

## Ethnic-Racial Socialization in Mixed Heritage Families: A Grounded Theory Study


Angel. Lee<sup>1</sup>, Amirul. Iskandar<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Social Sciences & Liberal Arts, Department of Psychology, UCSI University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia



<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

\* Corresponding author email address: amirul@um.edu.my

### E d i t o r

Stefano Vinaccia<sup>1</sup>  
Profesor de psicología Universidad  
del SINU, Montería, Colombia  
Vinalpi47@hotmail.com

### R e v i e w e r s

**Reviewer 1:** Hooman Namvar<sup>1</sup>  
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Saveh Branch, Islamic Azad  
University, Saveh, Iran. Email: hnamvar@iau-saveh.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Mahdi Khanjani<sup>1</sup>  
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University,  
Tehran, Iran.  
Email: khanjani\_m@atu.ac.ir

### 1. Round 1

#### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “Ethnic-racial socialization... becomes uniquely intricate in mixed heritage families...” needs clarification of what specifically distinguishes the complexity in these families. A short example or empirical reference would enhance specificity.

In “heritage language loss has been associated with declines in ethnic identity and self-esteem...,” consider adding the age range or developmental period where this is most impactful, based on the cited studies.

The sentence “...parents must then mediate not only between cultures but also between generations...” is strong but could be followed by a sentence identifying which generation (e.g., maternal/paternal grandparents) often asserts more cultural authority in Malaysian contexts.

The paragraph starting with “Cultural practices surrounding death, grief, and major life transitions...” introduces a culturally rich area. Consider referencing any observed practices from the current data to justify inclusion in the introduction.

The distinction between “subcategories” and “concepts” should be clarified. Are concepts equivalent to open codes, and are subcategories derived from axial coding? The table organization suggests this but should be explicitly confirmed in the narrative.

The quote “We chose a name that has both Indian and Chinese roots—it’s who she is” is powerful. This subtheme on naming deserves more elaboration, possibly citing whether naming was a point of intergenerational or co-parenting negotiation.

The phrase “I became that mom who emails the principal...” is impactful. The manuscript would be stronger by noting whether such advocacy resulted in structural changes or remained symbolic resistance.

The comparison with Zhou et al. (2020) is well-made, but it would be stronger if the authors linked it more directly to their own findings on food and naming, emphasizing intergenerational healing or reparation.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Mixed heritage families are not monolithic...” could be strengthened by providing a brief example of divergent parenting philosophies or language practices to ground this claim empirically.

The statement “...parents choose to emphasize one culture over another...” needs expansion. A sentence explaining how these choices are shaped by structural pressures (e.g., school policies, media) would offer more analytical depth.

The phrase “interviews were conducted in participants’ preferred language...” is excellent but incomplete. Specify which languages were used and whether translation or interpreter services were required, as this affects interpretation validity.

The quote “She laughs at jokes I don’t get—it’s small, but it matters” introduces the theme of cultural humor, which is underexplored. Consider whether humor misalignment is a frequent or rare source of disconnection.

The role of digital communities is briefly mentioned. Expand on whether these communities served as spaces for emotional support, cultural education, or both, and how frequently participants engaged with them.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.