**SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS**

**Pilot Study for Face Stimuli**

 Fifty-three students completed the pilot study to test face stimuli. Participants viewed photos of Asian, White, and multiracial Asian-White faces one at a time in random order. For each face, participants rated the emotional expression of the face on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Very negative*; 7 *= Very positive*). We computed the mean emotional expression ratings for the Asian, White, and multiracial faces separately and conducted a repeated-measures ANOVA to compare these means. We found no significant differences in emotional expression between the Asian, White, and multiracial faces, *F*(2, 104) = 1.30, *p* = .278, ƞ2p = .02.

**Results with Subsets of Multiracial Participants and Targets**

**Analytic Strategy**

 We conducted analyses using subsets of multiracial participants and multiracial target faces to test if the results are driven by multiracial participants whose racial combination matches the racial combination of target faces. If we find that multiracial participants were only more likely to categorize Asian-White targets as multiracial when the race combination of the participants and targets matches, this would suggest that the results may be explained by ingroup familiarity. We conducted these analyses on the following four subsets of data: 1) East Asian-White perceivers and targets, 2) East Asian-White perceivers and non-East Asian-White targets, 3) White-minority perceivers and East Asian-White targets, and 4) White-minority perceivers and non-East Asian-White targets. The White-minority group of participants included Black-White, Latin-White, Native American-White, Middle Eastern-White, and White-multiple minorities. We excluded South Asian-White participants from the analyses because the non-East Asian-White multiracial targets included some South Asian-White target photos. We used R 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017) and cross-classified generalized linear mixed effects models, in which we regressed participants’ race and task type onto categorizations of the targets. The three-level variable of participants’ race included the following contrast codes: 1) multiracial versus monoracial participants and 2) Asian versus White participants. The three-level variable task type included the following contrast codes: 1) free-response versus forced-choice tasks (i.e., combining the eight-choice and two-choice tasks) and 2) eight-choice versus two-choice tasks. Given that the main results reported in the manuscript showed no significant differences between samples, and to increase power, we combined the responses from both samples for these analyses and therefore did not include sample as an independent variable. We included participants and target photos as nesting variables and modelled random slopes of participants’ race and task types to achieve more precise estimates of the fixed effects. We conducted post-hoc analyses as needed using simple slopes (Aiken & West, 1991). For all analyses, we report regression coefficients, Odds Ratio (OR), which provides an index of effect size, and 95% confidence intervals.

**Subset 1: East Asian-White participants and targets**

We tested whether East Asian-White participants would racially categorize East Asian-White targets as multiracial more often than Asian and White participants in different response types (see Figure 3). Results revealed that, across response types, multiracial East Asian-White participants (37%) were more likely to categorize East Asian-White targets as multiracial than monoracial participants (29%), *b* = .69, *SE* = .22, *z* = 3.13, *p* = .002, OR = 2.00, 95% CI [1.30, 3.08]. Furthermore, participants categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial less in the free-response (11%) than in a forced-choice (40%) task, *b* = 2.56, *SE* = .20, *z* = 12.48, *p* < .001, OR = 12.87, 95% CI [8.62, 19.23]. Participants also categorized East Asian-White targets less often as multiracial in the eight-choice (24%) compared to the two-choice (55%) task, *b* = 1.63, *SE* = .10, *z* = 15.72, *p* < .001, OR = 5.11, 95% CI [4.17, 6.26].

Three interactions emerged, however, they all had weak effects and simple slopes were only able to detect the source of the first interaction (see Table 3 for analysis output). The first interaction that emerged was between participants’ race (monoracial versus multiracial) and task type (8-choice versus 2-choice). Simple slopes determined that East Asian-White participants categorized East-Asian White targets as multiracial more than monoracial participants did in the eight-choice task, however, no significant difference emerged between East Asian-White and monoracial participants in the two-choice task. The second interaction that emerged was between participants’ race (Asian versus White) and task type (free-response versus forced-choice). Simple slopes determined that both participant groups categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial significantly more in the forced-choice than in the free-response task. Furthermore, no significant differences emerged between Asian and White participants within each task type. The third interaction was between participants’ race (Asian versus White) and task type (8-choice versus 2-choice). Simple slopes determined that both participant groups categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial significantly more in the two-choice than in the eight-response task. Furthermore, no significant differences emerged between Asian and White participants within each task type.

In sum, East Asian-White participants categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial more than monoracial participants did. Participants also categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial most often in the two-choice, followed by the eight-choice, followed by the free-response task.

Table 3

*Results of Interactions between Participants’ Race and Response Type*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *b* | *SE* | *z* | OR | 95% CI |
| Participants’ Race (Monoracial vs. Multiracial) X Task Type (8-Choice vs. 2-Choice) | -.54\* | .24 | -2.23 | .59 | .37, .94 |
|  Eight-Choice Task: Multiracial vs.  Monoracial Participants | .88\*\*\* | .25 | 3.53 | 2.42 | 1.48, 3.96 |
|  Two-Choice Task: Multiracial vs.  Monoracial Participants | .35 | .22 | 1.62 | 1.42 | .93, 2.16 |
|  Multiracial Participants: Eight-Choice Task vs. Two-Choice Task | 1.27\*\*\* | .22 | 5.85 | 3.58 | 2.33, 5.48 |
|  Monoracial Participants: Eight-Choice  Task vs. Two-Choice Task | 1.79\*\*\* | .11 | 16.51 | 5.97 | 4.83, 7.38 |
| Participants’ Race (Asian vs. White) X Task Type (Free-Response vs. Forced-Choice) | -.63\* | .31 | -2.03 | .54 | .29, .98 |
|  Free-Response Task: Asian vs.  White Participants | .67t | .35 | 1.95 | 1.96 | 1.00, 3.87 |
|  Forced-Choice Task: Asian vs.  White Participants | -.01 | .16 | -.07 | .99 | .72, 1.36 |
|  Asian Participants: Free-Response vs.  Forced-Choice Task | 2.32\*\*\* | .25 | 9.44 | 10.14 | 6.27, 16.42 |
|  White Participants: Free-Response vs.  Forced-Choice Task | 2.94\*\*\* | .30 | 9.91 | 18.97 | 10.60, 33.96 |
| Participants’ Race (Asian vs. White) X Task Type (8-Choice vs. 2-Choice) | -.52\*\* | .20 | -2.61 | .60 | .41, .88 |
|  Eight-Choice Task: Asian vs. White  Participants | .31 | .23 | 1.34 | 1.36 | .87, 2.13 |
|  Two-Choice Task: Asian vs. White  Participants | -.21 | .19 | -1.09 | .81 | .56, 1.18 |
|  Asian Participants: Eight- vs.  Two-Choice Task | 1.55\*\*\* | .14 | 11.39 | 4.72 | 3.61, 6.17 |
|  White Participants: Eight- vs.  Two-Choice Task | 2.07\*\*\* | .16 | 13.29 | 7.90 | 5.83, 10.72 |

Note. *b* = unstandardized beta, *SE* = standard error, *z* = z-score, OR = Odds Ratio, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval, t = *p* < .10, \* = *p* < .05, \*\* = *p* < .01, \*\*\* = *p* < .001.

**Subset 2: East Asian-White perceivers and non-East Asian-White targets**

 We tested whether East Asian-White participants would racially categorize non-East Asian-White targets as multiracial more often than Asian and White participants in different response types (see Figure 4). Results revealed that participants categorized non-East Asian-White targets as multiracial less in the free-response (5%) than in a forced-choice (26%) task, *b* = 3.21, *SE* = .34, *z* = 9.33, *p* < .001, OR = 24.79, 95% CI [12.63, 48.68]. Participants also categorized non-East Asian-White targets less often as multiracial in the eight-choice (14%) compared to the two-choice (39%) task, *b* = 1.70, *SE* = .12, *z* = 14.28, *p* < .001, OR = 5.49, 95% CI [4.35, 6.94]. Although a significant difference between multiracial East Asian-White and monoracial perceivers did not emerge, *b* = .35, *SE* = .29, *z* = 1.23, *p* = .219, OR = 1.42, 95% CI [.81, 2.49], the pattern of results is similar to other subsets of data – multiracial East Asian-White perceivers (23%) categorized multiracial non-East Asian-White targets as multiracial at a greater rate than monoracial perceivers (18%).

An interaction emerged between participants’ race (monoracial versus multiracial) and task type (8-choice versus 2-choice). Simple slopes determined that East Asian-White participants categorized non-East-Asian White targets as multiracial more than monoracial participants did in the eight-choice task, however, no significant difference emerged between East Asian-White and monoracial participants in the two-choice task (see Table 4 for analysis output).

Table 4

*Results of Interactions between Participants’ Race and Response Type*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *b* | *SE* | *z* | OR | 95% CI |
| Participants’ Race (Monoracial vs. Multiracial) X Task Type (8-Choice vs. 2-Choice) | -.64\* | .25 | -2.56 | .53 | .32, .86 |
|  Eight-Choice Task: Multiracial vs.  Monoracial Participants | .69\* | .30 | 2.34 | 2.00 | 1.12, 3.57 |
|  Two-Choice Task: Multiracial vs.  Monoracial Participants | .05 | .24 | .20 | 1.05 | .65, 1.70 |
|  Multiracial Participants: Eight-Choice Task vs. Two-Choice Task | 1.28\*\*\* | .23 | 5.54 | 3.58 | 2.28, 5.62 |
|  Monoracial Participants: Eight-Choice  Task vs. Two-Choice Task | 1.90\*\*\* | .13 | 15.14 | 6.70 | 5.24, 8.57 |

Note. *b* = unstandardized beta, *SE* = standard error, *z* = z-score, OR = Odds Ratio, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval, t = *p* < .10, \* = *p* < .05, \*\* = *p* < .01, \*\*\* = *p* < .001.

**Subset 3: White-minority perceivers and East Asian-White targets**

We tested whether White-minority participants would racially categorize East Asian-White targets as multiracial more often than Asian and White participants in different response types (see Figure 3). Results revealed that, across response types, multiracial White-minority participants (40%) were more likely to categorize East Asian-White targets as multiracial than monoracial participants (29%), *b* = .91, *SE* = .26, *z* = 3.56, *p* < .001, OR = 2.50, 95% CI [1.51, 4.13]. Furthermore, participants categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial less in the free-response (11%) than in a forced-choice (40%) task, *b* = 2.36, *SE* = .22, *z* = 10.91, *p* < .001, OR = 10.60, 95% CI [6.94, 16.20]. Participants also categorized East Asian-White targets less often as multiracial in the eight-choice (24%) compared to the two-choice (55%) task, *b* = 1.77, *SE* = .12, *z* = 15.21, *p* < .001, OR = 5.86, 95% CI [4.67, 7.37].

Three interactions emerged, however, they all had weak effects and simple slopes were only able to detect the source of the first interaction (see Table 5 for analysis output). The first interaction that emerged was between participants’ race (monoracial versus multiracial) and task type (free-response versus forced-choice). Simple slopes determined that both participant groups categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial significantly more in the forced-choice than in the free-response task. Furthermore, White-minority participants categorized East-Asian White targets as multiracial more than monoracial participants did in both tasks, however the effect was larger in the free-response task. The second interaction that emerged was between participants’ race (Asian versus White) and task type (free-response versus forced-choice). Simple slopes determined that both participant groups categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial significantly more in the forced-choice than in the free-response task. Furthermore, no significant differences emerged between Asian and White participants within each task type. The third interaction was between participants’ race (Asian versus White) and task type (8-choice versus 2-choice). Simple slopes determined that both participant groups categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial significantly more in the two-choice than in the eight-response task. Furthermore, no significant differences emerged between Asian and White participants within each task type.

In sum, White-minority participants categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial more than monoracial participants did. Participants also categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial most often in the two-choice, followed by the eight-choice, followed by the free-response task.

Table 5

*Results of Interactions between Participants’ Race and Response Type*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *b* | *SE* | *z* | OR | 95% CI |
| Participants’ Race (Monoracial vs. Multiracial) X Task Type (Free-Response vs. Forced-Choice) | -1.14\*\* | .39 | -2.96 | .32 | .15, .68 |
|  Free-Response Task: Multiracial vs.  Monoracial Participants | 1.68\*\*\* | .44 | 3.84 | 5.34 | 2.27, 12.57 |
|  Forced-Choice Task: Multiracial vs.  Monoracial Participants | .44\* | .19 | 2.32 | 1.56 | 1.07, 2.26 |
|  Multiracial Participants: Free-Response Task vs. Forced -Choice Task | 1.60\*\*\* | .36 | 4.46 | 4.95 | 2.45, 10.01 |
|  Monoracial Participants: Free-Response Task vs. Forced -Choice Task | 2.72\*\*\* | .24 | 11.53 | 15.14 | 9.54, 24.02 |
| Participants’ Race (Asian vs. White) X Task Type (Free-Response vs. Forced-Choice) | -.65\* | .32 | -2.03 | .52 | .28, .98 |
|  Free-Response Task: Asian vs.  White Participants | .71t | .37 | 1.92 | 2.03 | .99, 4.16 |
|  Forced-Choice Task: Asian vs.  White Participants | -.01 | .17 | -.07 | .99 | .72, 1.37 |
|  Asian Participants: Free-Response vs.  Forced-Choice Task | 2.41\*\*\*\* | .26 | 9.37 | 11.18 | 6.75, 18.53 |
|  White Participants: Free-Response vs.  Forced-Choice Task | 3.07\*\*\* | .31 | 9.87 | 21.50 | 11.69, 39.55 |
| Participants’ Race (Asian vs. White) X Task Type (8-Choice vs. 2-Choice) | -.52\*\* | .20 | -2.58 | .59 | .40, .88 |
|  Eight-Choice Task: Asian vs. White  Participants | .31 | .23 | 1.31 | 1.37 | .86, 2.18 |
|  Two-Choice Task: Asian vs. White  Participants | -.21 | .19 | -1.08 | .81 | .56, 1.19 |
|  Asian Participants: Eight- vs.  Two-Choice Task | 1.58\*\*\* | .14 | 11.31 | 4.87 | 3.70, 6.41 |
|  White Participants: Eight- vs.  Two-Choice Task | 2.11\*\*\* | .16 | 13.16 | 8.21 | 6.00, 11.24 |

Note. *b* = unstandardized beta, *SE* = standard error, *z* = z-score, OR = Odds Ratio, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval, t = *p* < .10, \* = *p* < .05, \*\* = *p* < .01, \*\*\* = *p* < .001.

**Subset 4: White-minority perceivers and non-East Asian-White targets**

We tested whether White-minority participants would racially categorize non-East Asian-White targets as multiracial more often than Asian and White participants in different response types (see Figure 4). Results revealed that, across response types, multiracial White-minority participants (27%) were more likely to categorize non-East Asian-White targets as multiracial than monoracial participants (18%), *b* = .84, *SE* = .27, *z* = 3.06, *p* = .002, OR = 2.32, 95% CI [1.35, 3.96]. Furthermore, participants categorized non-East Asian-White targets as multiracial less in the free-response (5%) than in a forced-choice (27%) task, *b* = 3.28, *SE* = .38, *z* = 8.54, *p* < .001, OR = 26.46, 95% CI [12.47, 56.15]. Participants also categorized non-East Asian-White targets less often as multiracial in the eight-choice (13%) compared to the two-choice (40%) task, *b* = 1.79, *SE* = .12, *z* = 14.70, *p* < .001, OR = 5.99, 95% CI [4.72, 7.60]. No other main effects or interactions emerged, *b*s < .50, *z*s < 1.70, *p*s > .10, ORs < 1.20, 95% CIs [.24, 1.87].

In sum, White-minority participants categorized non-East Asian-White targets as multiracial more than monoracial participants did. Participants also categorized East Asian-White targets as multiracial most often in the two-choice, followed by the eight-choice, followed by the free-response task.

*Figure 3*. Observed multiracial categorizations of East Asian-White faces in each task type and for each group of participants.

*Figure 4*. Observed multiracial categorizations of non-East Asian-White faces in each task type and for each group of participants.

**Summary and Conclusion**

We examined the data using subsets of multiracial participants and multiracial target faces to test whether multiracial participants with the same racial combination as multiracial targets were more likely to categorize multiracial Asian-White targets as multiracial. We did not find evidence of greater use of the multiracial category when the racial background of the multiracial participants and the multiracial target faces matched. Indeed, multiracial participants of all combinations categorized multiracial target faces as multiracial more often than did monoracial participants. Therefore, the pattern of results suggests that the results may not be explained by ingroup familiarity.

**Results of Asian and White Target Faces**

**Analytic Strategy**

We used R 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017) and cross-classified generalized linear mixed effects models that were similar to the ones described in the main text to analyze the data for Asian and White target faces. First, we tested if Asian and White targets were categorized as Asian and White more often than non-Asian and as non-White, respectively. Next, we examined if perceivers’ race and sample predicted race categorizations of Asian and White faces using the free-response data. Finally, we compared the frequency with which perceivers racially categorized Asian targets as Asian and White targets as White in all three task types.

**Asian Targets**

**Free-response task**. Perceivers categorized Asian targets more often as Asian than as non-Asian, *b* = 4.59, *SE* = .00, *z* = 9256.75, *p* < .001, OR = 98.78, 95% CI [98.68, 98.88]. Three small main effects emerged. Monoracial perceivers categorized Asian targets as Asian significantly more than multiracial perceivers, *b* = .20, *SE* = .00, *z* = 408.08, *p* < .001, OR = 1.22, 95% CI [1.22, 1.22], and Asian perceivers categorized Asian targets as Asian significantly more than White perceivers did, *b* = .77, *SE* = .00, *z* = 1605, *p* < .001, OR = 2.16, 95% CI [2.16, 2.16]. Furthermore, participants in sample 1 categorized Asian targets as Asian significantly more than participants in sample 2, *b* = -.80, *SE* = .00, *z* = -1603, *p* < .001, OR = .45, 95% CI [.45, .45].

A weak interaction emerged between participants’ race contrast 1 (monoracial versus multiracial) and sample (sample 1 versus sample 2), *b* = -.78, *SE* = .00, *z* = -1624.27, *p* < .001, OR = .46, 95% CI [.46, .46]. Simple slopes determined that monoracial participants in sample 1 categorized Asian targets as Asian significantly more than multiracial participants in sample 1, *b* = .55, *SE* = .00, *z* = 1219.50, *p* < .001, OR = 1.72, 95% CI [1.22, 1.22]. However, there was no significant difference between monoracial and multiracial participants’ categorizations of Asian faces in sample 2, *b* = -.20, *SE* = .33, *z* = -.62, *p* = .53, OR = .82, 95% CI [1.22, 1.22].

A second interaction emerged between participants’ race contrast 2 (Asian versus White) and sample (sample 1 versus sample 2), *b* = .04, *SE* = .00, *z* = 88.38, *p* < .001, OR = 1.05, 95% CI [1.04, 1.05]. Simple slopes determined that White participants in sample 1 categorized Asian faces as Asian significantly more than White participants in sample 2, *b* = -.59, *SE* = .00, *z* = -1243.60, *p* < .001, OR = .55, 95% CI [.45, .45]. However, there was no significant difference between Asian participants’ categorizations of Asian faces in sample 1 versus sample 2, *b* = -.57, *SE* = .45, *z* = -1.28, *p* = .20, OR = .57, 95% CI [.45, .45].**Task effects**. Participants categorized Asian faces as Asian significantly more in the free-response than in the forced-choice task, *b* = -1.03, *SE* = .15, *z* = -7.10, *p* < .001, OR = .36, 95% CI [.27, .47], and in the eight-choice more than the two-choice task, *b* = -.60, *SE* = .12, *z* = -4.88, *p* < .001, OR = .55, 95% CI [.43, .70]. Asian participants categorized Asian faces as Asian significantly more often than White participants did, *b* = .55, *SE* = .20, *z* = 2.73, *p* = .006, OR = 1.74, 95% CI [1.17, 2.59]. Furthermore, perceivers in Sample 1 racially categorized Asian faces as Asian significantly more than perceivers in Sample 2, *b* = -.37, *SE* = .18, *z* = -2.06, *p* = .040, OR = .69, 95% CI [.48, .98].

An interaction emerged between participants’ race contrast 2 (Asian versus White participants) and task type contrast 2 (eight-choice versus two-choice task), *b* = .97, *SE* = .24, *z* = 4.01, *p* < .001, OR = 2.65, 95% CI [1.65, 4.26]. Simple slopes determined that Asian participants categorized Asian faces as monoracial significantly more often than White participants in the two-choice task, *b* = .95, *SE* = .23, *z* = 4.17, *p* < .001, OR = 2.59, 95% CI [1.66, 4.06]. However, there was no significant difference between White and Asian participants’ categorizations of Asian faces in the eight-choice task, *b* = -.02, *SE* = .03, *z* = -.08, *p* = .937, OR = .98, 95% CI [.59, 1.63] (see Figure 5).

*Figure 5*. Observed categorizations of Asian faces as Asian in each task type and for each group of participants.

**White Targets**

**Free-response task**. Perceivers categorized White targets more often as White than as non-White, *b* = 2.46, *SE* = .28, *z* = 8.86, *p* < .001, OR = 11.67, 95% CI [6.77, 20.09]. Two small main effects emerged for participants’ race: monoracial perceivers categorized White targets as White significantly more than multiracial perceivers, *b* = .55, *SE* = .22, *z* = 2.50, *p* = .012, OR = 1.73, 95% CI [1.13, 2.67], and White perceivers categorized White targets as White significantly more than Asian perceivers did, *b* = -.78, *SE* = .24, *z* = -3.21, *p* = .001, OR = .46, 95% CI [.28, .74]. No main effects of sample or interactions between participants’ race and sample emerged, *b*s < .25, *z*s < 1.50, *p*s > .25, ORs < 1.50, 95% CIs [.36, 3.09].

**Task effects**. Participants categorized White targets as White significantly more in the free-response than in the forced-choice tasks, *b* = -.55, *SE* = .10, *z* = -5.48, *p* < .001, OR = .58, 95% CI [.48, .71], and in the two-choice than in the eight-choice task, *b* = .78, *SE* = .08, *z* = 9.81, *p* < .001, OR = 2.18, 95% CI [1.86, 2.54]. Monoracial participants categorized White faces as White significantly more than multiracial participants, *b* = .30, *SE* = .15, *z* = 2.08, *p* = .038, OR = 1.35, 95% CI [1.02, 1.80]. Furthermore, White participants categorized White faces as White significantly more than Asian participants, *b* = -.69, *SE* = .18, *z* = -3.76, *p* < .001, OR = .50, 95% CI [.35, .72]. No main effect of sample or interactions emerged, *b*s < .50, *z*s < 2.00, *p*s > .05, ORs < 1.80, 95% CIs [.30, 2.61] (see Figure 6).

*Figure 6*. Observed categorizations of White faces as White in each task type and for each group of participants.