Table S1

Sample characteristics

Variable	Total sample (N = 1,753)	Poland n = 565	Vietnam n = 1,188
Gender, *n* (%)			
Female	1,338 (76)	447 (79)	891 (75)
Male	382 (22)	105 (19)	277 (23)
Other	33 (1.9)	13 (2.3)	20 (1.7)
Place of residence, *n* (%)			
Rural area	316 (18)	127 (22)	189 (16)
Town/small town	371 (21)	238 (42)	133 (11)
City/large city	1,066 (61)	200 (25)	866 (73)
Relationship status, *n* (%)			
Single, never married	1,417 (81)	256 (45)	1,161 (98)
Relationship, not living together	155 (9)	146 (26)	9 (1)
Relationship, living together	169 (10)	153 (27)	16 (1)
Divorced or widowed	12 (1)	10 (1)	2 (< 1)
Study/work status, *n* (%)			
Only studying	1,121 (64)	271 (48)	850 (72)
Studying and working	632 (36)	294 (52)	338 (28)
Year of study, *n* (%)			
1st year	755 (43)	177 (31)	578 (49)
2nd year	566 (32)	218 (39)	348 (29)
3rd year	274 (16)	80 (14)	194 (16)
4th year	107 (6)	53 (9)	54 (5)
5th year	41 (2)	33 (6)	8 (1)
6th year or postgraduate	10 (1)	4 (1)	6 (< 1)
Religious affiliation, *n* (%)			
Atheist or Agnostic	811 (46)	207 (37)	604 (51)
Buddhist	332 (19)	0 (0)	332 (28)
Catholic	370 (21)	310 (55)	60 (5)
Protestant	15 (1)	3 (<1)	12 (1)
Orthodox Christian	11 (1)	5 (1)	6 (< 1)
Other Christian	15 (1)	14 (3)	1 (< 1)
Other religious tradition	199 (11)	26 (5)	173 (14)
Chronic illness (yes), *n* (%)	217 (12)	119 (21)	98 (8.2)
Standard of living, *n* (%)			
Below average	78 (5)	20 (4)	58 (5)
Average	532 (30)	205 (36)	327 (28)
Above average	1,143 (65)	340 (60)	803 (68)

Note. Profile membership is based on most-likely class assignment.

Table S2

Measurement invariance of the parcel-level CFA model across Poland and Vietnam

Model	Constraints	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	ΔCFI
Configural	Same pattern of loadings	0.951	0.938	0.068	0.037	—
Metric	Loadings equal	0.949	0.939	0.067	0.042	–0.002
Scalar	Loadings + intercepts equal	0.939	0.929	0.072	0.045	–0.010

Note. Models estimated with MLR using parcel indicators. Parceling was used solely to reduce complexity and to enable stable multigroup estimation. Profile membership is based on most-likely class assignment.

Katarzyna Sitnik-Warchulska, Paweł Jurek, Klaudia T. Bochniarz, Ilona Bidzan-Bluma, Thị Minh Loan Lê, Hanh Dung Pham, Hao Van Le, Huong Thu Tran, Michał Olech, Mariola Bidzan, Bernadetta Izydorczyk, Weronika Wysocka, Paulina Pawlicka, Hoang Thi Thanh Hue, Joanna Różycka-Tran, Małgorzata Lipowska

Table S3

Reliability and convergent validity indices for the seven ASR-derived latent dimensions (total sample)

Factor	*k* (items)	AVE	CR	α (ordinal)	ω
IDNSC	18	0.399	0.920	0.918	0.887
Withdrawn	15	0.473	0.930	0.927	0.898
Somatic	11	0.507	0.917	0.911	0.872
Thought	6	0.539	0.875	0.861	0.795
Executive	18	0.436	0.932	0.930	0.901
AggRule	16	0.554	0.951	0.947	0.876
EmoDys	13	0.521	0.933	0.929	0.901

Note. k – number of items; AVE – average variance extracted; CR – composite reliability; α (ordinal) computed for ordinal indicators; ω – McDonald's omega. Profile membership is based on most-likely class assignment.

Table S4

Descriptive statistics of CFA factor scores used as LPA indicators (total sample and by country)

Variable	Sample	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	Skew	Kurtosis
IDNSC	Total	0.006	0.953	−2.843	2.819	−0.069	0.101
	Poland	−0.051	0.949	−2.843	2.800	−0.108	0.119
	Vietnam	0.033	0.953	−2.780	2.819	−0.051	0.081
Withdrawn	Total	0.003	0.944	−2.703	3.121	−0.066	−0.024
	Poland	−0.063	0.914	−2.703	2.820	−0.130	−0.003
	Vietnam	0.035	0.957	−2.590	3.121	−0.049	−0.053
Somatic	Total	0.020	0.904	−2.305	3.396	0.054	−0.171
	Poland	0.022	0.864	−2.305	2.650	0.118	−0.067
	Vietnam	0.019	0.923	−2.250	3.396	0.029	−0.227
Thought	Total	0.040	0.888	−2.338	3.589	0.090	−0.174
	Poland	0.027	0.822	−2.338	2.510	0.057	−0.041
	Vietnam	0.046	0.917	−2.320	3.589	0.097	−0.256
Executive	Total	0.008	0.950	−2.752	2.993	−0.069	−0.056
	Poland	−0.162	0.863	−2.752	2.270	−0.109	0.047
	Vietnam	0.088	0.979	−2.720	2.993	−0.111	−0.116
AggRule	Total	0.082	0.847	−1.943	3.618	0.322	0.020
	Poland	−0.029	0.702	−1.930	2.800	0.205	0.252
	Vietnam	0.134	0.904	−1.943	3.618	0.277	−0.209
EmoDys	Total	0.015	0.941	−2.542	3.206	0.050	0.023
	Poland	−0.047	0.872	−2.510	2.820	0.114	0.519
	Vietnam	0.044	0.971	−2.542	3.206	0.010	−0.161

Note. Factor scores were derived from the item-level CFA and used as continuous indicators for LPA. Profile membership is based on most-likely class assignment.

Table S5

Between-country comparisons (Welch's t-tests) for the seven LPA indicators

Variable	Mean diff. (PL − VN)	*t*	*df*	*p*	95% CI for diff.	Cohen's *d*	Effect
IDNSC	−0.084	−1.73	1113	0.083	[−0.180, 0.011]	−0.09	Negligible
Withdrawn	−0.098	−2.06	1156	0.040	[−0.191, −0.005]	−0.10	Negligible
Somatic	0.003	0.07	1177	0.944	[−0.085, 0.092]	0.00	Negligible
Thought	−0.019	−0.42	1226	0.672	[−0.104, 0.067]	−0.02	Negligible
Executive	−0.250	−5.42	1243	< .001	[−0.340, −0.159]	−0.27	Small
AggRule	−0.163	−4.13	1392	< .001	[−0.241, −0.086]	−0.19	Very small
EmoDys	−0.092	−1.98	1222	0.048	[−0.182, −0.001]	−0.10	Negligible

Note. Positive values indicate higher scores. Mean differences are computed as Poland minus Vietnam. Welch's correction was used to account for unequal variances.

Table S6

Fit statistics and classification quality for the one- through six-profile solutions

Profiles	LogLik	AIC	BIC	SABIC	BLRT *p*	Entropy	Min. PP	Profile proportions (%)
1	−16,349	32,726	32,803	32,758	—	—	—	100.0
2	−12,799	25,643	25,763	25,693	.010	.904	.971	52.4, 47.6
3	−11,121	22,302	22,466	22,371	.010	.912	.958	30.6, 46.8, 22.6
4	−10,240	20,556	20,764	20,643	.010	.913	.948	18.5, 38.2, 32.3, 10.9
5	−9,488	19,069	19,320	19,174	.010	.921	.937	29.8, 32.2, 23.0, 7.9, 7.1
6	−9,174	18,455	18,751	18,579	.010	.903	.907	22.4, 28.1, 15.1, 24.5, 4.2, 5.8

Note. LogLik – log-likelihood; AIC – Akaike information criterion; BIC – Bayesian information criterion; SABIC – sample-size-adjusted Bayesian information criterion; BLRT – bootstrap likelihood ratio test; PP – posterior classification probability. Lower AIC, BIC, and SABIC values indicate better relative fit. The BLRT compares a *k*-profile solution with the corresponding *k* – 1 profile solution. Entropy and posterior classification probabilities closer to 1 indicate greater classification precision. Profile proportions are based on most-likely class assignment.

Katarzyna Sitnik-Warchulska, Paweł Jurek, Klaudia T. Bochniarz, Ilona Bidzan-Bluma, Thị Minh Loan Lê, Hanh Dung Pham, Hao Van Le, Huong Thu Tran, Michał Olech, Mariola Bidzan, Bernadetta Izydorczyk, Weronika Wysocka, Paulina Pawlicka, Hoang Thi Thanh Hue, Joanna Różycka-Tran, Małgorzata Lipowska

Table S7

Fit indices and classification quality for multigroup LPA models

Model	LL	AIC	BIC	SABIC	Entropy	PP mean	PP min
M0 (configural)	−10937.67	22107.35	22741.76	22373.24	0.931	0.9620	0.954
M1 (equal means)	−11063.16	22302.32	22783.60	22504.03	0.929	0.9617	0.955
M2 (equal means + variances)	−11151.27	22422.54	22750.69	22560.07	0.928	0.9603	0.957