

Artefact Peer Review Discussion

Response 1

Of course, one aspect of this presentation really jumped out at me. On slide 12, in your questionnaire your second question asks “What is your gender (as per your national identity document)?” and provides only two possible responses: male and female.

Providing only two gender options, and requiring that the respondents use assigned gender at birth designations rather than self-identification risks alienating intersex, transgender, non-binary, and other gender-expansive individuals (Braun et al., 2021). Ethical guidelines suggest that research surveys capturing demographic information should include options that are inclusive of gender non-conforming people (American Psychological Association, 2015). Yet the wording of your question, and especially the requirement that the response match government identification appears very deliberate. Can you explain the rationale behind how this question was constructed? And do you believe that providing more inclusive response options would have altered your conclusions?

Thank you Kate for your response, yes, that is a very good point raised. Throughout the project, I have made many changes; I recall the change to only male and female options was likely my first and was a deliberate action. The main reasons for this are the local regulations of the special administrative region and alignment with the vulnerable sample group. In Hong Kong, no legislation recognises identities other than male or female (TEHK, 2023). While the educational institution from the sample allows students to express their gender identification, any administrative data has to follow government legislation and requires either a male or female as indicated on the identity document. The sample included students under the age of 18 years, classifying them as vulnerable. Achieving ethical approval was not an easy process; strict compliance was needed to ensure the sample was safeguarded and authorised from the Hong Kong school.

In future changes, if more inclusive options are implemented, I would hope to see more insightful findings, and indeed, the conclusions would have been altered due to the greater demographic diversity. For a global study or in another country, the gender question would have been set more like my original idea and inclusive. However, whether or not this will be seen in Hong Kong is still largely unclear, particularly as changes to gender identification on the national identity card (Hang, 2023) have only been recently permitted this year, yet many of those applications to change the gender identified on the card are still pending (Capellan, 2023).

Capellan, A. (2023). Hong Kong trans activist Henry Tse on how his journey inspired his fight for rights: 'giving my 100 per cent'. Available from: <https://www.scmp.com/yp/discover/lifestyle/features/article/3231425/hong-kong-trans-activist-henry-tse-how-his-journey-inspired-his-fight-rights-giving-my-100-cent> [Accessed 17 November 2023].

Hang, V. (2023). Rethinking Gender Recognition in Hong Kong and the Way Forward. *Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, 12.

Tehk. (2023). Legal Gender Recognition. Available from: <http://www.tehk.org.hk/recognition.html> [Accessed 17 November 2023].