

# Review of: "From Isolation to Acceptance: Improving Social Acceptance and Educational Opportunities for Transgender People in Pakistan"

Hamdan Said<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Introduction

Several parts are missing in this section. The authors should have provided strong justification regarding the selection of the stakeholders' (students, teachers, mothers) perceptions and views related to social acceptance and educational opportunities for transgender individuals. Reading through the article, it is revealed that none of the issues raised by the authors emerged from those stakeholders. The authors should bring data or evidence that the issues or problems related to transgender people are directly linked to these types of stakeholders. There was no evidence or write-ups that transgender people face rejection from their peers, teachers, and parents. It would be helpful if the authors provided evidence or data on incidents in which transgender students received cold treatment from their colleagues or teachers. Student peers (colleagues) and teachers have no power to accept or reject other students, including transgender students, to join the schools. Only school administrators and education officials can do that. Thus, evidence is needed to substantiate this study using elementary school students, teachers, and mothers.

## Methodological issues

This section needs to be revised. Many methodological issues or loopholes arise from this study, including an incomplete description of the methodology and a lack of clarity.

## Research design

The type of research design used for this study needs to be clarified. There are seven types of qualitative research designs. Which one is for this study? What are the justifications for the selection? Unfortunately, the choice of the research design is not in tandem with the selection of the participants.

## Selection of the schools

It is still being determined why these two elementary schools were selected. Why do these two elementary schools become the focus rather than the participants? Why do these two elementary schools become the focus compared to many other schools? This selection must be in tandem with the issues stated in the introduction section, research gaps, and qualitative research design.

## **Selection of the participants**

It needs to be made clear how purposive sampling is performed. What selection criteria were employed for this study? No selection criteria or basis are stated for selecting the participants. Why were those grade eight chosen girls compared to other girls in these two elementary schools? What happened to students from other grades? Similarly, why were only those female teachers selected compared to many different female teachers? Why were only eight participants from each category? What basis was employed to stop at eight participants for each category of stakeholders? What references were used? How can these eight participants for each group guarantee in-depth data collection?

## **Data collection tools and techniques**

How the interview guides were developed needs to be clarified. What frameworks or guidelines were used to assist in developing the interview questions in the interview guide?

It needs to be made clear how data was collected. Where were the data collected? In the room or where? How did the authors contact the participants for the appointments? Did the authors record the interview sessions? If yes, how? Did the authors seek permission to record the interview sessions?

## **Data analysis techniques**

It is reported that the interview sessions were transcribed and translated. Unfortunately, the transcription and translation transcripts have not been validated or verified. It is also dubious how Marshall and Rossman's model was employed to analyze the data. The brief description indicates that the data were analyzed without adhering to the Marshall and Rossman model and thematic analysis. The authors must detail the thematic data analysis using Marshall and Rossman's steps. Secondly, there is a lack of clarity on how consistency and dependency were addressed in data collection and analysis.

The authors claimed that the transcripts were shown to the participants. This statement is also dubious since no steps were described to indicate that this action was taken. How did the authors perform this step? Through emails or face-to-face meetings? I don't think any clarification has been provided. Three groups of stakeholders were interviewed. What is the arrangement like?

## **Data Findings**

This subtopic needs to be clarified. What do data findings mean? It is strongly suggested that you use either the term "findings" or "results," as data findings may provide more than one meaning or connotation.

The authors should have addressed all the research objectives according to the stated methodology and the selected data analysis model. Looking at the write-ups in this section, the authors did not use thematic analysis based on the Marshall and Rossman model as claimed. The action is questionable, invites unintended questions, and jeopardizes the authors' validity, reliability, and truthfulness in seeking answers to issues and the research objectives. The candidate should have provided themes from each research objective. The themes must emerge aligned with the selected model of

data analysis.

## **Discussion**

The discussion section needs to be more credible, as many parts of the write-ups are beyond the findings of this study. Much of the stated discussion does not emerge from the study's thematic data analysis but from the literature survey or search. Not even a single theme of each research objective was highlighted, making this section dubious. This action indicates that this study is not exploratory, as claimed in the methodology section of this article. The write-ups in this section should have critically discussed and linked the discussion to the issues and research gaps. This action left this section without a legitimate and conclusive study contribution to fill any knowledge gaps. It is strongly suggested that the authors revisit the data analysis process by adhering to the thematic analysis using the stated model.

## **Conclusion**

This section needs further improvement to match and align with the issues, knowledge gaps, and findings. It is unacceptable that no loopholes in educational policies were stated in the introduction or part of the article.

## **Reference**

Writing the reference is inconsistent. The authors must adhere to one format only. Be mindful of uppercase and lowercase (capital and small letters), spacing, and italics and non-italics.