orientalism & Other Mentality*

In his book *Orientalism*, Edward Said expands on the concept that western media have often portrayed Asian parties through the frame of “the other,” portraying them as a distanced from the west in a way that is not part of the western whole (1979). In describing the portrayal of Asians as other, he describes western media as alienating the Asian minority and defining traits that western media attribute to Asians (Said, 1979). The perpetuated image of Asians through the othering perspective aligns directly with emergence stereotypes not only of Asians being inadequate in social skills and sexually, but also the emergence of the model minority myth, which explains the depiction of Asians to be those who work hard, are diligent in mind and tasks, and competent in technology (Huynh & Woo, 2014; Chou & Feagin, 2008; Eng, 2001; Lee & Joo, 2018). While the model minority frame is a stereotype that portrays Asians to be “diligent, hardworking, technologically competent, and mathematically skilled” (Joo, et. al, 2018 p. 655; Cohen, 1992; Delener & Neelankavil, 1990; Taylor & Lee, 1994; Taylor et. al 1995; Taylor & Stern, 1997), studies suggest that model minority myth beliefs are also empirically connected to stereotypes of social inadequacy and sexual impotency; that those who perceive Asians through the trait of success are also inclined to perceive “Asian Americans as socially incompetent” (Wong et al., 2012 p. 77; Fiske et al., 2002; Lin et al., 2005; Ho & Jackson, 2001; Huynh & Woo, 2014; Chou & Feagin, 2008; Eng, 2001). Second level agenda setting tells us that media depiction has the power to iterate how the audience perceives external content, including racial attributes. There are many popular American films that depict Asians through the frames of model minority, as well as emphasize Asian male characters as having specific traits such as

intense diligence (traits that emphasize Asians as pushing to achieve economic or scholarly success), or social incompetence (which are traits that render Asians to be awkward or unsuccessful in social situations). Asians have also been depicted through the perpetual foreigner stereotype, which are frames that display the character(s) as massively attached to their original culture and hence being unable to assimilate (Wong et. al, 2012; Lee et al., 2009). A few of the films that frame Asian males in ways such as these are *The Hangover* (Phillips, 2009), *Sixteen Candles* (Hughes, 1984), and *Harold and Kumar Go to White Castle* (Liener, 2004).

The 2002 film *Better Luck Tomorrow* expertly portrays the model minority archetypes while striving to take audiences beyond these external frames (Lin). Within the film, main character Ben Manibag is introduced as diligent, hard-working, nerdy, and at the start of the film has no hope in dating the popular girl—until he offers to help her with her classes, often getting pushed under the bus for his meek and unobtrusive behavior until becoming “cool” (Lin, 2002). In the *Harold & Kumar Go to White Castle* film trailer, the first character is introduced as Harold, a Korean-American character who "never got too far with the ladies" (Leiner 2007; Youtube, 2011), then proceeds to create an awkward encounter between himself and a beautiful woman in the elevator (Leiner, 2007). Despite being in one of the lead roles for the film, further in the trailer John Cho still gets introduced as “starring that Asian guy from American Pie” rather than his full name (Leiner, 2007; Youtube, 2011). More recently, even Glenn, Steven Yeun’s character in *The Walking Dead*, a gory and predominantly masculine-associated series, is at first presented as meek and unassuming until later growing into someone who is able to survive in the apocalyptic land until, spoiler, his untimely demise in season 7 at the hands of a burly and masculine antagonist (Darabont et. al 2010).

## Modern Mainstream Representation

It wasn't until more recently that Hollywood and other mainstream U.S. media have been introducing more Asian representation with shows such *Fresh off the Boat*, and romantic comedy films such as *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* and of course, *Crazy Rich Asians*. Although Asian representation on mainstream screens has arguably gotten better within the last twenty years, there have still been criticisms from those who are seeking a more inclusive scope of representation; there is no guarantee that these portrayals alone are helping to eradicate the stereotypes of past film portrayal, and some portrayals still tend to play into these previously defined roles. In a 2018 interview regarding being cast in roles, actor John Cho states that sometimes he feels like Moses, who, while watching the tribe walk into Canaan, "is prevented from going in" (*The Daily Beast*, 2017). "But one day," he continues, "there will be an Asian James Bond, or Batman..." he states after iterating that "it's all going to happen after I'm too old to take any of these roles" (*The Daily Beast*, 2017). If media portrayals neglect to expand externally from previous media agendas, Asian actors can feel the pressure of being unable to find work in more diverse roles. Michelle Yooh, actress in *Crazy Rich Asians*, states that Asian representation is getting better and that it's about time, yet, there is still room for improvement in equaling diversity (*South China Morning Post*, 2019). This is where the textual analysis of the *Crazy Rich Asians*, *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, *Always Be My Maybe*, and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* comes in. Because media often bring to light truths that may otherwise go uncovered—what are the East Asian traits that modern cinema shows are still being perpetuated today? Or, have portrayals of East Asian men on the U.S. cinematic screen changed completely?



### *Study Part 1 Research Questions*

Study part 1 focuses on two main primary research questions.

RQ1: What traits of East Asian males are embedded in the frames of modern cinematic portrayals, specifically in the films *Crazy Rich Asians*, *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, *Always Be My Maybe*, and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You*?

RQ2: Which traits, if any, defined from the 2012 study by Wong et. al are embedded in the frames of modern cinematic portrayals, specifically in the films *Crazy Rich Asians*, *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, *Always Be My Maybe*, and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You*?

### Media and External Perception of Asian Males

Although “model minority” media stereotypes have traits that can be perceived as positive, there has also been an overpowering amount of Asian American representations perpetuated by the media that are “mostly negative, unfavorable, and unflattering” (Zhang, 2010 p. 21; Paek & Shah, 2003; Ramasubramanian, 2007), and even when the media set an agenda of “favorable” stereotypical portrayals of Asians, it can unleash negative effects (Zhang, 2010, Cheryan & Monin, 2005; S. Lee, 1996; Suzuki, 1989, 2002; Taylor et al., 2005). When the media predominantly expose audience members to images of Asians being in the frames of portrayals, such as some of those defined in the 2012 study by Wong et. al, the perceptions can have real-time effects on societal beliefs about Asians and real-time outcomes. A 2010 study exploring the extent to which participants believed in stereotypical traits of Asians found that participants’ beliefs about Asian Americans aligned significantly with stereotypical media representations (lack of social skills, high in academic success, peer rejection), and that these corresponded to respondents rating their interest in initiating friendships with Asians as the lowest out of any other ethnic group (Zhang, 2010). With aligned belief systems between the mass media portrayal of Asians and the beliefs of audience member groups, further alienation was found to be created

when even friendship preference was affected negatively (Zhang, 2010). Those who perceive Asians as having traits of the “model minority” were also found to believe Asians to have better mental health in general, and believe that Asians are less likely to need clinical attention for mental health, creating a barrier between those who may need mental health treatment and those who may be afraid to break stigma (Ramasubramanian, 2011). This further alienation, when perpetuated as a media agenda, can continually create a chain of barriers between Asian males’ mental health and Western ideations.

### Media Impact on Stereotypes

It is important to mention that film exposure alone is not the sole predecessor to racial grouping perception, and that perception occurs through a multitude of different factors, including environmental factors and institutional impactors (Weaver & Wakshlag, 1986; Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior, 1972). However, there is substantial evidence that other factors noted to affect audience perception appear less influential than the mass media (Weaver & Wakshlag, 1986; Gerbner & Gross, 1976 p. 143; Gross & Morgan, 1985; Morgan, 1983), and that when individuals lack in direct experiences, they are at the most risk for believing information that has been passed on to them “interpersonally or through the mass media” (Weaver & Wakshlag, 1986 p. 143; cf. Bem, 1970; Hawkins & Pingree, 1982; Zillmann, 1979). There are several instances which hold implication for how this could affect the perception of Asian males through modern mainstream cinema. In a 2017 study exploring predetermining factors of anti-Muslim prejudice, exposure to Hollywood films were found to be empirically linked to predicting anti-Muslim prejudice, while this determining factor decreased when interpersonal interaction with Muslims increased (Ahmed, 2017). In another study by Abraham and Appiah (2006), showing images of Blacks before news

stories was found to lead viewers to hold stronger associations of Blacks with the interpersonal problems that the stories portrayed. Therefore, based on the framing of the images shown and the story thereafter, racial conclusions were drawn (Abraham & Appiah, 2006). A revealing study by Ramasubramanian (2011) found a correlation between exposure to television content, perceived Asian traits, and internalized stereotypical beliefs attributed to Asians being in the “model minority”. Studies such as these reveal substantial evidence that exposure to media which correlate with factors of racial factors or prejudice, or, the “model minority” myth, can have a palpable effect on viewers, possibly mediated by direct experiences of meaningful connection to Asian males.

#### Impact of Second-Level Agenda Setting on Asian Males

The media alienation of a race by setting strict character guidelines can not only impact external groups in palpable ways, but the internal groups portrayed as well. When audiences are exposed to the media telling them that one group is portrayed in a certain way, these attributes and mindsets can affect the portrayed groups’ self-perception. Lee and Joo articulate that “exposure to these images may create undue pressure on Asian Americans to confirm stereotype-driven expectations, consequently undermining their performance” (2018 p. 655). Lee and Joo further go on to elaborate that Asian Americans could fail in meeting preconceived expectations, and in turn “suffer lowered self-esteem” and harsher penalties than other groups (2018 p. 655). In an interview with *Vulture*, actor Steven Yeun discusses examples which confirm the idea of stereotypes and self-depiction coming full circle, describing that when he would talk to others, at times they would appear to be portraying “the Asian that they think America is telling them they’re supposed to be, and they don’t even know it” (*Vulture*, 2017). In *Better Luck Tomorrow*, Ben and his friends often discuss the negative impacts the model minority myth has on their own

group of friends, discussing the pressures of jobs, getting into good colleges, and maintaining their image all the while hiding their behind-the-scenes rebellious life, showing the impact of the myth on the characters portrayed (Lin, 2002).

In the study by Wong et. al, Asian males' perceived external stereotypes of themselves corresponded directly to the model minority myth and Edward Said's explanation of the other, showing that through the society they were surrounded in, the external evidence was enough for Asian male respondents to feel that these stereotypes were being perpetuated about themselves (2012; 1979). These perceptions can have major consequences (Zhang, 2010; Cheryan & Monin, 2005; Lee, 1996; Suzuki, 1989, 2002; Taylor et al., 2005). The study found that Asian male participants who believed that external groups perceived Asian stereotypes as having traits attributed to the other, ("perpetual foreigners, intensely diligent, and sexually or romantically inadequate"), were found to be at a higher risk of having depressive symptoms than those who believed that others perceived Asians in different categories (Wong et. al, 2012 p. 84; Suzuki, 2002).

When it came to *Crazy Rich Asians*, director Jon Chu stated that the entire cast and crew felt a sense of purpose in the creation of the film: to expand from representation that they've experienced through screens in the past (*Variety*, 2018). When an entire minority group is reduced to a singular "myth," it reduces depth to the truths and struggles that a minority can actually face. On commenting about Asian representation, John Cho elaborates what a change in past Asian representation entails:

It's really about seeing Asian-Americans as full-fledged human beings, rather than some function in a narrative, or the sidekick, or the extraneous character in another person's story. That we have agency, and souls, and desires...there is something important about

cinema, and television... for people of color to see themselves in popular culture, because it reinforces the notion that we have a place here (*The Daily Beast*, 2017).

Acclaimed actress Michelle Yoo said in a 2018 interview that to her, “real representation means you have a meaningful character that has hopes and dreams” (Today). Today, modern cinema such as *Crazy Rich Asians* provides opportunities to create reality checks through both presenting, and potentially removing, the shallow “model-minority” stereotypes to extend beyond the depictions. In her interview, Michelle continues that she believes *Crazy Rich Asians* “really shows the other side of the Asians to our friends around the world” (Today, 2018).

### Modern Cinema and the Portrayal of Asian Males

Within the last two years, more films have emerged which portray Asian male characters. Study Part 1 was conducted by the author analyzing mainstream modern cinema to define traits found to be common among East Asian male characters through the frames of romantic comedies. Four films, *Crazy, Rich Asians* (2018), *To All the Boys I've Loved Before* (2018), *Always Be My Maybe* (2019), and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* (2020), were explored to determine traits portrayed as commonalities among East Asian male characters and East Asian male characters spoken into prominence by other characters. As a base, Study Part 1 used Wong et. al's predefined stereotypes, many of which align directly to the “model minority” portrayal: Interpersonal deficits, Unflattering physical attributes, Sexual/romantic inadequacies, Intense diligence, Physical ability distortions, Intelligence, and Perpetual foreigner (2012), to see if the comedy portrayals deviated from or coincided with the traits. Traits that were commonalities could only be added if two or more characters were shown as having the traits. The analysis revealed that all seven of the Wong et. al study traits were commonalities among East Asian male characters, and found six new traits that were found to be prominent among East Asian male

characters (2012). Among the six new traits were several counterparts to Wong et. al's defined traits, including Flattering physical attributes, Social adequacies, and Sexual/Romantic adequacies (2012). The remaining three traits found were Materialistic qualities, Subordinate Traits, and Hyper-sexualized Tendencies. Table A1 and Table A2 in Appendix A outline both the Wong et. al defined traits and Study Part 1 defined traits as well as their characteristics in detail (2012).

The theory of agenda setting outlines that exposure to certain media tell audience members what to think about various fields externally from the media itself—this includes audience perception of racial attributes. The previous literature has suggested evidence that those who have little or no understanding of the content that the media is outlining must rely on the frames through which they are viewing the subject (Oh, 2017). In an experiment conducted by Tamborini et. al, groups that were exposed to an external stimulus (crime documentary and unresolved crime dramas) were found to have more exaggerated beliefs that the documentary and drama perpetuated (1984). In a similar way, mainstream cinematic content carries the unique ability to both bring light to, change, or exaggerate stereotypes, yet in doing so, also carry the weight of the inherent exaggeration of comedy impacting audiences in often unidentified ways. Because Study Part 1 found characters depicted through new characteristics, some of which were traits commonly attributed as positive, modern cinema could be introducing a more diverse influx of Asian male character traits leading to positive implications for the perception of Asian males. Although six new traits apart from Wong et. al's traits were defined through watching the films, the implication with still finding all of the traits defined by Wong et. al's study from 2012 in 2018 through 2020 mainstream cinema shows us that despite moving forward in new portrayals, the modern representation of Asian males may still be holding onto portrayals of the

past. If modern cinema continues to push an agenda that remains consistent with past frames, it could have further negative impacts on the Western Asian male community. If this is the case, in what ways could exposure to modern cinema be influencing the Western perception of Asian males?

### Study Part 2 Hypotheses

This chapter has outlined the literature review of the Study Part 1 and Study Part 2. The next chapter will provide the methodology prepared to answer the research questions proposed and to test the hypotheses presented. Based on previous research, the following hypotheses will be tested in part two of this study.

H1: Exposure to media portrayals of Asian males in modern cinema will produce stronger perceptions of stereotypical traits.

H2: Less frequent interactions with Asian males will produce stronger perceptions of stereotypical traits.

H3: Exposure to media portrayals of Asian males in modern cinema and less frequent interactions with Asian males will produce the strongest perceptions of stereotypical traits.

## Chapter Three: Methodology

### Study Part 1

#### *Procedure*

The film *Crazy Rich Asians* is adapted from Kevin Kwan's novel, *Crazy Rich Asians* (2013), who explains his novel as "satirical" and "high parody" (*Reuters*, 2013). Linda Hutcheon states that "parody and metacinema may be one answer for an Asian American film industry that both aspires to the big time and is loath to surrender its oppositional edge," continuing that parody both brings to light ideologies and undermines them in authentic ways (1989, p. 50; Hillenbrand, 2008). In this way, romantic comedies have the ability to call into light the processes of representation as well as distinguish what ideologies formed to shape them (Hutcheon, 1989; Hillenbrand, 2008).

Using the theory of framing, this study performs a textual analysis on modern cinema offering East Asian male representation through the framing of romantic comedy: *Crazy Rich Asians*, *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, *Always Be My Maybe*, and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* to determine frames which are arguably commonalities among East Asian male representations. The author looks at framing through spoken dialogue and video imagery of East Asian male characters throughout the films to describe East Asian men. For this study, East Asian male characters that are analyzed are those with speaking roles and those talked about by other characters who pose significant implication. Speaking roles for this study are regarded as characters who can be seen speaking directly on camera. As a base, this study uses Asian male



stereotypes perceived by college Asian American males defined by Wong et. al in 2012, testing to see if the films play along with perceived stereotype ideas or create new common traits among East Asian male characters. Because Wong et. al's study was carried out in 2012, it has given enough time for changes to occur in the film setting which could either accompany or dismantle previous stereotype ideas. The categories, definitions, and examples within Table A1 are borrowed from Wong et. al elaborating the framing the researcher utilizes as a base for their study (2012).

The author uses the stereotype bases of Impersonal deficits, Intelligence, Intense diligence, Unflattering physical attributes, Physical ability distortions, Perpetual foreigner, and Sexual/romantic inadequacies to see if Asian male characters from each of the four films fit into these roles or fall into other categories (Wong et. al, 2012). For every character that falls outside of these categories, a category is added during axial coding to accommodate their primary characteristics as well as statistics of the number of characters in each category. In the results, the trait recorded had to occur within at least two separate characters for the trait to be considered significant enough to for a new prominent category to be added. It should be noted that when a character fell into more than one of these categories, they were added to each accordingly.

The films *To All the Boys I've Loved Before* and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* have small-role East Asian male characters on screen for a very short duration, therefore, these two films were watched fully through twice. However, the parts of these two films which involve East Asian male characters were watched and analyzed 5 times each. During the full two times, the researcher took part in open coding where the researcher took note of East Asian male characters, preformed open coding, and took note of the time codes that the East Asian males appeared. During this stage, the researcher took note of and organized key character traits into

the existing Wong et. al stereotypes or developed new categories for those needed (2012). Then, beginning at ten seconds before the characters' recorded time stamps and ending ten seconds after, the researcher watched the scenes to confirm that the determined traits accurately portrayed the character framing within the film. After this, the researcher watched the time stamps of the characters in this way two final times, which was the selective coding phase where the researcher took note of supporting dialogue for the noted depiction of East Asian males.

The films *Always Be My Maybe* and *Crazy Rich Asians* were each watched 5 times. The first two times were the open coding stages where the researcher took note of East Asian male characters, time codes, and general trait characteristics. The researcher then compiled the notes and partook in axial coding. During this stage, the researcher accordingly took note of and organized key character traits into the existing Wong et. al stereotypes or developed new categories for those needed, the film watched through twice during this stage for accuracy (2012). The researcher watched the films a third time to confirm that the determined traits accurately portrayed the character framing within the films. The final two times watching the film were the selective coding phase where the researcher will took note of key framing and dialogue representing and depicting East Asian males in the frame, the film watched through twice through this stage for accuracy.

### *Study Part 1 Research Questions*

Study part 1 will focuses on two main primary research questions as mentioned previously:

RQ1: What traits of East Asian males are embedded in the frames of modern cinematic portrayals, specifically in the films *Crazy Rich Asians*, *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, *Always Be My Maybe*, and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You*?

RQ2: Which traits, if any, defined from the 2012 study by Wong et. al are embedded in the frames of modern cinematic portrayals, specifically in the films *Crazy Rich Asians*, *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, *Always Be My Maybe*, and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still*

## *Love You?*

### Study Part 2

#### *Procedure*

Before this quasi-experiment is conducted, a pretest will be conducted with a sample pulled from a class at the University of South Florida who will answer survey questions regarding what they believe the cinematic clips are perpetuating about Asian males. They will be shown 4 film clips depicting Asian males consolidated into one viewing experience: one clip from *Crazy, Rich Asians*, one from *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, one from *Always Be My Maybe*, and one from *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You*. After viewing the video online, they will then be given the survey. This survey will be utilized as what the clips from the cinema analyzed in Study Part 1 portraying, and if the students perceive the traits defined in the conducted textual analysis as being perpetuated. Therefore, the study questions in this pretest will portray a scale of the traits defined in Study Part 1. The survey instrument is available in Appendix B. Students who participated in the pretest were instructed not to participate in the Study survey.

#### *Manipulation Check Results*

The manipulation check demonstrated that students significantly perceived the clips as perpetuating Asian males as Hard-working, Intelligent, and Standing out. This resulted in an “Other traits” section to emerge with the three traits having a Cronbach’s alpha of .740. A set of negatively perceived traits emerged with 7 items and a Cronbach’s alpha of .790. The Other traits were more varied, possibly because items such as “intelligent” are difficult to say whether they are “positive” or “negative.” Based on these findings, it is possible that the video will serve to increase the Other perceptions in the experiment among those who watch vs. those who do

not. The traits removed from the final sets were Attractive and Socially keen due to inconclusive results.

Table 1. Manipulation Check: Negative Perceptions

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.790	7

Negative Perceptions

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
N I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be materialistic.	2.82	.983	33
N I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be subordinate.	2.94	1.298	33
N I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be sexualized.	2.36	.994	33
N I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be physically undesirable.	2.52	1.228	33
N I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be socially awkward.	3.45	1.063	33
N I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be romantically undesirable.	2.79	1.269	33
N I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be weak.	2.76	1.119	33

Table 2. Manipulation Check: Other Perceptions

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.740	3

Other Perceptions

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
P I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be hard-working.	3.27	.944	33
P I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be intelligent.	3.45	.905	33
P I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males as standing out.	3.12	.992	33

Table 3. Manipulation Check: One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
NEGPERCEPTIONS	33	2.8052	.75998	.13230
OTHERPOSPERCEPTIONS	33	3.2828	.76884	.13384

Table 4. Manipulation Check: One-Sample Test

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
NEGP	21.204	32	.000	2.80519	2.5357	3.0747
OTHERPOSPE	24.528	32	.000	3.28283	3.0102	3.5554

*Procedure Pt. 2*

A control group (O) was given the Study survey with no exposure to the study intervention (the same video in the Pretest compiled with clips from the films Crazy, Rich Asians, To All the Boys I’ve Loved Before, Always Be My Maybe, and To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You.) A treatment group was asked the same questions after exposure to the study intervention (X). These groups were conducted at the same time using a survey flow structure which split participants evenly among the two groups. The sample was chosen from a group of University of South Florida Mass Communications students, who, given their area of research, had been exposed to a multitude of differing media, diversifying the sample pool. Three statements pertaining to each trait were given to the sample through the means of an online survey approach to agree or disagree with, with the exception of Intelligence, which was given two statements based off of examples by Wong et. al (2012). Survey questions in Section 3 use the structure and were adapted from a study by Ahmed (2017), and Section 4 questions incorporate the structure from the Scale of Anti-Asian American Stereotypes developed by Lin et. al (2005).

### *Study Part 2 Hypotheses*

The previous section outlined the methodology for Study Part 2. Based on previous research, the following hypotheses will be tested in part two of this study.

H1: Exposure to media portrayals of Asian males in modern cinema correlates to stronger perceptions of stereotypical traits.

H2: Less frequent interactions with Asian males correlates to stronger perceptions of stereotypical traits.

H3: Exposure to media portrayals of Asian males in modern cinema and less frequent interactions with Asian males will correlate to the strongest perceptions of stereotypical traits.

## **Chapter Four: Results**

### Study Part 1

#### *Common Traits*

A total of 27 East Asian male characters were analyzed. All of the traits defined by Wong et. al's study were found in at least two characters portrayed. The traits defined by Wong et. al (2012) and number of characters with the traits, ranked in order of number of characters portrayed are as follows: Interpersonal deficits (9), Unflattering physical attributes (6), Sexual/romantic inadequacies (6), Intense diligence (4), Physical ability distortions (3), Intelligence (2), and Perpetual foreigner (2).

Depicting five or more characters each, six traits were identified through the coding process. The traits found and number of characters with the traits, ranked in order of number of characters portrayed are as follows: Materialistic qualities (13), Subordinate traits (10), Hyper-Sexualized tendencies (7), Flattering physical attributes (7), Social adequacies (7), and Sexual/Romantic adequacies (5). *Please see Table 2 at the end of the document for definitions of traits, meanings, and examples.*

There were four prominent traits that were identified that were not included as prominent character traits with one character depiction each. These traits were Leadership capabilities, Overt drug use, Humility, and General dishonesty.

One character was unable to be categorized as having prominent traits despite having lines, which was Russell Wong in *Crazy, Rich Asians* (Cho, 2018). It is uncertain if the character



had been onscreen longer if he would have traits that would be categorized as Wong et. al or newly defined traits (2012).

### *Frames Depicting Subordinate Traits*

The first film analyzed was *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, which has one Asian speaking character. The film features a scene from *Sixteen Candles* where Long Duk Dong is reacting intensely to a calm white man knocking at the door (Hughes, 1984; Johnson, 2018). The only East Asian male speaking character in *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, Long Duk Dong is portrayed as beat up and screaming with a heavy Asian accent, all traits that correspond to Wong et. al's defined types: Physical ability distortions, Interpersonal deficits, and Perpetual foreigner (2012). While watching the scene with Long Duk Dong, Peter, the primary love interest of the film's main character, Lara Jean, inquires of Lara Jean and her younger sister about the film being "extremely racist" (Johnson, 2018). Where Long Duk Dong is the only Asian male in a film about an Asian lead and her dating habits, he is portrayed only as a side character and is portrayed through unflattering frames. This film was the first analyzed that portrayed East Asian males framed by subordinate traits racially, physically, and romantically.

A trend of subordination in various factors was evident throughout the coding process. The main character of *Always Be My Maybe* is Marcus Kim, a Korean American who is part of a duo air conditioning team with his dad called "Harry" in big letters and in small letters, "and son" (Khan, 2019). The words are visible as their van drives up to their onscreen air-conditioning gig, highlighting that even in their small home company, Marcus isn't prominent enough to have his own name on the van. Marcus is a member of a band "that could really be something" as stated his friend at the time Sasha (2019). This being so, his own girlfriend still stated that she would kill him first in a game of intense truth or dare because other players' cultural footprints were

much bigger and influential than his, and she just "couldn't do that to the world" (2020). Marcus is juxtaposed often with Keanu Reeves, who throughout the film at one point steals both of his love interests, tells Marcus he should embrace his "mediocre nothingness," and explains that Marcus couldn't possibly pay for their meal at an expensive restaurant by cupping Marcus' face in a belittling demeanor and telling him that "it's okay" (Khan, 2019). The framing in the latter scene shows main character Marcus as a puppy, lower than Keanu Reeves and holding an expression of beyond belief. All of these instances highlight that Marcus is an example of someone lesser in society economically, romantically, and sociologically.

*Crazy Rich Asians* also introduces frames of subordination. Main character Nick is seemingly in control of his life, until looking deeper and realizing that even he isn't in control of who he can marry. His father was able to marry someone his mother didn't approve of by forging his own ring for her. Despite Nick's forging his own ring for his love interest, Rachel, she denies him. His mother later realizes that because she made sure that Nick could only choose between herself, who hated Rachel, or choose Rachel and leave the family, Nick could not mix both options like he wished. For this reason Rachel "chose for him," as described by Nick's mother, and denies his proposal (Chu, 2018). Despite trying to break out of the mold of familial dominance and running away from his grandmother when she tells him if he follows Rachel he "can never come back," Nick only gets a green light to marry Rachel once his mother approves the marriage, gives Nick her family ring, and Rachel, seeing the ring of his mother's approval, decides to accept (Chu, 2018).

There is a trend in the film of familial and financial hierarchy, and even Colin, a secondary character and Nick's best friend and groom to be, states that the choosing of his best man was not his choice to decide (2019). A director and his assistant in the beginning of the film

show the financial inability to fire a horrible actress from their set because she is the girlfriend of the man who is financing the entire film (Chu, 2018).

Michael in this film is another character enveloped in these frames, his framing similar to Marcus. Despite being a CEO of a company, he is portrayed as neither rich nor famous, with everyone in society knowing that his wife wears “the money pants in this family” (Chu, 2018). While in the midst of an affair, Michael tells his wife he’s tired nothing he does mattering. His wife breaks down in tears at this while Michael walks away coldly. At the end of the film, despite Michael making decisions to move out and making plans to see his son, his ex-wife denies him and lays down the rules for visitation rights, leaving him after saying she can’t make him a man (Chu, 2018). This leaves Michael staring after her, the frame showing a visual of Michael staring at himself in a mirror alone as a result of his sins born out of familial, financial, and social subordination to his wife. *Crazy Rich Asians* was analyzed as having 5 male characters with subordinate traits, *Always Be My Maybe* was analyzed as having 4 characters with subordinate traits, and *To All the Boys I’ve Loved Before* was analyzed as having one character with subordinate traits.

### *Materialistic Qualities*

In its title, *Crazy Rich Asians* associates its characters with two major character types: Interpersonal deficits and Material wealth. Overt association with material wealth encompasses the framing of 62.5% of prominent East Asian male actors in the film. In this film, these are characters who, often, in addition to being rich as a large portion of their character development, are overtly concerned with others’ material wealth or items. One of these characters is Nick’s cousin Eddie, a character who a wealthy man with a family of three boys shown multiple times throughout the film. He is first introduced as a man who cares about his image more than looking

natural, scolding his wife for wearing a dress that would get them into *Chinese Vogue* instead of *American Vogue* (Chu, 2018). Later, Eddie is seen at an extravagant party giving Nick advice about his commoner girlfriend, Rachel, telling Nick starkly that he doesn't have to keep his girlfriend happy because she's "just lucky to be here" (Chu, 2018). He goes on to prompt Collin with asking if he thinks Collin's father would be financing their wedding for millions of dollars if Collin's fiancé's "parents didn't own a billion-dollar resort chain" (Chu, 2018). The entirety of Nick's family is framed in a halo of wealth from their own scenes and in scenes of others, a prominent line being by Piek Lin's explaining "these people are not just rich, okay? They're crazy rich" (Chu, 2018).

Traits of materialistic qualities are not just portrayed in Nick's family, but in other characters of the film as well. Jeweler Calvin offers to let his earrings go at cost for \$1.2 million dollars because the person wearing them would be good for his publicity (Chu, 2018).

Photographer 2 stood photographing two girls at Collin's wedding event until Rachel arrived, after which he told the two to move out of the way while he took pictures of Rachel, commenting on her beautiful dress (Chu, 2018).

*Always Be My Maybe* followed this trend with characters Harry, Keanu Reeves, and Sasha's father. After years of not seeing Sasha, the first question Harry, the father of Marcus who was her childhood crush, asks her is a smiling "How much money do you have now?" (Khan, 2019). When she laughs the question off, Marcus tells her that his father's not joking. In a similar way, Keanu's character is one encompassed by prominent financial wealth. He pays a \$6,000 check for their party to eat at a fancy restaurant, takes Sasha and her friends to his extravagantly large apartment, and recommends a suit shop to Marcus where the first suit Marcus tries on is over \$12,000 (Khan, 2019). Sasha's parents and father are first described

through the frame that their worst fear in life is that their daughter would have to tip someone (Khan, 2019). Similar to Harry, after not seeing Sasha for a long time, the first question her father asks her directly is if she had to pay someone a tip for her ride from the airport. This is continued throughout the film, and the final gift her father and his wife give to Sasha is telling her that to support her, they paid full price at one of her restaurants (Khan, 2019). Sasha responds in denial, and they pull out a receipt to show her proof of their spending (Khan, 2019).

### *Hyper-Sexualized Traits*

Within *Crazy Rich Asians* and *Always Be My Maybe*, Hyper-sexualized qualities are also prominent. These are frames where obscene gestures, language, suggestive camera angles, or suggestive scenes are utilized. In *Crazy Rich Asians*, Nick has three shirtless scenes and two intimate scenes in bed with his girlfriend. In one of his shirtless scenes, the set lighting casts directly on his lower abdomen while he takes off his shirt. In another instance, Nick stands starkly leaning on a wall post as his girlfriend focusses her glasses on his midriff, after which he crawls on top of her in bed for the second time in the film. In addition to physical tendencies, other characters add to these frames through their dialogue. The last two lines of the film are directed toward Nick and his fiancé hugging as an onlooker in the crowd prompts them, “make babies! Make babies” (Chu, 2018).

Characters Colin and his relative Bernard also fall into these frames. Colin has two scenes with his top exposed, one shot of which his abs stand as a focal background, and another where his torso serves as the focal lower third. At Collin’s party, Bernard stands with an exposed midriff and announces over the whole party that Colin has to get a massage or they’d shave his “coo coo chara” (Chu, 2018). In response, the whole party chants the phrase (Chu, 2018). Bernard later is come onto by a woman rumored to be a porn actress. She places his hands on her

hips, and later they blatantly stumble into a shot where Bernard has lost all of his clothing except golden underpants. He stands dumbfounded in front of flashing press cameras. Alastair, another member of the family, had previously been involved with the same woman, dancing in obscene positions with her in public (Chu, 2018).

Both Michael and Goh's characters also fall into hyper-sexualized traits. Michael is introduced by a camera shot where he is in the shower, an extreme close-up being utilized on water running down his back, arms, stomach, and chest until finally panning up to his face. Later in the scene he remains shirtless, the scene ending with intimate kissing between himself and his wife.

Later in the film, character Goh is seen making obscene gestures with his hand and later seen climbing on top of his wife in front of multiple people and implying that he wants to have sex with her "just right here, right now" (Chu, 2018).

In *Always Be My Maybe*, Marcus is also portrayed through these traits. He is involved in two sex scenes, is the subject of multiple sexual comments, and makes a joke about his own man part (Khan, 2019).

*Flattering physical attributes, Sexual/Romantic adequacies,  
& Their Counterparts*

There are a handful of characters who are portrayed through Flattering physical attributes: physical or phenotypical attributes that are generally considered attractive, and Sexual/Romantic adequacies: adequacies in "sexual functioning or in romantic relationships" (Adapted from Wong et. al, 2012; also seen Table A1). In *Crazy Rich Asians*, 25% of prominent East Asian males are portrayed with Flattering physical attributes. These are characters who are portrayed with physically attractive characteristics including but not limited to having visible ab

muscles, bright smiles, and muscular frames. In the same film, characters portrayed by Wong et. al's defined trait of Unflattering physical attributes sit at 18% (2012). Two East Asian male characters in this film are shown as having Sexual/Romantic adequacies (both Colin and Nick, who have standing and visibly healthy long-term relationships). Nick is also viewed as someone desired by many. This contrasts with the film's four characters shown with Wong et. al's characteristics of Sexual/Romantic inadequacies. These are characters in the film shown as those who overtly could not maintain steady relationships or are framed as disloyal lovers. Examples of this are Michael, who is having an affair, and both Alastair and Eddie, who are in relationships in the film but are seen cozying up with other women. Despite being rich, Alastair's girlfriend ends up leaving him for someone richer, showing that she only loved him for his money. Also, in these frames is P.T., a young man whose first sentence to main character Rachel is a whispered "I love you" (Chu, 2018).

Both *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* and *Always Be My Maybe* have characters with Sexual/Romantic adequacies and Flattering physical attributes. *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You's* secondary character Trevor is tall and handsome, and eventually is seen hanging out with Lara Jean's best friend as a potential love interest. Later in the film they are seen together three times, Trevor arriving to have lunch with her with a rose in his mouth on Valentine's day (Fimognari, 2020).

In *Always Be My Maybe*, there is a mixture of those with Sexual/Romantic adequacies, Flattering physical attributes, and their counterparts. There is an even number of those in this film who are portrayed with Sexual/Romantic adequacies and Sexual/Romantic inadequacies. Marcus and Brandon are those who fall into the category of Sexual/Romantic inadequacies. Marcus goes from being portrayed as a man at eighteen who has the same condom from seventh

grade health class to a man who lost both of his previous girlfriends to someone more romantically adequate. There is a scene with a distinct juxtaposition between Marcus and Keanu, where on a double date Keanu whispers to Sasha “you look gorgeous” (Khan, 2019). In the next few shots with a mirrored composition from those with Keanu, Marcus tries to mimic Keanu’s suaveness, during which his own girlfriend ignores his less romantic words and gestures by focusing only on Keanu (Khan, 2019). Sasha’s second love interest, Brandon, despite being portrayed with Flattering physical attributes such as being fit and having a nice smile, is broken up with by Sasha and is described by her as being in love with self-centered “sexy, handsome, chiseled statue of a Korean Eric from The Little Mermaid” (Khan, 2019).

Keanu and Harry, the characters with Sexual/Romantic adequacies, are both seen with multiple successful love interests. Keanu, first with Sasha and then with picking up Marcus’ ex-girlfriend, and Harry, who is widowed and seen kissing and dating a Diana Ross impersonator.

#### *Social Adequacies & Interpersonal Deficits*

Throughout the four films, nine characters display Interpersonal deficits and seven display Social adequacies. *Crazy Rich Asians* leads the numbers with five characters portrayed with frames perpetuating Interpersonal deficits. These are characters such as Alastair, who is shown inappropriately touching or making out with someone publicly in almost every scene in which he is portrayed; Bernard, who is described as a “human douchenozzle” and frequently makes others upset in conversation; and Eddie, who also makes people angry in social settings by his off-kilter comments (Chu, 2018). Eddie is seen making others so annoyed at an upscale party that all those surrounding him have moved apart from him and out of frame, and even his wife leaves his arm once the others have left (Chu, 2018). P.T. takes to taking pictures of people



at odd times, rather than starting conversations. As previously noted, the film's title encompasses the stereotype of Social deficits by associating Asians with being crazy.

*Crazy Rich Asians* also portrays characters with Social adequacies: those who are charming, conversationally keen, and have a large social circle. These are characters such as Nick, a character who is charming conversationally and knows how to successfully navigate his broad social circle. Another character who possesses this trait is Olli, a relative of Nick's who is in charge of providing anything the family asks for. He provides items from golden koi to a team who could promptly give Rachel a complete makeover, showing that not only is Olli socially keen, but he has connections in the wider rich world who respect him. He is also asked by Nick's mother to take care of Alastair and his girlfriend after Collin's wedding when they are dancing inappropriately in the middle of the dance floor. In a matter of minutes, Olli manages to break up their dancing, have Alastair leave the floor running, and cause Alastair's film-long girlfriend to leave him for somebody else (Chu, 2018). All of these require understanding of how to implement social strategy.

*Always Be My Maybe* has an equal number of those framed with Social adequacies and Interpersonal deficits with three each. Brandon, in addition to being savvy with media presence and conversation, has over 2,000 friends on Facebook with over 100 likes on his most recent photo, 35 shares on his most recent photo, and is described as having over 27,000 followers on Instagram (Khan, 2019). Keanu knows others at the expensive restaurant he and Sasha go to for their double date and is described by Marcus's girlfriend as influential (Khan, 2019). Marcus, on the other hand, has a blunt and sarcastic nature out of place at expensive diners and suit shops, and on three separate occasions wears the wrong attire for fancy occasions. The only character marked as both having Social adequacies and Interpersonal deficits is Keanu Reeves, who

although has social influence and friends in high places, also makes comments which push Marcus over the edge such as stating that he would kill Marcus during a game that was supposed to be fun (Khan, 2019).

The film *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* is the only film analyzed without a character portrayed as having Interpersonal deficits. On the contrary, Trevor's character is one who is framed as having Social adequacies through his popularity, adequacy of knowing when to leave awkward situations, and hi-fiving of a cheering fanbase before heading off to his sports game (Fimognari, 2020). Trevor from *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* is also the only character analyzed who is framed as having Leadership capabilities (different from Intense diligence in that he is shown leading others, rather than simply propelling himself).

#### *Intense diligence*

Intense diligence is a relatively prominent trait found throughout the films, portraying 14.8% of characters analyzed. Both Nick's father and Michael are framed as characters who take business over familial affairs. Michael himself states that he hates to miss his son's birthday, but his business affair "is important" (Chu, 2018), and Brandon from *Always Be My Maybe* postpones his own wedding for a unique business opportunity (Khan, 2019). Even in *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You*, one of the only male Asian characters is seen using a megaphone prompting students to choose their school volunteer opportunities wisely because they will be representing their high school with any option they choose (Fimognari, 2020).

#### *Physical ability distortions*

The trait of Physical ability distortion was found in three characters analyzed, all of which were characters framed as weak. Despite having a muscular frame, Nick is described as someone "who can't fight for nuts" (Chu, 2018), and Marcus in *Always Be My Maybe* loses in a

fight after three seconds, only able to get a punch in when his opponent stood still and asked him to throw a punch (Khan, 2019). In addition, Long Duk Dong in *To All the Boys I've Loved Before* in his portrayed scene is disheveled and beat up with blue and swollen bruises lining his face (Hughes, 1984; Johnson, 2018).

### *Intelligence & Perpetual foreigner*

Intelligence & Perpetual foreigner each have two characters in their categories. While *Crazy Rich Asians* has no characters categorized with traits depicting Intelligence or “responses implying academic or professional success” (Wong et. al, 2012 p. 81), *Always Be My Maybe* and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* each have one character with frames of Intelligence: Keanu with profound philosophical comments that impress both Sasha and Marcus’ girlfriend (Khan, 2019), and Trevor who comments on the gradual deflation and economic implication of a U.S. \$20 bill (Fimognari, 2020).

As mentioned previously, Long Duk Dong is a character who is portrayed through the lens of Perpetual foreigner in a scene using a heavy accent and incomprehensible words. Similarly, Sasha’s father is portrayed as having a heavy accent and having an exaggerated dislike of the custom of paying tips (Khan, 2019).

### Study Part 2

Study part 2 involved the use of a quasi-experimental design to gauge audience exposure to the four films, their interaction with Asian males, and in what ways the films could be perpetuating traits about Asian males.

### *Demographics*

Data analysis began with an inspection of the demographic characteristics of the sample. Data was collected for race, gender, and age.

Table 5. Race

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Asian	25	8.5	8.6	8.6
	Black or African American	36	12.2	12.4	21.0
	Hispanic or Latino	68	23.1	23.4	44.5
	White	161	54.6	55.5	100.0
	Total	290	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.7		
Total		295	100.0		

Table 6. Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	77	26.1	26.4	26.4
	Female	215	72.9	73.6	100.0
	Total	292	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.0		
Total		295	100.0		

Table 7. Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-24	287	97.3	98.3	98.3
	25-34	3	1.0	1.0	99.3
	35-44	1	.3	.3	99.7
	45-54	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	292	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.0		
Total		295	100.0		

In terms of race, the majority of participants identify themselves as White. The second-largest group identify themselves as Hispanic or Latino, and the smallest groups were those who identified themselves as Asian, comprising 8.5% of participants. An overview of these findings are found in Table 5. A large majority of those taking this survey identify themselves as female

as shown in Table 6. Table 7 outlines the age of participants, which shows that 97.3% of participants were in the age range of 18-24 with a few participants falling above that range.

### *Descriptive Statistics*

Following examination of the demographic data, an examination of the raw mean scores for the items measured in this study was conducted. Table 10 provides the raw data for the independent variables tested in this study. Table 11 provides the raw data for the items used to measure the dependent variables in this study.

Table 8. Independent Variables: Raw Means

#### Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Have you seen the film <i>Always Be My Maybe?</i> (2019)	295	4.90	2.076
How often do you watch U.S. television shows in a theater, on television, on DVD/ other sources or streamed online/online downloads?	293	3.94	.972
Have you seen the film <i>To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You?</i> (2020)	295	3.80	2.487
Have you seen the film <i>Crazy Rich Asians?</i> (2018)	295	3.78	2.489
How often do you watch Hollywood movies in a theater, on television, on DVD/other sources or streamed online/online downloads?	295	3.37	.788
Have you seen the film <i>To All the Boys I've Loved Before?</i> (2018)	295	2.97	2.446
How often do you interact with Asian males at school?	294	2.70	1.263
How often have you seen media content portraying Asian male characters?	295	2.64	.877

Table 8: Continued

How often do you interact with Asian males elsewhere?	295	2.64	1.173
How often do you interact with Asian males on social media?	295	2.62	1.349
How often do you interact with Asian males as close friends?	295	2.45	1.484
How often do you watch Asian television shows in a theater, on television, on DVD/ other sources or streamed online/online downloads?	295	2.06	1.064
How often do you watch Asian movies in a theater, on television, on DVD/ other sources or streamed online/online downloads?	294	2.05	.857
Which media have you most often seen that portrays Asian males?	295	2.01	1.182
How often do you interact with Asian males as family members?	293	1.42	1.097
Valid N (listwise)	291		

Table 8 includes the Raw Means of the Independent Variables. Scores for Have you seen the film questions (Always Be My Maybe, To All the Boys I've Loved Before, To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You, and Crazy Rich Asians) questions were based on the following scoring system: Yes – 1 and No – 6.

Table 9. Dependent Variables: Raw Means

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Asian men are often intelligent.	293	3.71	.682
Asian men have pleasant physical features.	291	3.49	.794
Asian men function well in social situations.	293	3.45	.653
Asian men often own name brand items.	293	3.45	.782
Asian men cultivate lasting romantic relationships.	292	3.41	.665
Asian men seem to be striving to become number one.	293	3.39	.815
Asian men are conversationally keen.	293	3.38	.582
Asian men can perform sexually.	292	3.30	.681
Asian men are romantically desirable.	293	3.30	.766
Asian men have a mentality that stresses gain of finance.	293	3.30	.822
Asian men have a large social circle.	292	3.28	.649
Asian men have more economic success than other races.	292	3.25	.801
Asian men can be described as working all of the time.	293	3.20	.831
Asian men have more academic ability than other men.	293	3.19	.860
Asian men are often physically desirable.	292	3.15	.797
Asian men have mostly Asian friends.	293	3.13	.857

Table 9: Continued

Asian men stress money more than other qualities.	293	3.04	.771
Asian men achieve an above average fitness level.	293	3.04	.623
Asian men always choose their family's culture.	293	3.01	.823
Asian men are often sensual.	293	2.97	.602
Asian men are short.	293	2.95	.834
Asian men are muscular.	293	2.95	.620
Asian men have more sexual qualities than other men.	293	2.74	.708
Asian men are less demanding than other men.	293	2.74	.736
Asian men know martial arts.	292	2.74	.792
Asian men have strong accents.	293	2.60	.861
Asian men do not interact with others smoothly in social situations.	292	2.53	.700
Asian men's bodies are often exposed.	291	2.46	.814
Asian men have odd personality traits.	293	2.38	.866
Asian men are physically weak.	293	2.38	.714
Asian men are romantically incompetent.	293	2.36	.757
Asian men are often unattractive.	292	2.29	.822
Asian men do not perform well in romantic relationships.	293	2.29	.782
Asian men cannot cultivate lasting romantic relationships.	293	2.29	.812
Asian men are not in charge of their own lives.	293	2.27	.891



Table 9: Continued

Asian men have unflattering physical attributes.	292	2.24	.763
Asian men are boring.	293	2.16	.810
Asian men do not make their own decisions.	292	2.15	.830
Valid N (listwise)	280		

Table 9 includes the Raw Means of the Dependent Variables, traits about Asian men believed by participants on a 1–5 Likert scale, 1 being Strongly Disagree, 5 being Strongly Agree. The trait that was outlined as believed most by participants on average was that Asian men are often intelligent, with the trait believed least being that Asian men do not make their own decisions.

*Variables and Scales*

Following examination of the descriptive statistics, data analysis proceeded with an examination of the multi-item scales used to measure the variables of interest. The two scales developed for this study were the Asian Male Interaction Scale (AMIS) and Film Exposure Scale (FES).

Table 10. Asian Male Interaction Scale (AMIS)

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.814	.811	5

An Asian Male Interaction Scale (AMIS) was created by combining the five questions about participant Asian Male Interaction frequency to measure the possible effects of AMIS on

perceived traits with or without the mainstream cinema exposure. Upon testing the Cronbach's alpha, these were then collapsed into one variable.

*Film Exposure Scale (FES)*

To measure previous film exposure, four questions were asked to understand which (if any) of the four films analyzed in this study participants had been exposed to previously. A sum score was compiled for each individual from how many of the films the participant had watched previously. The questions were based on the following scoring system: Yes – 1 and No – 6. Therefore, a lower FES score meant that participants had watched more of the four films, while a higher FES meant that participants had been exposed to fewer of the four films.

Following the two defined scales, a rotated factor matrix was utilized to detect underlying sub-factors within Asian male stereotypes which could be sorted into composite traits.

Table 11. Perceived Asian Male Traits Rotated Factor Matrix<sup>a</sup>

	Factor						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Asian men do not perform well in romantic relationships.	.836						
Asian men cannot cultivate lasting romantic relationships.	.781						
Asian men are romantically incompetent.	.766						
Asian men cultivate lasting romantic relationships.	.533						
Asian men are boring.	.473						
Asian men are often physically desirable.		.766					

Table 11: Continued

Asian men are romantically desirable.		.696				
Asian men have pleasant physical features.		.686				
Asian men are muscular.		.617				
Asian men can perform sexually.	-.406	.506				
Asian men's bodies are often exposed.		.419				
Asian men have more sexual qualities than other men.						
Asian men have more academic ability than other men.			.738			
Asian men are often intelligent.			.699			
Asian men seem to be striving to become number one.			.674			
Asian men have more economic success than other races.			.616			
Asian men can be described as working all of the time.			.555			
Asian men always choose their family's culture.			.533			
Asian men know martial arts.			.435			
Asian men have unflattering physical attributes.				.736		
Asian men are often unattractive.		-.437		.640		
Asian men have odd personality traits.				.463		
Asian men are short.						
Asian men do not make their own decisions.					.970	

Table 11: Continued

Asian men are not in charge of their own lives.					.720	
Asian men are conversationally keen.						.716
Asian men function well in social situations.						.699
Asian men do not interact with others smoothly in social situations.						.462
Asian men have strong accents.						
Asian men have a mentality that stresses gain of finance.						.845
Asian men stress money more than other qualities.						.574

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.<sup>a</sup>

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Table 11 was utilized to detect underlying sub-factors within Asian male stereotypes. Traits that did not correlate well enough with other factors were dropped from the matrix. Because this study is experimental in nature, scores that varied below .5 were kept as to not exclude any potentially important data.

Following the rotated factors matrix, reliability tests were conducted to test the compiled factors. When tested through the below reliability tests, the Cronbach's Alphas and correlations were statistically sound.

*New Categories Defined*

Table 12. Romantic Inadequacies

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.852	.853	4

Table 13. Physical Adequacies

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.790	6

Table 14. Intense Diligence

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.807	.808	7

Table 15. General Unattractive Attributes

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.791	.797	3

Table 16. Subordinate Traits

Correlations

		Asian men do not make their own decisions.	Asian men are not in charge of their own lives.
Asian men do not make their own decisions.	Pearson Correlation	1	.750**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	292	292
Asian men are not in charge of their own lives.	Pearson Correlation	.750**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	292	293

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 17. Social Adequacies

Correlations

		Asian men are conversationally keen.	Asian men function well in social situations.
Asian men are conversationally keen.	Pearson Correlation	1	.528**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	293	293
Asian men function well in social situations.	Pearson Correlation	.528**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	293	293

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 18. Materialistic Qualities

Correlations

		Asian men have a mentality that stresses gain of finance.	Asian men stress money more than other qualities.
Asian men have a mentality that stresses gain of finance.	Pearson Correlation	1	.554**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	293	293
Asian men stress money more than other qualities.	Pearson Correlation	.554**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	293	293

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The reliability tests revealed that the statistics for the composite traits were statistically sound.

Following reliability analysis of the scales used to measure the independent and dependent variables of this study, all multi-item scales were collapsed into composite variables for hypothesis testing.

Table 19. Composite Variables

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Social Adequacies	293	3.4164	.54017
Intense Diligence	293	3.2162	.54986
Materialistic Qualities	293	3.1689	.70197

Table 19: Continued

Physical Adequacies	293	3.1067	.52153
General Unattractive Attributes	293	2.3049	.68659
Romantic Inadequacies	293	2.2756	.65802
Subordinate Traits	293	2.2065	.80614
Valid N (listwise)	293		

Of the composite traits, the traits believed most by participants about Asian men were Social adequacies, while the traits believed the least about Asian men were Subordinate traits.

*Hypothesis testing*

To test H1, one ANOVA was conducted between FES and the Composite Variables. For every film watched, 1 point was given. For every film not watched, 6 points were given. Therefore, those with 4.00 points watched every film, and those with 24.00 points watched none of the 4 films.

Table 20. FES and Composite Variables – Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Romantic	4.00	33	2.1970	.77247	.13447	1.9231	2.4709	1.00	4.00
Inadequacies	9.00	58	2.2112	.70680	.09281	2.0254	2.3971	1.00	3.75



Table 20: Continued

	14.00	66	2.3712	.61275	.07542	2.2206	2.5218	1.00	4.00
	19.00	61	2.3361	.60876	.07794	2.1802	2.4920	1.00	4.00
	24.00	75	2.2267	.64485	.07446	2.0783	2.3750	1.00	3.25
	Total	293	2.2756	.65802	.03844	2.1999	2.3513	1.00	4.00
Physical	4.00	33	3.4596	.51375	.08943	3.2774	3.6418	2.33	4.83
Adequacies	9.00	58	3.0776	.55604	.07301	2.9314	3.2238	1.83	4.50
	14.00	66	3.0879	.47802	.05884	2.9704	3.2054	2.00	4.33
	19.00	61	3.0874	.54181	.06937	2.9487	3.2262	1.50	4.33
	24.00	75	3.0062	.46391	.05357	2.8995	3.1130	1.33	4.33
	Total	293	3.1067	.52153	.03047	3.0467	3.1667	1.33	4.83
Intense	4.00	33	3.4459	.55874	.09726	3.2478	3.6440	2.57	4.71
Diligence	9.00	58	3.1835	.63566	.08347	3.0164	3.3506	1.57	5.00
	14.00	66	3.2727	.51032	.06282	3.1473	3.3982	1.29	4.86
	19.00	61	3.0890	.54095	.06926	2.9504	3.2275	1.43	4.71
	24.00	75	3.1943	.48963	.05654	3.0816	3.3069	1.71	4.57
	Total	293	3.2162	.54986	.03212	3.1530	3.2795	1.29	5.00
General	4.00	33	2.0202	.68688	.11957	1.7766	2.2638	1.00	3.67
Unattractive	9.00	58	2.2816	.69474	.09122	2.0989	2.4643	1.00	4.00
Attributes	14.00	66	2.5202	.67717	.08335	2.3537	2.6867	1.00	4.00
	19.00	61	2.2678	.70401	.09014	2.0875	2.4481	1.00	4.00
	24.00	75	2.2889	.63277	.07307	2.1433	2.4345	1.00	3.33

Table 20: Continued

	Total	293	2.3049	.68659	.04011	2.2259	2.3838	1.00	4.00
Subordinate	4.00	33	2.5455	1.03353	.17991	2.1790	2.9119	1.00	4.50
Traits	9.00	58	2.1379	.74806	.09822	1.9412	2.3346	1.00	4.00
	14.00	66	2.2576	.66934	.08239	2.0930	2.4221	1.00	4.00
	19.00	61	2.1885	.87637	.11221	1.9641	2.4130	1.00	4.00
	24.00	75	2.0800	.76246	.08804	1.9046	2.2554	1.00	4.00
	Total	293	2.2065	.80614	.04709	2.1138	2.2992	1.00	4.50
Social	4.00	33	3.6818	.64733	.11269	3.4523	3.9114	3.00	5.00
Adequacies	9.00	58	3.4397	.54674	.07179	3.2959	3.5834	1.50	4.50
	14.00	66	3.3788	.51932	.06392	3.2511	3.5065	2.00	4.50
	19.00	61	3.3607	.55626	.07122	3.2182	3.5031	2.00	4.50
	24.00	75	3.3600	.46178	.05332	3.2538	3.4662	2.50	4.50
	Total	293	3.4164	.54017	.03156	3.3543	3.4785	1.50	5.00
Materialistic	4.00	33	3.4394	.62196	.10827	3.2189	3.6599	2.00	5.00
Qualities	9.00	58	3.1034	.71793	.09427	2.9147	3.2922	1.00	5.00
	14.00	66	3.2576	.67506	.08309	3.0916	3.4235	1.50	4.50
	19.00	61	3.0820	.80716	.10335	2.8752	3.2887	1.00	5.00
	24.00	75	3.0933	.62974	.07272	2.9484	3.2382	2.00	4.50
	Total	293	3.1689	.70197	.04101	3.0882	3.2497	1.00	5.00

Table 21. FES and Composite Variables

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Romantic Inadequacies	Between Groups	1.450	4	.363	.836	.503
	Within Groups	124.983	288	.434		
	Total	126.433	292			
Physical Adequacies	Between Groups	4.962	4	1.241	4.798	.001
	Within Groups	74.461	288	.259		
	Total	79.423	292			
Intense Diligence	Between Groups	3.037	4	.759	2.565	.039
	Within Groups	85.248	288	.296		
	Total	88.285	292			
General Unattractive Attributes	Between Groups	5.869	4	1.467	3.207	.013
	Within Groups	131.783	288	.458		
	Total	137.652	292			
Subordinate Traits	Between Groups	5.456	4	1.364	2.132	.077
	Within Groups	184.302	288	.640		
	Total	189.758	292			
Social Adequacies	Between Groups	2.878	4	.719	2.517	.042
	Within Groups	82.324	288	.286		
	Total	85.201	292			
Materialistic Qualities	Between Groups	4.071	4	1.018	2.097	.081
	Within Groups	139.816	288	.485		

Composite variables found to be significantly affected by FES were Physical adequacies, Intense diligence, Social adequacies, and General unattractive attributes. The more films participants watched (a lower FES), the higher the perceived traits of Physical adequacies, Intense diligence, and Social adequacies. The more films participants watched also resulted in a lower perceived trait of General unattractive attributes. FES did not affect perceived traits of Romantic inadequacies, Subordinate traits, or Materialistic qualities.

Following the measurement of the effects of FES on belief of Composite variables, an ANOVA was conducted between groups who did or did not see the film clips in the study and the Composite Variables (Group O and X) to measure effects of the film clips on perceived traits.

Table 22. H1: Group O, X, and Composite Variables – Descriptive Statistics

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound
Romantic Inadequacies	Viewed Clips	148	2.2956	.61999	.05096	2.1949
	Did Not View Clips	145	2.2552	.69626	.05782	2.1409
	Total	293	2.2756	.65802	.03844	2.1999
Physical Adequacies	Viewed Clips	148	3.0809	.46829	.03849	3.0048
	Did Not View Clips	145	3.1331	.57123	.04744	3.0393
	Total	293	3.1067	.52153	.03047	3.0467
Intense Diligence	Viewed Clips	148	3.2505	.52855	.04345	3.1646
	Did Not View Clips	145	3.1813	.57050	.04738	3.0876
	Total	293	3.2162	.54986	.03212	3.1530
General Unattractive Attributes	Viewed Clips	148	2.2883	.64786	.05325	2.1830
	Did Not View Clips	145	2.3218	.72586	.06028	2.2027
	Total	293	2.3049	.68659	.04011	2.2259
Subordinate Traits	Viewed Clips	148	2.2162	.81683	.06714	2.0835
	Did Not View Clips	145	2.1966	.79778	.06625	2.0656
	Total	293	2.2065	.80614	.04709	2.1138
Social Adequacies	Viewed Clips	148	3.4155	.53576	.04404	3.3285
	Did Not View Clips	145	3.4172	.54650	.04538	3.3275
	Total	293	3.4164	.54017	.03156	3.3543
Materialistic Qualities	Viewed Clips	148	3.2534	.72256	.05939	3.1360
	Did Not View Clips	145	3.0828	.67189	.05580	2.9725
	Total	293	3.1689	.70197	.04101	3.0882

Table 23. H1: Group O, X, and Composite Variables

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Romantic Inadequacies	Between Groups	.120	1	.120	.276	.600
	Within Groups	126.313	291	.434		
	Total	126.433	292			
Physical Adequacies	Between Groups	.200	1	.200	.734	.392
	Within Groups	79.224	291	.272		
	Total	79.423	292			
Intense Diligence	Between Groups	.351	1	.351	1.161	.282
	Within Groups	87.934	291	.302		
	Total	88.285	292			
General Unattractive Attributes	Between Groups	.082	1	.082	.174	.677
	Within Groups	137.569	291	.473		
	Total	137.652	292			
Subordinate Traits	Between Groups	.028	1	.028	.043	.835
	Within Groups	189.729	291	.652		
	Total	189.758	292			
Social Adequacies	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.001	.979
	Within Groups	85.201	291	.293		
	Total	85.201	292			
Materialistic Qualities	Between Groups	2.132	1	2.132	4.377	.037
	Within Groups	141.755	291	.487		
	Total	143.887	292			

Table 22 and 23 revealed that those exposed to the film clips (group X) perceived Asian

males as having more Materialistic qualities than those who were not exposed to the film clips (group O).

To test H2, another ANOVA was conducted between participant Asian Male Interaction Scale (AMIS) and Composite Variables to gauge how interaction with Asian males could mediate perceived traits.

Table 24. H2: AMIS and Composite Variables – Descriptive Statistics

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Romantic Inadequacies	1.00	18	2.4722	.66360	.15641	2.1422	2.8022	1.00	3.50
	1.20	24	2.3750	.55658	.11361	2.1400	2.6100	1.00	3.00
	1.40	22	2.3409	.47900	.10212	2.1285	2.5533	1.00	3.00
	1.60	23	2.3152	.68348	.14252	2.0197	2.6108	1.00	3.25
	1.80	20	2.5625	.63802	.14267	2.2639	2.8611	1.00	3.25
	2.00	25	2.2200	.67823	.13565	1.9400	2.5000	1.00	3.25
	2.20	24	2.1979	.50529	.10314	1.9845	2.4113	1.25	3.00
	2.40	23	2.4022	.83168	.17342	2.0425	2.7618	1.00	4.00
	2.50	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	2.60	15	2.1667	.55635	.14365	1.8586	2.4748	1.00	3.00
	2.80	11	2.0909	.72692	.21917	1.6026	2.5793	1.00	3.00
	3.00	18	2.2222	.63529	.14974	1.9063	2.5381	1.00	3.00
	3.20	20	2.0500	.62091	.13884	1.7594	2.3406	1.00	3.00
	3.25	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	3.40	7	2.2857	.46611	.17617	1.8546	2.7168	1.75	3.00
	3.50	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	3.60	7	1.7857	.56695	.21429	1.2614	2.3101	1.00	2.50
	3.80	9	2.5278	.49124	.16375	2.1502	2.9054	1.75	3.00
	4.00	6	1.7500	.80623	.32914	.9039	2.5961	1.00	3.00
	4.20	7	2.7857	.36596	.13832	2.4473	3.1242	2.25	3.25
4.40	1	1.5000	.	.	.	.	1.50	1.50	
4.60	3	2.0000	.90139	.52042	-.2392	4.2392	1.00	2.75	

Table 24: Continued

	4.80	4	1.6250	.75000	.37500	.4316	2.8184	1.00	2.50
	5.00	3	1.3333	.57735	.33333	-.1009	2.7676	1.00	2.00
	Total	293	2.2756	.65802	.03844	2.1999	2.3513	1.00	4.00
Physical Adequacies	1.00	18	2.8333	.53014	.12495	2.5697	3.0970	2.17	4.33
	1.20	24	2.8611	.44955	.09176	2.6713	3.0509	2.17	3.67
	1.40	22	3.1879	.48725	.10388	2.9718	3.4039	2.33	4.17
	1.60	23	3.0942	.50459	.10521	2.8760	3.3124	2.00	4.00
	1.80	20	2.8167	.49234	.11009	2.5862	3.0471	1.33	3.67
	2.00	25	3.2400	.49084	.09817	3.0374	3.4426	2.50	4.50
	2.20	24	3.1667	.49879	.10182	2.9560	3.3773	2.17	4.17
	2.40	23	3.1812	.43622	.09096	2.9925	3.3698	2.50	4.50
	2.50	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	2.60	15	3.0667	.45338	.11706	2.8156	3.3177	2.17	4.00
	2.80	11	3.3636	.43345	.13069	3.0724	3.6548	2.50	4.00
	3.00	18	3.2667	.38552	.09087	3.0750	3.4584	2.67	4.17
	3.20	20	3.1417	.57297	.12812	2.8735	3.4098	2.00	4.83
	3.25	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	3.40	7	3.2143	.52453	.19825	2.7292	3.6994	2.83	4.33
	3.50	1	3.8333	.	.	.	.	3.83	3.83
	3.60	7	3.2381	.93223	.35235	2.3759	4.1003	1.50	4.33
	3.80	9	3.0741	.51445	.17148	2.6786	3.4695	1.83	3.50
	4.00	6	3.2500	.29345	.11980	2.9420	3.5580	3.00	3.67
	4.20	7	2.9524	.43795	.16553	2.5473	3.3574	2.00	3.33
4.40	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00	
4.60	3	3.7778	.58531	.33793	2.3238	5.2318	3.17	4.33	
4.80	4	3.5000	.57735	.28868	2.5813	4.4187	2.67	4.00	
5.00	3	2.6667	1.00000	.57735	.1825	5.1508	1.67	3.67	
	Total	293	3.1067	.52153	.03047	3.0467	3.1667	1.33	4.83
Intense Diligence	1.00	18	3.2302	.60834	.14339	2.9276	3.5327	2.29	4.57
	1.20	24	2.9821	.51648	.10543	2.7641	3.2002	1.57	4.00
	1.40	22	3.2727	.48075	.10250	3.0596	3.4859	2.57	4.71
	1.60	23	3.1770	.62784	.13091	2.9055	3.4485	2.29	5.00
	1.80	20	3.2786	.45994	.10285	3.0633	3.4938	2.29	3.86
	2.00	25	3.0571	.47738	.09548	2.8601	3.2542	2.00	4.00
	2.20	24	3.4464	.46399	.09471	3.2505	3.6424	2.71	4.57

Table 24: Continued

	2.40	23	3.2671	.49917	.10408	3.0512	3.4829	2.43	4.57
	2.50	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	2.60	15	3.4095	.44153	.11400	3.1650	3.6540	2.71	4.29
	2.80	11	3.3117	.26200	.07900	3.1357	3.4877	2.86	3.71
	3.00	18	3.0000	.44100	.10394	2.7807	3.2193	2.14	4.00
	3.20	20	3.1357	.75518	.16886	2.7823	3.4892	1.29	4.71
	3.25	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	3.40	7	2.8163	.28229	.10670	2.5552	3.0774	2.29	3.00
	3.50	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	3.60	7	3.3061	.60849	.22999	2.7434	3.8689	2.71	4.57
	3.80	9	3.3968	.44480	.14827	3.0549	3.7387	3.00	4.29
	4.00	6	2.9524	.73216	.29890	2.1840	3.7207	2.29	4.29
	4.20	7	3.2245	1.04932	.39661	2.2540	4.1949	1.43	4.86
	4.40	1	2.5714	.	.	.	.	2.57	2.57
	4.60	3	3.6190	.35952	.20757	2.7260	4.5121	3.29	4.00
	4.80	4	3.7143	.32991	.16496	3.1893	4.2393	3.43	4.00
	5.00	3	3.4762	.41239	.23810	2.4517	4.5006	3.00	3.71
	Total	293	3.2162	.54986	.03212	3.1530	3.2795	1.29	5.00
General	1.00	18	2.7593	.94838	.22353	2.2876	3.2309	1.00	4.00
Unattractive	1.20	24	2.3750	.54118	.11047	2.1465	2.6035	1.00	3.00
Attributes	1.40	22	2.2121	.51993	.11085	1.9816	2.4426	1.33	3.33
	1.60	23	2.2029	.70881	.14780	1.8964	2.5094	1.00	3.00
	1.80	20	2.8167	.45209	.10109	2.6051	3.0283	1.67	3.33
	2.00	25	2.1867	.60919	.12184	1.9352	2.4381	1.00	3.00
	2.20	24	2.1944	.56395	.11512	1.9563	2.4326	1.00	3.33
	2.40	23	2.1884	.69505	.14493	1.8878	2.4890	1.00	3.33
	2.50	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	2.60	15	2.2889	.77528	.20018	1.8596	2.7182	1.33	4.00
	2.80	11	1.8788	.50050	.15091	1.5425	2.2150	1.00	3.00
	3.00	18	2.3333	.57166	.13474	2.0491	2.6176	1.00	3.00
	3.20	20	2.2333	.64072	.14327	1.9335	2.5332	1.00	3.00
	3.25	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	3.40	7	2.0476	.62148	.23490	1.4728	2.6224	1.00	3.00
	3.50	1	3.6667	.	.	.	.	3.67	3.67
	3.60	7	1.6190	.65060	.24590	1.0173	2.2208	1.00	2.67



Table 24: Continued

	3.80	9	2.5926	.61864	.20621	2.1171	3.0681	2.00	4.00
	4.00	6	1.8889	.68853	.28109	1.1663	2.6115	1.00	3.00
	4.20	7	2.9524	.48795	.18443	2.5011	3.4037	2.00	3.33
	4.40	1	2.3333	.	.	.	.	2.33	2.33
	4.60	3	2.5556	.38490	.22222	1.5994	3.5117	2.33	3.00
	4.80	4	1.8333	.88192	.44096	.4300	3.2367	1.00	3.00
	5.00	3	1.5556	.50918	.29397	.2907	2.8204	1.00	2.00
	Total	293	2.3049	.68659	.04011	2.2259	2.3838	1.00	4.00
Subordinate Traits	1.00	18	2.4722	.89889	.21187	2.0252	2.9192	1.00	4.00
	1.20	24	2.3125	.81844	.16706	1.9669	2.6581	1.00	4.00
	1.40	22	2.2500	.93541	.19943	1.8353	2.6647	1.00	4.50
	1.60	23	2.1087	.79710	.16621	1.7640	2.4534	1.00	3.50
	1.80	20	2.1250	.66639	.14901	1.8131	2.4369	1.00	3.00
	2.00	25	1.9600	.77621	.15524	1.6396	2.2804	1.00	3.50
	2.20	24	2.2292	.83379	.17020	1.8771	2.5812	1.00	4.00
	2.40	23	2.5435	.76742	.16002	2.2116	2.8753	1.00	4.00
	2.50	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	2.60	15	2.0667	.94239	.24332	1.5448	2.5885	1.00	4.00
	2.80	11	2.1818	.64315	.19392	1.7497	2.6139	1.00	3.00
	3.00	18	2.3611	.58926	.13889	2.0681	2.6541	1.00	3.00
	3.20	20	2.1250	.77587	.17349	1.7619	2.4881	1.00	4.00
	3.25	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	3.40	7	1.8571	.69007	.26082	1.2189	2.4953	1.00	3.00
	3.50	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	3.60	7	1.8571	1.02933	.38905	.9052	2.8091	1.00	4.00
	3.80	9	2.2222	.79495	.26498	1.6112	2.8333	1.00	4.00
	4.00	6	1.6667	.81650	.33333	.8098	2.5235	1.00	3.00
	4.20	7	2.1429	.74801	.28272	1.4511	2.8347	1.00	3.00
4.40	1	1.0000	.	.	.	.	1.00	1.00	
4.60	3	2.3333	.28868	.16667	1.6162	3.0504	2.00	2.50	
4.80	4	2.0000	.70711	.35355	.8748	3.1252	1.00	2.50	
5.00	3	2.6667	.57735	.33333	1.2324	4.1009	2.00	3.00	
	Total	293	2.2065	.80614	.04709	2.1138	2.2992	1.00	4.50
Social Adequacies	1.00	18	3.1944	.66728	.15728	2.8626	3.5263	2.00	4.50
	1.20	24	3.2292	.38951	.07951	3.0647	3.3936	2.50	4.00

Table 24: Continued

	1.40	22	3.3636	.49237	.10497	3.1453	3.5819	2.50	4.00
	1.60	23	3.2391	.39513	.08239	3.0683	3.4100	3.00	4.00
	1.80	20	3.4000	.50262	.11239	3.1648	3.6352	2.50	4.50
	2.00	25	3.4600	.47697	.09539	3.2631	3.6569	3.00	4.50
	2.20	24	3.3750	.67967	.13874	3.0880	3.6620	1.50	4.00
	2.40	23	3.3913	.54265	.11315	3.1566	3.6260	2.50	5.00
	2.50	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	2.60	15	3.7333	.53005	.13686	3.4398	4.0269	3.00	5.00
	2.80	11	3.5455	.47194	.14230	3.2284	3.8625	3.00	4.00
	3.00	18	3.3333	.45374	.10695	3.1077	3.5590	3.00	4.50
	3.20	20	3.5250	.54952	.12288	3.2678	3.7822	2.50	4.50
	3.25	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	3.40	7	3.7143	.39340	.14869	3.3505	4.0781	3.00	4.00
	3.50	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	3.60	7	3.7857	.80917	.30584	3.0374	4.5341	3.00	5.00
	3.80	9	3.4444	.39087	.13029	3.1440	3.7449	3.00	4.00
	4.00	6	3.7500	.61237	.25000	3.1074	4.3926	3.00	4.50
	4.20	7	3.0000	.64550	.24398	2.4030	3.5970	2.00	4.00
	4.40	1	3.5000	.	.	.	.	3.50	3.50
	4.60	3	3.6667	.57735	.33333	2.2324	5.1009	3.00	4.00
	4.80	4	3.3750	.47871	.23936	2.6133	4.1367	3.00	4.00
	5.00	3	4.1667	.28868	.16667	3.4496	4.8838	4.00	4.50
	Total	293	3.4164	.54017	.03156	3.3543	3.4785	1.50	5.00
Materialistic Qualities	1.00	18	3.0833	.73264	.17269	2.7190	3.4477	2.00	4.50
	1.20	24	3.0833	.80307	.16393	2.7442	3.4224	1.00	5.00
	1.40	22	3.2273	.81251	.17323	2.8670	3.5875	2.00	5.00
	1.60	23	3.2174	.75115	.15663	2.8926	3.5422	2.00	4.50
	1.80	20	3.3250	.71221	.15925	2.9917	3.6583	1.50	4.50
	2.00	25	3.0600	.66646	.13329	2.7849	3.3351	1.50	4.00
	2.20	24	3.0625	.87616	.17885	2.6925	3.4325	1.00	5.00
	2.40	23	3.1957	.65260	.13608	2.9134	3.4779	2.00	4.00
	2.50	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	2.60	15	3.4667	.58146	.15013	3.1447	3.7887	2.50	4.50
	2.80	11	3.3636	.55186	.16639	2.9929	3.7344	2.00	4.00
3.00	18	2.8889	.47140	.11111	2.6545	3.1233	2.00	4.00	

Table 24: Continued

3.20	20	3.1500	.69016	.15432	2.8270	3.4730	2.00	4.50
3.25	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
3.40	7	3.0000	.00000	.00000	3.0000	3.0000	3.00	3.00
3.50	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
3.60	7	2.7143	.39340	.14869	2.3505	3.0781	2.00	3.00
3.80	9	3.1111	.60093	.20031	2.6492	3.5730	2.00	4.00
4.00	6	2.9167	.58452	.23863	2.3032	3.5301	2.00	3.50
4.20	7	3.5000	.64550	.24398	2.9030	4.0970	3.00	4.50
4.40	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
4.60	3	4.0000	.00000	.00000	4.0000	4.0000	4.00	4.00
4.80	4	3.3750	1.10868	.55434	1.6108	5.1392	2.00	4.50
5.00	3	3.1667	1.04083	.60093	.5811	5.7522	2.00	4.00
Total	293	3.1689	.70197	.04101	3.0882	3.2497	1.00	5.00

Table 25. H2: AMIS and Composite Variables

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Romantic Inadequacies	Between Groups	19.863	23	.864	2.180	.002
	Within Groups	106.570	269	.396		
	Total	126.433	292			
Physical Adequacies	Between Groups	11.345	23	.493	1.949	.007
	Within Groups	68.079	269	.253		
	Total	79.423	292			
Intense Diligence	Between Groups	10.358	23	.450	1.555	.054
	Within Groups	77.926	269	.290		
	Total	88.285	292			
General Unattractive Attributes	Between Groups	29.022	23	1.262	3.125	.000
	Within Groups	108.630	269	.404		

Table 25: Continued

	Total	137.652	292			
Subordinate Traits	Between Groups	19.215	23	.835	1.318	.155
	Within Groups	170.543	269	.634		
	Total	189.758	292			
Social Adequacies	Between Groups	10.880	23	.473	1.712	.024
	Within Groups	74.321	269	.276		
	Total	85.201	292			
Materialistic Qualities	Between Groups	11.843	23	.515	1.049	.404
	Within Groups	132.045	269	.491		
	Total	143.887	292			

Table 24 and 25 revealed that the more participants interacted with Asian males, the higher their beliefs in Asian males to have Physical adequacies and Social Adequacies. The higher the AMIS, the less likely participants were to believe Asian males as having Romantic inadequacies and General unattractive attributes.

To test H3, an MANOVA was conducted to see whether there was a correlation between AMIS and Composite traits believed between groups O and X. No statistically significant correlation was found.

Table 26. H3: MANOVA - AMIS, X/O, and Perceived Traits

Multivariate Tests <sup>a</sup>						
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.991	4441.756 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.009	4441.756 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	109.867	4441.756 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	109.867	4441.756 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.000

Table 26: Continued

Watched clips	Pillai's Trace	.023	.965 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.457
	Wilks' Lambda	.977	.965 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.457
	Hotelling's Trace	.024	.965 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.457
	Roy's Largest Root	.024	.965 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.457
AMIS	Pillai's Trace	.040	1.673 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.115
	Wilks' Lambda	.960	1.673 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.115
	Hotelling's Trace	.041	1.673 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.115
	Roy's Largest Root	.041	1.673 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.115
Watched clips * AMIS	Pillai's Trace	.011	.429 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.884
	Wilks' Lambda	.989	.429 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.884
	Hotelling's Trace	.011	.429 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.884
	Roy's Largest Root	.011	.429 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	283.000	.884

a. Design: Intercept + Watchedclips + AMIS + Watchedclips \* AMI2

b. Exact statistic

To further test H3, another MANOVA was conducted to see whether there was a correlation between AMIS, FES, and Composite traits believed about Asian males.

Table 27. H3: MANOVA - AMIS, FES, and Perceived Traits

Multivariate Tests<sup>a</sup>

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.991	3277.879 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	197.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.009	3277.879 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	197.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	116.473	3277.879 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	197.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	116.473	3277.879 <sup>b</sup>	7.000	197.000	.000
FES	Pillai's Trace	.192	1.438	28.000	800.000	.067
	Wilks' Lambda	.820	1.436	28.000	711.716	.069
	Hotelling's Trace	.205	1.431	28.000	782.000	.070
	Roy's Largest Root	.098	2.791 <sup>c</sup>	7.000	200.000	.009

Table 27: Continued

AMIS	Pillai's Trace	1.085	1.619	161.000	1421.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.297	1.641	161.000	1336.187	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	1.367	1.658	161.000	1367.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	.432	3.810 <sup>c</sup>	23.000	203.000	.000
FES * AMIS	Pillai's Trace	1.884	1.206	434.000	1421.000	.007
	Wilks' Lambda	.105	1.219	434.000	1384.847	.005
	Hotelling's Trace	2.743	1.234	434.000	1367.000	.003
	Roy's Largest Root	.775	2.537 <sup>c</sup>	62.000	203.000	.000

There was a statistically significant interaction effect between AMIS and FES on the combined dependent variables,  $F(434, 1384.847) = 1.219, p = .005$ ; Wilks'  $\Lambda = .105$ .

Following the MANOVA, a test of between-subject effects was performed to determine which traits were affected, revealing that the effect of FES \* AMIS was significant on the composite trait of Physical adequacies.

Table 28. H3: Test of Between-Subject Effects- AMIS, FES, and Perceived Traits

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	Romantic Inadequacies	45.443 <sup>a</sup>	89	.511	1.280	.079	.359
	Physical Adequacies	37.190 <sup>b</sup>	89	.418	2.009	.000	.468
	Intense Diligence	33.434 <sup>c</sup>	89	.376	1.390	.029	.379
	General Unattractive Attributes	60.721 <sup>d</sup>	89	.682	1.800	.000	.441
	Subordinate Traits	63.426 <sup>e</sup>	89	.713	1.145	.217	.334
	Social Adequacies	35.033 <sup>f</sup>	89	.394	1.593	.004	.411
	Materialistic Qualities	44.539 <sup>g</sup>	89	.500	1.023	.441	.310

Table 28: Continued

Intercept	Romantic Inadequacies	658.307	1	658.307	1650.044	.000	.890
	Physical Adequacies	1226.660	1	1226.660	5896.139	.000	.967
	Intense Diligence	1320.522	1	1320.522	4887.236	.000	.960
	General Unattractive Attributes	696.647	1	696.647	1838.261	.000	.901
	Subordinate Traits	648.392	1	648.392	1041.887	.000	.837
	Social Adequacies	1536.095	1	1536.095	6215.609	.000	.968
	Materialistic Qualities	1328.441	1	1328.441	2714.418	.000	.930
	FES	Romantic Inadequacies	1.159	4	.290	.726	.575
Physical Adequacies		1.828	4	.457	2.197	.071	.041
Intense Diligence		1.842	4	.461	1.705	.150	.032
General Unattractive Attributes		2.518	4	.629	1.661	.160	.032
Subordinate Traits		2.803	4	.701	1.126	.345	.022
Social Adequacies		1.725	4	.431	1.745	.142	.033
Materialistic Qualities		2.837	4	.709	1.449	.219	.028
AMIS		Romantic Inadequacies	20.027	23	.871	2.183	.002
	Physical Adequacies	10.329	23	.449	2.159	.002	.197
	Intense Diligence	8.766	23	.381	1.411	.108	.138
	General Unattractive Attributes	25.631	23	1.114	2.941	.000	.250
	Subordinate Traits	18.846	23	.819	1.317	.160	.130
	Social Adequacies	9.520	23	.414	1.675	.032	.159
	Materialistic Qualities	11.331	23	.493	1.007	.459	.102
	FES * AMIS	Romantic Inadequacies	23.935	62	.386	.968	.549
Physical Adequacies		22.524	62	.363	1.746	.002	.348
Intense Diligence		21.545	62	.347	1.286	.099	.282
General Unattractive Attributes		27.274	62	.440	1.161	.220	.262

Table 28: Continued

	Subordinate Traits	39.115	62	.631	1.014	.459	.236
	Social Adequacies	22.317	62	.360	1.456	.027	.308
	Materialistic Qualities	29.452	62	.475	.971	.543	.229
Error	Romantic Inadequacies	80.990	203	.399			
	Physical Adequacies	42.233	203	.208			
	Intense Diligence	54.850	203	.270			
	General Unattractive Attributes	76.931	203	.379			
	Subordinate Traits	126.332	203	.622			
	Social Adequacies	50.168	203	.247			
	Materialistic Qualities	99.349	203	.489			
	Total	Romantic Inadequacies	1643.688	293			
Physical Adequacies		2907.360	293				
Intense Diligence		3119.128	293				
General Unattractive Attributes		1694.222	293				
Subordinate Traits		1616.250	293				
Social Adequacies		3505.000	293				
Materialistic Qualities		3086.250	293				
Corrected Total		Romantic Inadequacies	126.433	292			
	Physical Adequacies	79.423	292				
	Intense Diligence	88.285	292				
	General Unattractive Attributes	137.652	292				
	Subordinate Traits	189.758	292				
	Social Adequacies	85.201	292				
	Materialistic Qualities	143.887	292				

a. R Squared = .359 (Adjusted R Squared = .079)



- b. R Squared = .468 (Adjusted R Squared = .235)
- c. R Squared = .379 (Adjusted R Squared = .106)
- d. R Squared = .441 (Adjusted R Squared = .196)
- e. R Squared = .334 (Adjusted R Squared = .042)
- f. R Squared = .411 (Adjusted R Squared = .153)
- g. R Squared = .310 (Adjusted R Squared = .007)

Following the test of between-subject effects, means were compared between AMIS and FES beliefs of Physical adequacies.

Table 29. H3: Test of Between-Subject Effects- AMIS, FES, and Perceived Traits

Dependent Variable	FES	FES * AMIS				
		AMI S	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
Physical Adequacies	4.00	1.00	2.833	.456	1.934	3.733
		1.20	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
		1.40	3.417	.323	2.781	4.053
		1.60	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
		1.80	2.667	.456	1.767	3.566
		2.00	3.500	.323	2.864	4.136
		2.20	3.667	.228	3.217	4.116
		2.40	3.750	.228	3.300	4.200
		2.50	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
		2.60	3.125	.228	2.675	3.575
		2.80	3.542	.228	3.092	3.991
		3.00	3.278	.263	2.759	3.797
		3.20	4.833	.456	3.934	5.733
		3.25	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
		3.40	3.333	.456	2.434	4.233
		3.50	3.833	.456	2.934	4.733
		3.60	3.833	.323	3.197	4.469
		3.80	3.000	.456	2.101	3.899
		4.00	3.000	.456	2.101	3.899
		4.20	3.000	.456	2.101	3.899
	4.40	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	

Table 29: Continued

	4.60	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	4.80	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	5.00	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
9.00	1.00	2.958	.228	2.509	3.408
	1.20	2.667	.186	2.300	3.034
	1.40	3.167	.228	2.717	3.616
	1.60	2.917	.228	2.467	3.366
	1.80	2.708	.228	2.259	3.158
	2.00	3.542	.161	3.224	3.860
	2.20	2.944	.263	2.425	3.464
	2.40	3.333	.228	2.884	3.783
	2.50	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	2.60	3.056	.263	2.536	3.575
	2.80	2.944	.263	2.425	3.464
	3.00	3.292	.228	2.842	3.741
	3.20	3.167	.263	2.647	3.686
	3.25	3.000	.456	2.101	3.899
	3.40	2.833	.456	1.934	3.733
	3.50	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	3.60	3.333	.456	2.434	4.233
	3.80	2.333	.323	1.697	2.969
	4.00	3.667	.456	2.767	4.566
	4.20	3.167	.456	2.267	4.066
	4.40	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	4.60	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	4.80	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	5.00	3.667	.456	2.767	4.566
14.00	1.00	2.556	.263	2.036	3.075
	1.20	3.000	.263	2.481	3.519
	1.40	3.167	.456	2.267	4.066
	1.60	2.944	.186	2.577	3.312
	1.80	2.833	.152	2.534	3.133
	2.00	3.000	.263	2.481	3.519
	2.20	3.444	.186	3.077	3.812
	2.40	3.000	.204	2.598	3.402

Table 29: Continued

	2.50	2.000	.456	1.101	2.899
	2.60	3.333	.456	2.434	4.233
	2.80	3.583	.323	2.947	4.219
	3.00	3.800	.456	2.901	4.699
	3.20	3.167	.152	2.867	3.466
	3.25	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	3.40	3.000	.456	2.101	3.899
	3.50	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	3.60	3.000	.323	2.364	3.636
	3.80	3.333	.263	2.814	3.853
	4.00	3.167	.323	2.531	3.803
	4.20	2.667	.323	2.031	3.303
	4.40	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	4.60	3.778	.263	3.259	4.297
	4.80	3.333	.323	2.697	3.969
	5.00	2.667	.456	1.767	3.566
19.00	1.00	2.375	.228	1.925	2.825
	1.20	2.917	.161	2.599	3.235
	1.40	3.209	.138	2.938	3.480
	1.60	3.333	.172	2.993	3.673
	1.80	3.389	.263	2.870	3.908
	2.00	3.042	.228	2.592	3.491
	2.20	2.958	.228	2.509	3.408
	2.40	3.200	.456	2.301	4.099
	2.50	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	2.60	3.167	.323	2.531	3.803
	2.80	3.417	.323	2.781	4.053
	3.00	3.262	.172	2.922	3.602
	3.20	2.875	.228	2.425	3.325
	3.25	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	3.40	4.333	.456	3.434	5.233
	3.50	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	3.60	1.500	.456	.601	2.399
	3.80	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	4.00	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.

Table 29: Continued

	4.20	3.167	.456	2.267	4.066
	4.40	3.000	.456	2.101	3.899
	4.60	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	4.80	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	5.00	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
24.00	1.00	3.194	.186	2.827	3.562
	1.20	2.905	.172	2.565	3.245
	1.40	3.042	.228	2.592	3.491
	1.60	3.083	.186	2.716	3.450
	1.80	2.389	.263	1.870	2.908
	2.00	3.062	.161	2.745	3.380
	2.20	2.857	.172	2.517	3.197
	2.40	2.959	.152	2.659	3.259
	2.50	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	2.60	2.933	.204	2.531	3.336
	2.80	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	3.00	3.056	.263	2.536	3.575
	3.20	2.833	.263	2.314	3.353
	3.25	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	3.40	3.000	.263	2.481	3.519
	3.50	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	3.60	4.167	.456	3.267	5.066
	3.80	3.333	.263	2.814	3.853
	4.00	3.250	.323	2.614	3.886
	4.20	3.000	.323	2.364	3.636
	4.40	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	4.60	. <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.
	4.80	3.667	.323	3.031	4.303
	5.00	1.667	.456	.767	2.566

a. This level combination of factors is not observed, thus the corresponding population marginal mean is not estimable.

Table 29 revealed that on average, higher AMIS (3.0 and above) and the less films others

had seen (higher FES), the more likely participants were to believe Asian males as having Physical adequacies. However, the more films that participants had seen (Lower FES), the less likely participants were to view Asian males as having Physical adequacies even when AMIS increased (3.0 and above). Therefore, Table 29 reveals that the media statistically impacted viewers to perceive Asian males as having less Physical adequacies even when AMIS increased.

## Chapter Five: Discussion & Implications

### Study Part 1

*Crazy Rich Asians* was the first film chronologically released that was analyzed within this study. In this sense, one could say that the film helped set the stage for allowing East Asian male characters to be portrayed more frequently in the romantic comedy genre in positive light. Some of the other most recent mainstream U.S. cinema, specifically, romantic comedies, that feature East Asian male speaking roles include Michael Showalter's *The Big Sick* in 2017, and Alice Wu's *Saving Face* in 2004, a film released 14 years prior to *Crazy Rich Asians*. *Crazy Rich Asians* depicts all of the new traits defined by this study prior to finding them in the other films, in addition to portraying all of Wong et. al's defined stereotypes except for Intelligence and Perpetual foreigner. *Crazy Rich Asians* introduces a noticeable trend of Materialistic tendencies beginning in its title with associating Asians with being rich. Chinese films that originate in the East often have centered around those invested in material wealth and riches. Being rich is an archetype, visible in popular Chinese films with a wide range of genres such as *L Storm* (2018), *The Mermaid* (2016), and *Hello, Mr. Billionaire*. This trend has been less visible in western mainstream films. In this way, it is possible that *Crazy Rich Asians* introduces more predominant ideas about Materialism and East Asians males into the United States, however, more films from mainstream U.S. media would have to be analyzed to make such a claim. It should be noted that *Crazy Rich Asians* is not the first mainstream film from the United States to have introduced emphasis on East Asians and Material wealth. For example, Ang Lee's *The Wedding Banquet*

released in 1993 also introduces characters with qualities that would be categorized as Materialistic, including the fact that the main characters' parents are encompassed by their desire to come to the United States with \$30,000 to spend on an extravagant wedding for their son.

A trend of general subordinate frames were also found throughout the films, a notable portion being racially charged. During Gedde Watanabe's scene in *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, both of the girls continue to watch the film despite Peter's inquiry about the film they're watching being racist, after which Lara Jean's younger sister dismisses the comment with a justification that emphasizes Jake Ryan's attractiveness (Hughes, 1984; Johnson, 2018). Chris Jae Lee puts these portrayals into words perfectly by stating that what audiences are given "are two Asian girls excusing the racial clowning of an Asian man because what they really care about is the handsome white man" (2018).

In *Crazy Rich Asians*, Eddie comments in anger diminishing *Chinese Vogue* in favor of *American Vogue*, implying that his being in *Chinese Vogue* is less socially impressive than his being in *American Vogue*, even when living in Asia (Chu, 2018). Nick is described by Peik Lin as being "like the Asian Bachelor" (Chu, 2018), which leaves questions as to why Nick can't simply be the Bachelor. Despite his charming looks and social adequacy, this comment is shedding light on the fact even though Nick is a picture-perfect definition of a man who has charming looks and social adequacy, the idea of a Bachelor being Asian is far-fetched enough for Peik Lin to make a racially charged comment about it. Through these frames, portions of the films analyzed perpetuate Said's idea of the Other through "contrasting image, idea, personality, experience" (Said, 1978 p.10). This, however, is not new to mainstream Asian representation. In Edward Said's novel *Orientalism*, he describes that the West has defined Asians by certain "imagery, and vocabulary" which present Asians with little or no resemblance of what to be

Asian really means (1979 p.13). His work discusses how the west is notorious for framing Asians as “Others,” those contrasting greatly from their western through negative characteristics (Said, 1978; Wong et. al). It can be noted that similes like Piek Lin’s were made about female Asian characters as well, with comparisons such as “Asian Ellen” (framed negatively) (Chu, 2018), and “our own Asian Oprah” (framed positively) (Khan, 2019). Society’s underlying comparisons of East Asian males, and East Asian females being Others are still present in *Crazy Rich Asians* and two of the other three films watched (Said, 1978).

It is important to note that audiences may not know that Keanu Reeves is someone with Asian heritage. As someone with light skin and European-passing features, he is portrayed in *Always Be My Maybe* as Marcus’ superior economically, romantically, and sociologically. All of the instances that juxtapose Keanu’s superiority to Marcus, such as his girlfriend leaving Marcus because his impact is so small, also frame the idea that just because Marcus isn’t rich or famous, his impact means nothing (Khan, 2019). This is significant because frames such as these have the ability to negatively impact those that the characters are representing by portraying East Asian males not living up to societal expectations of the model minority, i.e. those who are diligent or intelligent, and perpetuate the ideas into society that they will never be enough until fulfilling the defined role of success. It should be noted that Marcus, a character prominent in smoking weed every day, states that he smokes weed to "suppress the darkness" while having a conversation with a bandmate (Khan, 2019). Given that Marcus doesn't live up to the cultural footprint status of those higher up in the societal ladder, one could argue that the stereotype of intense diligence affects him negatively when he doesn't live up to expectations (Khan, 2019). This differs greatly from films such as *The Notebook*, where main character Noah works at a lumberyard and still ends up marrying a rich woman happily ever after (Cassavetes, 2004), and *The Proposal*, where



the man falls in love with his boss to the approval of their entire workplace (Fletcher, 2009). Both successful and romantic films depict white men who are subordinate in their jobs and work, yet are portrayed as being societally and romantically enough to keep their partners happy. Even the title of *Always Be My Maybe* frames Sasha's perpetual uncertainty that Marcus will be the best fit for her achieving lifestyle (Khan, 2019).

In *Crazy Rich Asians*, even though Michael is the CEO of a company, skips party socializing for business calls, and plans on missing his own son's birthday for work, he feels he is not prominent enough for his actions to matter to his rich wife and society, a sentiment that eventually leads to his having an affair and the downfall of his marriage (Chu, 2018). The frames of intense diligence were found throughout the film and the depictions are framed to have negative consequences on family and friends. Brandon in *Always Be My Maybe* is also framed as one who is intensely diligent to his work, sacrificing his relationship with his fiancé for a business opportunity that would separate them for six months (Khan, 2019). He is also portrayed as romantically incompetent, described as an alternative, Asian-stereotype example of a white prince (Khan, 2019), again, framing him as an "Other" and holding negative implications for the perception of Asian men (Said, 1978). In both *To All the Boys I've Loved Before* and *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You*, there are no lead Asian male characters. In *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*, Lara Jean has five love interests shown in the film, none of which are of Asian descent. Even her biological father is not of Asian descent, showing that Lara Jean's mother married outside of her race. While holding positive implications for interracial dating, these portrayals could also undermine the positive traits of dating East Asian men when even Asian women prefer dating outside of their own race.

Marcus, the character who fights his darkness through weed, sprinkles lyrics into his songs such as those depicting himself as an Asian man who eats a rat sandwich and starts at the bottom and is “still at the bottom, I never rise, I fall” (Khan, 2019). This corresponds directly to Wong et. al’s study which found that “participants who perceived that people stereotyped Asian American men as perpetual foreigners, intensely diligent, and sexually or romantically inadequate tended to be more depressed” than those that perceived the study’s other four stereotypes (2012). Therefore, films that perpetuate stereotypes in this way could have the negative effect of reminding those who perceive themselves as having traits of the “Other” of the negative connotations of their traits (Said, 1978), and render them as more at risk to symptoms of depression (Wong et. al, 2012). For reasons such as this, especially in cinema and specifically, romantic comedies, which are often intended to be relatable to the range of audiences they are portraying, it is important to portray a wide range of characters that do not leave groups of people wondering if they are supposed to fit into the frames portrayed. It should be noted again that Sexual/romantic inadequacies and Intense diligence rank #3 and #4 of Wong et. al’s defined stereotypes most portrayed in the films analyzed in this study, even six to eight years after the study’s release (2012). In the findings of this present study, Sexual/romantic inadequacies still frame one more character than its counter trait of Sexual/Romantic adequacies.

These stereotypes were not the only ones prominent from Wong et. al’s study that remained intact. Interpersonal deficits ranked as number one of Wong et. al’s study’s defined traits discovered in the films with one third of all characters analyzed having these tendencies. Its counter-trait, Social adequacies, only had about one fourth of characters analyzed as having the frames. Most often, characters had either Interpersonal deficits or its counterpart, Social adequacies. Keanu Reeves is the only character marked as having both Social adequacies and

Interpersonal deficits. Despite his heavy social influence and having friends in high places, as the film progresses Keanu makes increasingly off-the-wall comments that make Marcus upset and is framed as having increasingly strange characteristics such as the willingness to smash a vase on his own head (Khan, 2019). These frames show that even when an East Asian male character is described as having all of the most desirable attributes (such as all of the best traits of Brandon but better), the character is still one who under surface has whacky interpersonal attributes and an intimately negative interpersonal style (Khan, 2019).

Chronologically, *Crazy Rich Asians* is the first film analyzed to introduce characters with Flattering physical attributes (4 characters), Social adequacies (3 characters), and Sexual/Romantic adequacies (2 characters). Following *Crazy Rich Asians*, each of the following films (with the exception of *To All the Boys I've Loved Before*) portray at least one character through the framing of these traits. Given the possible psychological effects of the portrayal of Asian characters having Sexual/Romantic inadequacies, the incorporation of more East Asian male characters with positive physical, interpersonal, and sexual/romantic attributes could correspond to having more positive psychological effects for those who relate to the roles being portrayed onscreen, reminding them of positive associations to their own traits (Wong et. al, 2012). The addition of positively perceived traits could also hold implications of leading to more open-minded association from out-groups (Mastro et. al, 2009;1992).

It should be noted that among these traits, there were also those who were portrayed with Hyper-sexualized traits. This is notable because in the past, this is a trait typically found in East Asian female characters throughout films. The hypersexualization of East Asian males through the films analyzed often results in the most extreme: the films portraying men who are visibly very attractive, or the film portraying those who with visibly not attractive traits with very little

in between. Although beauty is subjective, when films repeatedly pair traits generally considered unattractive with traits of romantic incompetence, this can set the stage for those comparing themselves to the screen to associate with their image negatively (Wong et. al, 2012).

One character who breaks out of the traits defined by the study by Wong et. al is Trevor from *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You*. Trevor is not only romantically and socially competent, but is also portrayed as having traits of Leadership. Leadership, in this case, differs from Intense diligence and Social adequacy in that the trait is framed as Trevor being apt to leading others to his desired goals as the leading charge, rather than achieving all of those goals by himself. Despite all of these qualities, Trevor is still not introduced as a primary love interest in the film. This film also features an East Asian male through the frames of Intense diligence, as his character is shown through his persistent urging for other students to take school matters seriously. This character is not the main focus of the film or scene, and is onscreen for less than five seconds. The relationship of Asian male characters to others in this film varies widely in spite of having only two prominent Asian male characters. This is the most recent of the four films analyzed, and it will be interesting to observe if more films follow its example with characters such as Trevor who break out of many previously defined traits to create their own, as many characters in the other three films analyzed fell into solely previously defined traits.

It is interesting to note that only four prominent traits were found in one character and not another. This shows that the majority of traits bounced off of each other, arguably limiting diversity in the frames which they were portrayed. This being said, two of the traits found in one character each were positive: Leadership and Humility, and two were negatively framed: Overt drug use and General dishonesty. These show that because there were not multiple characters portrayed through these frames, East Asian male characters were portrayed with traits outside of

the model minority mold or any of the defined traits in this study. This shows promise of more dynamic and interesting characters taking to the screen that do not adhere to a range of defined traits. In these ways, the direction of mainstream cinema could be heading in a direction where East Asian men not only see themselves onscreen more often, but in ways where viewers can relate to the characters more than previously before.

### *Study Part 1 Conclusion*

Study Part 1 provides evidence supporting that when portraying characters through modern cinema, it is important to take into account the qualities and quantities of characters portrayed. While *Crazy Rich Asians* was praised for its innovation and its groundbreaking work in modern Asian representation, it still introduces characters subject to potentially painful past stereotypes. With such a large platform, it is important that film makers call for not only prominent representation, but representation which will bring balance to the screen between the cinematically characterized and those who are leading regular, ordinary lives. It is important to take to account possible effects and drawbacks of adding characters when discussing which characters to write into action, as the frequency and frames through which audiences view characters can define their internal ideals (Mastro et. al, 2009; 1992).

Study Part 1 can be used to build upon in research and adds to research in East Asian media representation in multiple ways. First, this Study Part 1 provides traits of East Asian male characters and evidence of those traits through the frames of modern U.S. cinema. Many studies have discussed film archetypes and implications from past films, however, this study utilizes a unique take on East Asian male representation to present findings of Asian male representation in modern U.S. cinema.

Secondly, this study analyzes East Asian male representation through modern mainstream U.S. cinema in comparison to previously perceived Asian male traits, shedding light on areas where representation has arguably improved since perception and where representation has arguably remained the same.

Finally, this study lays a foundation of interpretation for potential trends to come in the future of male East Asian film representation in modern cinema, and specifically, romantic comedy films in the United States. Researchers and filmmakers can look to this study for an analysis of characterization and traits, as well as potential implications of the traits discovered and expanded on to apply to their own film analyses.

#### *Study Part I Limitations & Future Areas of Study*

The author acknowledges that films originating in the United States do not constitute the entirety of all films, and the findings are only conclusive to films analyzed originating from the United States. The author of this article acknowledges that they were not able to analyze all U.S. mainstream modern cinema, specifically romantic comedies, between 2018 and 2020 that feature East Asian speaking male characters. They worked to pinpoint the prominent films in Hollywood and mainstream platforms to perform an adequate study for the related field. The author acknowledges that they single-handedly preformed the coding processes and that coding is open to subjectivity.

Further research could be implemented to pinpoint positive change in Asian representation in modern United States cinema through analyzing past cinema that features East Asian male speaking roles and taking note of the portrayals. This study, as well as the suggested future research, could expand to also include finding common traits between current portrayals of East Asian women.

## Study Part 2

It's important to discuss that through the data, new subsets of combined traits occurred. Where initially sets of two and three characteristics were used to gauge the belief level of one specified trait using stereotypes of the past and traits defined in Study Part 1, using the Data Matrix, these characteristics were shifted and combined into new belief systems found by correlations in the Matrix, forming possibly new combinations of believed traits about Asian men which stray from both the Wong et. Al defined traits and those defined in the textual analysis executed in part 1 of this study. The characteristics used to gauge beliefs in the previously defined traits got rearranged into the following new segments:

Table 30. Composite Traits: New Perceived Traits Regarding Asian Males\*

Romantic Inadequacies	Asian men do not perform well in romantic relationships, cannot cultivate lasting romantic relationships, are romantically incompetent, are boring
Physical Adequacies	Asian men are often physically desirable, are romantically desirable, have pleasant physical features, are muscular, can perform sexually, Asian men's bodies are often exposed
Intense Diligence	Asian men have more academic ability than other men, are often intelligent, seem to be striving to become number one, have more economic success than other races, can be described as working all of the time, always choose their family's culture, know martial arts**
General Unattractive Attributes	Asian men have unflattering physical attributes, are often unattractive, have odd personality traits
Subordinate Traits	Asian men do not make their own decisions, Asian men are not in charge of their own lives
Social Adequacies	Asian men are conversationally keen, function well in social situations
Materialistic Qualities	Asian men have a mentality that stresses gain of finance, stress money more than other qualities

\*Traits which did not statistically correlate were dropped

\*\*Because having high intelligence (gained/applied knowledge), always choosing a family's culture, and learning a martial art are traits for which diligence is required, these were accounted

for under the heading of “intense diligence”

Because this study resulted in a new emergence of traits within correlation with one another and that 97.3 of those taking the survey were among the ages of 18-24, this reveals that perhaps with the younger generation, previously held stereotypical perceptions of Asian males are changing and forming new belief systems about Asian males. These belief systems are not all of which defined in Wong et. Al in 2012, but have included new traits which were perceived in Part 1 of this study such as Social adequacies, Physical adequacies, Materialistic Qualities, and Subordinate traits. This is significant because previously held ideas of belief systems could be changing right before our very eyes into the factors listed above. It is important to note that the definition of the defined traits above do not necessarily mean that these are prominently believed about Asian males; only that the definition of previously held traits (and the newly defined traits of this study) are what the definitions could be morphing into through belief systems about Asian males.

### *Hypotheses*

Results between groups O and X indicated that in regard to most traits believed about Asian men, the research intervention was shown to have only a statistically significant effect on participants with the trait of Materialistic qualities, which revealed that those exposed to the video clips significantly saw Asian men as having more Materialistic qualities. Materialistic qualities was defined by the textual analysis in Study Part 1, however, research in this study now implicates that Materialistic qualities is an emerging trait believed about Asian males in the United States, especially after being exposed to content like that which was shown in the video clips from the four films in this study. Critics have expressed concern about *Crazy Rich Asians* specifically cultivating this belief system about Asians (*Medium*, 2020; *Flare*, 2018), and in the



qualitative analysis in Study Part 1, *Crazy Rich Asians* wasn't the only film analyzed to portray males as having Materialistic qualities. Implications of Study Part 2 are that mainstream modern cinema could be perpetuating more traits of Materialistic qualities about Asian men.

Because the films shown in this study are mainstream films which participants may have already been exposed to prior to this study, Table 21 looked into the composite traits believed about Asian men after previous exposure to the four films (FES). A lower FES (more exposure to previous films) showed statistical significance of increased beliefs of Asian males having Social adequacies, Intense diligence, and Physical adequacies. Additionally, there was a statistically significant correlation between a low FES and a decrease in beliefs of Asian males having General unattractive attributes. When a MANOVA was conducted between FES, AMIS, and Composite traits, there was not a significant effect of AMIS mediating perceived traits about Asian males previous film exposure, but rather, the other way around. Table 29 revealed that when participants had been exposed to more modern cinema, where AMIS increased (3.0 and above), the belief of Asian males having more Physical adequacies decreased, revealing that the mainstream cinema mediated how viewers perceived Asian males more than their high AMIS. This shows us that while modern mainstream cinema could be helping Asian males to be perceived as having Physical adequacies to an extent, they could also be hindering the belief of Asian males having Physical adequacies, because more interaction between Asian males statistically mediated opinions less in this trait as participants were exposed to more of the four films.

Whereas the literature implied that increased interaction between Asian males would interact between media exposure and held beliefs, the findings in this study could imply that the effect of beliefs perpetuated media are substantially less influential than traits perpetuated by the

media. Where there could be positive implications of this in finding an increase in beliefs of Asian males having Social and Physical adequacies, the findings could also present concerns when the ideals of Intense diligence also increase after exposure to mainstream modern films. This being said, because the trait of Intense diligence has also been cited as being having negative implications when applied to an entire race, it is important to note that these films may be perpetuating this trait further if individuals feel that they are not living up to expectations (Wong et. al, 2012; Lee and Joo, 2018). Exposure to more of the four films also decreased the perception of Asian males having General unattractive attributes, a shift from beliefs that researchers have observed in the past (Wong et. al, 2012; Lee and Joo, 2018).

Where there was a notable difference in certain perceptions about Asian males correlating to FES, exposure to the four films did not sway viewers completely from already established perceptions of Asian males. Traits that remained statistically congruent after previous film exposure were beliefs in Romantic inadequacies and Subordinate traits. Although where a low FES (exposure to more previous films) increased beliefs of Asian men having Physical and Social adequacies, numbers did not statistically decrease where participants were asked about Asian men having Romantic inadequacies. It's possible that this is because character portrayals within the four mainstream films still contain traits that fall under Romantic inadequacies defined in previous research (Wong et. al, 2012; Lee and Joo, 2018). The fact that attribution of General unattractive attributes to Asian males decreased where viewers were exposed to more of the previous films reveals that in some aspects the mainstream films could be helping to eradicate ideas of Asian men have unflattering physical attributes, being unattractive, or having odd personality traits, all traits which were defined as being characteristics believed about Asian males by Asian males in 2012 (Wong et. al). Based on these correlations, while the mainstream

modern films have potentially not moved to change all previously held beliefs about Asian males, they have potentially added new portrayals which have impacted beliefs about Asian men.

Analyses between AMIS and viewer beliefs revealed that H2 was only partially true: less frequent interactions with Asian males led to stronger perceptions of Asian males having General unattractive attributes and Romantic inadequacies. However, as AMIS decreased, there was a decrease in believing Asians to have Physical and Social adequacies. This is congruent with the findings that more interactions with those from an outside group can lead to less stereotypical perceptions of them (Weaver & Wakshlag, 1986 p. 143; cf. Bem, 1970; Hawkins & Pingree, 1982; Zillmann, 1979). Interaction between Asian males alone had a palpable effect on certain beliefs about Asian men, however, contrary to H3, Table 26 revealed AMIS did not statistically correlate to mediating viewer responses when exposed to the clips. This reveals that the finding of Materialistic qualities was not mediated by the AMIS, and therefore, that the video clips were statistically shown to perpetuate this trait about Asian men. Additionally, the AMIS and FES MANOVA had no statistic correlation on perceived traits with the exception of Physical adequacies, which revealed that media had a more statistically significant effect when exposure to previous films and interactions with Asian males increased. The lack of any other statistically significant influence reveals that the traits believed with a lower or higher FES are also statistically sound.

Although AMIS had an effect on beliefs about Asian males as a whole, the score did not widely statistically affect how the media impacted viewers, revealing that the media had an effect on the perceived traits of Asian males mainly unmediated by the frequency of Asian male interaction. The implications of this are that modern cinema could be impacting beliefs about Asian males mostly unmediated by viewer interaction with Asian males. While it is uncertain

whether other factors contributed to individual respondent beliefs about Asian men, this research reveals that perhaps interaction between groups may have less of an impact on believed traits than previously thought. These findings are congruent with the previous literature which reveals substantial evidence that other factors which affect audience perception appear less influential than the mass media (Weaver & Wakshlag, 1986; Gerbner & Gross, 1976 p. 143; Gross & Morgan, 1985; Morgan, 1983). With the findings of this study congruent to literature of the past in negating that interaction doesn't always mediate perceived traits after media exposure, it is important to note the role the media have in affecting the beliefs of their surrounding audiences. Mainstream films in this way have a strong responsibility to portray characters in ways which will positively impact society and the viewers exposed to the messages within, creating wide ranges of character portrayals which will not limit public perception to ways which limit portrayals for any group represented.

#### *Study Part 2 Conclusion*

The aim of this study was to understand if modern U.S. cinema is having a palpable effect on how the public perceives Asian men. Through an experimental design the research revealed that the four films explored in this study could significantly be affecting how others perceive Asian men through the traits defined in this study. It is important to look to mainstream films to determine trends in cinematic portrayals, and the findings outlined by this study could have powerful implications on the ways which media affect changes in perceptions about Asian males through the ways in which they are portrayed.

#### *Study Part 2 Limitations and Future Areas of Study*

The researcher acknowledges that there could be other mediating factors contributing to believed traits about Asian men. Using background literature as a foundation, Asian male

interaction was pinpointed as the greatest probable mediator between the media and perceived traits about Asian men.

This study lays a foundational framework of possible beliefs formed about Asian men in the United States among primarily young adults. There may be opportunities for more research to emerge studying these traits to dissipate or confirm the traits evaluated in this study. This study reveals that media may be playing a large part in perpetuating racial traits and beliefs among Asian men, and more studies could explore this emerging data. Additionally, this study reveals that there are statistically significant correlations between modern cinema exposure and increased and decreased beliefs about Asian men, revealing that future research could explore this framework to understand if this trend continues as time moves forward. Research could be conducted to further reveal the ways in which interactions may mediate effects by the media, or whether or not belief systems are primarily more mediated by media consumption than personal interaction.

## References

- Abraham, L., & Appiah, O. (2006). Framing news stories: The role of visual imagery in priming racial stereotypes. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 17(3), 183-203.
- Asato J., Foronda E., Lin J. (Producer), & Lin J. (Director). (April 11, 2003). *Better Luck Tomorrow* [Motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros. Pictures.
- Ardèvol-Abreu, A. (2015). Framing theory in communication research. Origins, development and current situation in Spain. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, (70).
- Bateson, G. A. (1955/1972). A theory of play and fantasy. In G. A. Bateson (ed.). *Steps to an ecology of mind* (reprinted by American Psychiatric Association Research Reports, 1955, II, 1939-1951). New York: Chandler.
- Bem, D. J. (1970). *Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Billingsley, N. K. (2020, June 26). *The Truth Behind "Crazy Rich Asians."* Medium. <https://medium.com/coffee-table-wisdom-magazine/the-truth-behind-crazy-rich-asians-643f43f06fdd>
- Chan, V. (2018, August 9). *We Need to Talk About the 'Crazy Rich Asians' Stereotype*. Flare. <https://www.flare.com/tv-movies/crazy-rich-asians-racism-vancouver/>
- Cheng, A. W., Chang, J., O'Brien, J., Budgazad, M. S., & Tsai, J. (2017). Model minority stereotype: Influence on perceived mental health needs of Asian Americans. *Journal of immigrant and minority health*, 19(3), 572-581.
- Cheng, S. J., Hall, D., Hope, T., Hsu, L.K., Jiang, F.C., Lee, A., Schamus, J., (Producer), & Lee, A. (Director). (August 4, 1993). *The Wedding Banquet* [Motion picture]. United States: The Samuel Goldwyn Company.
- Cheryan, S., & Monin, B. (2005). "Where are you really from?": Asian Americans and identity denial. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 717-730.
- Chou, R. S., & Feagin, J. R. (2008). The myth of model minority: Asian Americans facing racism.
- Cobb, R.W., & Elder, C.D. (1972). *Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda-building*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

- Darabont, F., Hurd, G. A., Alpert, D., Kirkman, R., Eglee, C.H., Mazzara, G., Gimple, S.M., Nicotero, G., Luse, T., Huth, D., Kang, A., Incaprera, J., Dale J., Womble, C., Gadd, P., Bellson, H., (Producer). (2010). *The Walking Dead* [Television series]. New York, NY: AMC Network Entertainment LLC.
- Eng, D. L. (2001). *Racial castration: managing masculinity in Asian America*. Duke University Press.
- Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976). Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of communication*, 26(2), 172-199.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goldberg, D. (Producer), & Phillips, T. (Director). (June 2, 2009). *The Hangover* [Motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros. Pictures.
- Gray, T. (2019, January 4). *Jon M. Chu on 'Crazy Rich Asians': 'We Had a Sense of Purpose.'* Variety. <https://variety.com/2019/film/news/jon-chu-crazy-rich-asians-1203105999/#!>
- Green, H.A. (Producer), & Hughes, J. (Director). (May 4, 1984). *Sixteen Candles* [Motion picture]. United States: Universal Pictures.
- Gross, L., & Morgan, M. (1985). Television and enculturation. In J. R. Dominick & J. E. Fletcher (Eds.), *Broadcasting research methods* (pp. 221-234). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Harris, L., Johnson, H. (Producer), & Cassavetes, N. (Director). (June 25, 2004). *The Notebook* [Motion picture]. United States: New Line Cinema.
- Havis, R. J. (2019). *Last Christmas stars Michelle Yeoh, Henry Golding say Hollywood getting better for Asian actors but still has room for more diversity, women*. Scmp. <https://www.scmp.com/lifestyle/entertainment/article/3040321/hollywood-getting-better-asian-actors-say-crazy-rich-asians>
- Hawkins, R. P., & Pingree, S. (1982). Television's influence on social reality. In D. Pearl, L. Bouthilet, & J. Lazar (Eds.), *Television and behavior: Ten years of scientific progress and implications for the eighties* (DHHS Publication No. ADM 82-1196, Vol. 2, pp. 224-247). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Haynes, S. (2018). *Crazy Rich Asians Is More Than Glitz and Glamour. It's Groundbreaking for People Like Me*. Time. <https://time.com/5363724/crazy-rich-asiansrepresentation-meaning/>

- Hillenbrand, M. (2008). Of Myths and Men: "Better Luck Tomorrow" and the Mainstreaming of Asian America Cinema. *Cinema Journal*, 50-75.
- Ho, C., & Jackson, J. W. (2001). Attitude toward asian americans: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(8), 1553-1581.
- Hoberman D., Lieberman, T. (Producer), & Fletcher, A., (Director). (June 19, 2009). *The Proposal* [Motion picture]. United States: Walt Disney Studios Motion Pictures.
- Hutcheon L. *The Politics of Postmodernism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), 89-90.
- Huynh, K., & Woo, B. (2014). 'Asian fail': Chinese Canadian men talk about race, masculinity, and the nerd stereotype. *Social Identities*, 20(4-5), 363-378.
- Jacobson N., Penotti J., Simpson B. (Producer), & Chu J. M. (Director). (August 15, 2018). *Crazy Rich Asians* [Motion picture]. United States: Warner Bros. Pictures.
- Jung, E. A. (2017, July 6). *Steven Yeun Finds Life After Glenn*. Vulture.  
<https://www.vulture.com/2017/07/steven-yeun-interview-okja-walking-dead.html>
- Kahane N., Shapiro G. (Producer), & Leiner D. (Director). (July 30, 2004). *Harold & Kumar Go to White Castle* [Motion picture]. United States: New Line Cinema.
- Kaplan, M., Cash, D. (Producer), & Fimognari, M. (Director). (February 12, 2020). *To All the Boys: To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You* [Motion picture]. United States: Netflix.
- Kahane N., Shapiro G. (Producer), & Leiner D. (Director). (July 30, 2004). *Harold & Kumar Go to White Castle* [Motion picture]. United States: New Line Cinema.
- Knopp, N. (2020). East Asian Male Stereotypes Perpetuated by Current Mainstream U.S. Romantic Comedies.
- Kwan, K. (2013). *Crazy Rich Asians* (Vol. 1). Anchor.
- Lee, C. J. (2018) 'TO ALL THE BOYS I'VE LOVED BEFORE' HAS CREEPY RACIAL THINGS GOING ON. Plan A Magazine. <https://planamag.com/to-all-the-boys-ive-loved-before-has-creepy-racial-things-going-on/>
- Lee, K.-Y., & Joo, S.-H. (2005). The Portrayal of Asian Americans in Mainstream Magazine Ads: An Update. *Journalism & Mass Communication /Quarterly*, 82(3), 654–671.  
 Retrieved from  
<http://ezproxy.lib.usf.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=507834250&site=eds-live>
- Lee, S. (1996). *Unraveling the "model minority" stereotype*. New York, NY: Teachers College



Press.

- Lee, S. J., Wong, N. A., & Alvarez, A. N. (2009). The model minority and the perpetual foreigner: Stereotypes of Asian Americans. In N. Tewari, & A. N. Alvarez (Eds.), *Handbook of Asian American Psychology* (pp. 69–84). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Levin, J. (Producer), & Johnson, S. (Director). (August 17, 2018). *To All the Boys I've Loved Before* [Motion picture]. United States: Netflix.
- Lies, E. (2013, September 04). Book Talk: 'Crazy Rich Asians' tackles stereotypes via satire. Reuters. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-books-authors-kwan/book-talk-crazy-rich-asians-tackles-stereotypes-via-satire-idUSBRE98401H20130905>
- Lin, M. H., Kwan, V. S., Cheung, A., & Fiske, S. T. (2005). Stereotype content model explains prejudice for an envied outgroup: Scale of anti-Asian American stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(1), 34-47.
- Mastro, D., Lapinski, M. K., Kopacz, M. A., & Behm-Morawitz, E. (2009). The influence of exposure to depictions of race and crime in TV news on viewer's social judgments. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 53(4), 615-635.
- McCombs, M. (2018). *Setting the agenda: Mass media and public opinion*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Morgan, M. (1983). Symbolic victimization and real world fear. *Human Communication Research*, 9, 146-157.
- Nam, Y. (2018, February 8). *Asian Representation in Film: The Impact of 'Crazy Rich Asians.'* New York Film Academy. <https://www.nyfa.edu/student-resources/asian-representation-crazy-rich-asians/>
- Neuendorf, K. A., Armstrong, G. B., & Brentar, J.E. (1992). Minority Images and Racial Attitudes as Functions of Viewing Measure Specificity and Gender.
- Nguyen Scaife, S. (2018, August 28). *Crazy Rich Asians has survived impossible representation standards*. The Verge. <https://www.theverge.com/2018/8/28/17788198/crazy-rich-asians-movie-representation-diversity-constance-wu-henry-golding-awkwafina>
- Oh, D. C. (2017). K-Pop Fans React: Hybridity and the White Celebrity-Fan on YouTube. *International Journal of Communication* (19328036), 11.
- Paek, H. J., & Shah, H. (2003). Racial ideology, model minorities, and the “not-so-silent partner”: Stereotyping of Asian Americans in U.S. magazine advertising. *The Howard Journal of Communication*, 14, 225-243.

- Ramasubramanian, S. (2007). Media-based strategies to reduce racial stereotypes activated by news stories. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 84, 249-264.
- Ramasubramanian, S. (2011). Television exposure, model minority portrayals, and Asian-American stereotypes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 26(1), 1-17.
- Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. Vintage.
- Schager, N. (2017). *John Cho on Race, Representation, and the Most 'Meaningful' Role of His Career*. The Daily Beast. <https://www.thedailybeast.com/john-cho-on-race-representation-and-the-most-meaningful-film-of-his-career-3>
- Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior. (1972). *Television and growing up: The impact of televised violence* (DHEW Publication No. HSM 72-9090). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Suzuki, B. H. (1989). Asian Americans as the “model minority”: Outdoing Whites? Or media hype? *Change*, November/December, 13-19.
- Suzuki, B. H. (2002). Revisiting the model minority stereotype: Implications for student affairs practice and higher education. *New Directions for Student Service*, 97, 21-32.
- Tamborini, R., Zillmann, D., & Bryant, J. (1984). Fear and victimization: Exposure to television and perceptions of crime and fear. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 8(1), 492-513.
- Taylor, C. R., Landreth, S., & Bang, H.-K. (2005). Asian Americans in magazine advertising: Portrayals of the “model minority.” *Journal of Macromarketing*, 25, 163-174.
- Today. [Today]. (2018, August 15). *'Crazy Rich Asians' Cast On The Film's Impact On Representation In Hollywood / TODAY* [Video file]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X4wrvjOfaWs>
- Tracy, S. J. (2019). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tseng-Putterman, M. (2018, August 23). One Way That *Crazy Rich Asians* Is a Step Backward. The Atlantic. <https://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2018/08/asian-americas-great-gatsby-moment/568213/>
- Weaver, J., & Wakshlag, J. (1986). Perceived vulnerability to crime, criminal victimization experience, and television viewing.
- Wong, A., Park, R., Kahane, N., Westerman, E. (Producer) & Khan, N. (Director). (May 29,

- 2019). *Always Be My Maybe* [Motion picture]. United States: Netflix.
- Wong, T. (2018, August 18). *Crazy Rich Asians doesn't break stereotypes, it reinforces them*. The Star. <https://www.thestar.com/entertainment/movies/opinion/2018/08/18/crazy-rich-asians-doesnt-break-stereotypes-it-reinforces-them.html>
- Wong, Y. J., Owen, J., Tran, K. K., Collins, D. L., & Higgins, C. E. (2012). Asian American male college students' perceptions of people's stereotypes about Asian American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 13(1), 75.
- Youtube Movies [Youtube]. (2011, April 4). *Harold & Kumar Go to White Castle - Trailer* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cwP5E15VzRM>
- Zhang, Q. (2010). Asian Americans beyond the model minority stereotype: The nerdy and the left out. *Journal of international and intercultural communication*, 3(1), 20-37.
- Zillmann, D. (1979). *Hostility and aggression*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

## Appendix A: Qualitative Codebook

Table A1. Wong et. al Defined

Category	Definition	Examples
Interpersonal deficits	A strong work ethic; or an intense concern with work or academic studies.	<i>Boring, bad tippers, wacky</i>
Intelligence	Physical or phenotypical attributes that are generally considered unattractive.	<i>Smart, intelligent, good at math</i>
Intense diligence	A strong work ethic; or an intense concern with work or academic studies.	<i>Hardworking, they take academics very seriously, studies a lot</i>
Unflattering physical attributes	Physical or phenotypical attributes that are generally considered unattractive.	<i>Short, unattractive, slanted eyes</i>
Physical ability distortions	Atypical or limitations in physical or athletic skills.	<i>Unathletic, physically weak, knows kung fu</i>
Perpetual foreigner	Depictions of Asian Americans as foreigners or which exaggerate their connections with their cultures of origin.	<i>Has a strong accent, only has Asian friends, stick to their culture</i>
Sexual/romantic inadequacies	Inadequacies in sexual functioning or in romantic relationships.	<i>Small penis, inability to perform sexually, bad at relationships</i>

(Wong et. al, 2012)

Table A2. Knopp Defined Stereotypes

Category	Definition	Examples
Materialistic qualities	Overtly associated/concerned with material items or wealth.	<i>Rich, focused on material items, exaggerated importance of money</i>
Subordinate traits	In a lesser position socially, romantically, financially, or in job position.	<i>Lesser than, don't make the decisions, portrayed as less than others</i>
Hyper-sexualized tendencies	Excessive emphasis on sexual characteristics.	<i>Suggestive framing, shirtless without need, obscene language or behaviors, multiple scenes depicting sexual intimacy</i>
Flattering physical attributes	“Physical or phenotypical attributes that are generally considered” attractive. (Wong et. al, 2012)	<i>Tall, attractive, muscular</i>
Social adequacies	A positive “interpersonal style or skill; excludes any response that satisfies the criteria for the sexual/romantic adequacies category.” (Wong et. al, 2012)	<i>Charming, conversationally keen, large social circle, supportive</i>
Sexual/Romantic adequacies	Adequacies “in sexual functioning or in romantic relationships.” (Wong et. al, 2012)	<i>Romantically stable, desirable, ability to perform sexually (Wong et. al, 2012)</i>

(Flattering physical attributes, Social adequacies, and Sexual/Romantic adequacies adapted from

(Wong et. al, 2012)

## **Appendix B: Pretest Instrument**

After viewing the romantic comedy clips, participants will be given the following survey testing traits participants believe were perpetuated by the clips (and their direct counterparts) from a left to right likert scale of 1 to 5; Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree nor disagree, Agree, or Strongly agree.

- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be materialistic.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be subordinate.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be sexualized.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be attractive.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be physically undesirable.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be socially keen.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be socially awkward.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be romantically desirable.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be romantically undesirable.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be hard-working.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be weak.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males to be intelligent.
- I believe that these clips are perpetuating Asian males as standing out.

## Appendix C: Survey Instrument

The following survey has been developed by analyzing the attributes of Table 1 and Table 2 in Appendix A, narrowing key characteristics of the traits into three questions. Survey questions in Section 2 use the structure and were adapted from a study by Ahmed (2017), and Section 3 questions incorporate the structure from the Scale of Anti-Asian American Stereotypes developed by Lin et. al (2005).

### Survey Section 1

Section 1 contains general questions gauging general exposure to Asian representation in the media with a Yes or No response format.

- Have you seen the film *Crazy Rich Asians?* (2018)
- Have you seen the film *To All the Boys I've Loved Before?* (2018)
- Have you seen the film *Always Be My Maybe?* (2019)
- Have you seen the film *To All the Boys: P.S. I Still Love You?* (2020)

### Survey Section 2

Section 2 contains general questions gauging general exposure to Asian representation in the media.

How often have you seen media content portraying Asian male characters?

- a. Not at all
- b. One to Two times per year
- c. One to Two times a month

- d. One to Three times a week
- e. One or more times a day

Which media have you most often seen that portrays Asian male characters?

- a. Films
- b. Television
- c. News
- d. Social Media

If you chose “Films,” which genre of films do you most often watch that portrays East Asian male characters?

- a. Action
- b. Comedy
- c. Romantic Comedy
- d. Drama

### Survey Section 3

Section 3 contains the following questions designed to gauge exposure to Asian representation in the media. The responses range from a-e: a. Not at all, b. One to Two times per year, c. One to Two times a month, d. One to Three times a week, e. One or more times a day:

- How often do you watch Hollywood movies in a theater, on television, on DVD/other sources or streamed online/online downloads?
- How often do you watch Asian movies in a theater, on television, on DVD/ other sources or streamed online/online downloads?

### Survey Section 4

Section 4 contains the following questions designed to gauge interpersonal relationships



with Asian males. The responses range from a-e: a. Not at all, b. One to Two times per year, c. One to Two times a month, d. One to Three times a week, e. One or more times a day:

- How often do you interact with Asian males at school?
- How often do you interact with Asian males as close friends?
- How often do you interact with Asian males as family members?
- How often do you interact with Asian males on social media?
- How often do you interact with Asian males elsewhere?

### Survey Section 5

The following section contains statements through the use of a likert scale of 0 to 5: 0 - strongly disagree, 1 - moderately disagree, 2 - slightly disagree, 3 - slightly agree, 4 - moderately agree, 5 - strongly agree. These statements are designed to measure participant beliefs of traits outlined in Table 1 and Table 2.

#### Materialistic Qualities

- Asian men often own name brand items.
- Asian men stress money more than other qualities.
- Asian men have a mentality that stresses gain of finance.

#### Subordinate Traits

- Asian men are less demanding than other men.
- Asian men are not in charge of their own lives.
- Asian men do not make their own decisions.

#### Hyper-sexualized Tendencies

- Asian men are often sensual.
- Asian men have more sexual qualities than other men.

- Asian men's bodies are often exposed.

#### Attractive Physical Attributes

- Asian men are often physically desirable.
- Asian men are muscular.
- Asian men have pleasant physical features.

#### Unattractive Physical Attributes

- Asian men are often unattractive.
- Asian men have unflattering physical attributes.
- Asian men are short.

#### Social Adequacies

- Asian men function well in social situations.
- Asian men are conversationally keen.
- Asian men have a large social circle.

#### Social Inadequacies

- Asian men do not interact with others smoothly in social situations.
- Asian men are boring.
- Asian men have odd personality traits.

#### Sexual/Romantic Adequacies

- Asian men are romantically desirable.
- Asian men can perform sexually.
- Asian men cultivate lasting romantic relationships.

#### Sexual/Romantic Inadequacies

- Asian men are romantically incompetent.
- Asian men cannot cultivate lasting romantic relationships.
- Asian men do not perform well in romantic relationships.

#### Intense Diligence

- Asian men have more economic success than other races.
- Asian men seem to be striving to become number one.
- Asian men can be described as working all of the time.

#### Physical Ability Distortions

- Asian men achieve an above average fitness level.
- Asian men are physically weak.
- Asian men know martial arts.

#### Intelligence

- Asian men are often intelligent.
- Asian men have more academic ability than other men.

#### Perpetual Foreigner

- Asian men always choose their family's culture.
- Asian men have mostly Asian friends.
- Asian men have strong accents.

(Certain questions adapted from a study by Ahmed (2017) and the Scale of Anti-Asian American Stereotypes developed by Lin et. al (2005).

#### Survey Section 6

The final set of questions seek to find demographics of age, race, and gender.

## Survey Section 7

A final question was asked in order to remove responses from students who took the pretest.