Proceedings of ICILLP 2025 Symposium: Property Law and Blockchain Applications in International Law and Legal Policy
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28403

Governance Mechanism and On-the-Ground Implementation of the U.S. X-Gender Passport — A Case Study Using PEST and SWOT

Shutian Wu

Guangdong Country Garden School, Foshan, China
wushutian2026@gmail.com

Abstract. This paper takes the X gender option in the U.S. passport as the entry point. It places it within a decade-long discussion about how to redefine sex and gender to explain why different fields expect different things from policy. At the federal level, the implementation of self-attestation by applicants, coupled with a three-tiered classification system, streamlines border transit and interagency validation processes. This, in turn, mitigates individual-level impediments pertaining to travel logistics, academic registration, and occupational pursuits. In contrast, areas that stress fairness and safety—such as sports, school facilities, and custodial placement—require more substantial evidence, and boundaries often need a second round of definition. Drawing on course materials and recent developments, this paper applies PEST and SWOT to analyze four dimensions—politics and law, administration and economy, society and culture, and technology and data—and uses college sports as a comparison to show how "recognition, implementability, and fairness/safety" proceed at different speeds in different arenas.

Keywords: U.S. X-gender passport, Policy implementation, PEST and SWOT analysis, Federal–state coordination

1. Introduction

In recent years, transgender and gender-diverse groups have become easier to see. Media coverage is growing, and public institutions are adjusting documents, education, and employment rules. Visibility alone is not enough, though; different settings hold different expectations for how recognition happens and what should follow after it. In practice, social norms and legal documents must address two primary challenges: establishing the definitions of sex and gender, and subsequently, codifying these definitions into tangible procedures and allocation protocols [1].

The passport is a good window into these changes. It primarily serves cross-border travel and cross-agency checks, the main goals of accurate identification and a smooth process while reducing unnecessary data exposure [2]. By contrast, sports grouping tends to put fairness and safety first, relying on evidence from exercise physiology; standard rules usually need repeated polishing [3]. Seeing these two institutional goals simultaneously helps explain why "recognizing gender" advances at different speeds across fields. Globally, gaps in education and health have closed faster.

© 2025 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28403

Concurrently, advancements in economic engagement and political agency are considerably more gradual, and this disparity influences the cadence of progressive change and the public's tolerance [4]. The paper will first lay out theory and history, then return to the passport case, and finally offer a sports comparison and a workable route map, so the argument moves from “why” toward “how.”

2. Background and theoretical threads

Prior to delving into the specifics of this case, it is beneficial to elucidate the imperative for a discourse on the X marker. Initially, gender was frequently considered synonymous with biological characteristics. Subsequently, advancements in psychology and feminist studies led to a distinction between gender roles and biological sex. In recent years, the increasing visibility of transgender individuals has compelled both society and the legal system to reevaluate definitions and support mechanisms. This situation constitutes the "definitional exigency" commonly addressed in academic discussions [5].

Attitudes are also shaped by how people meet and how information travels. Face-to-face intergroup contact tends to reduce prejudice when equal status and institutional support exist [6]. With technology and social media, people meet less in person; even so, long-term mediated contact can still lower prejudice—maybe slower—this is the “parasocial contact” pathway [7]. In other words, how issues are communicated and presented affects acceptance of gender theories and related policies.

History can reset starting points. In the 1970s, the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from the diagnostic manual, giving later marriage equality and anti-discrimination laws a new medical and legal footing [8]. In feminism, Western movements moved from nineteenth-century legal equality toward cultural equality and then intersectional views [9]. In China, protracted periods frequently exhibit a juxtaposition of institutional parity and tangible disparities, wherein advancements in education and employment may be succeeded by concomitant systemic impediments [10]. On the same timeline, organizational experience in social movements also changed—from early community groups to modern rights mobilization—so agendas and strategies kept shifting, creating today’s channels for policy diffusion [11]. With this background set, return to practice: how the passport’s X marker runs and where it collides with other systems.

3. Case analysis of the passport X marker

At present, the X marker relies on self-declaration. By incorporating a non-binary "X" option in documentation and interface fields, we can align legal identity with personal identification across critical interactions. This reduces friction at border crossings, security screenings, onboarding processes, and school registrations by minimizing redundant explanations and system incompatibilities, thereby enabling agencies to achieve data interoperability [2].

In practice, the real resistance often lies outside the passport registry. States keep different thresholds for changing birth certificates and driver’s licenses; some still require medical proof or a waiting period. So even if a federal passport is updated to X, in some local school, HR, or insurance systems, the gender field remains binary, and records don’t fully align. A pragmatic approach is to use the federal passport as a consistent “anchor,” then push local systems to align step by step through clear procedures [12].

There were new variables this year. In April, USCIS updated its policy manual to stop using X in its identity documents and to write “gender” uniformly as “sex.” In mid-June, the federal district court in Massachusetts issued a preliminary injunction in Orr v. Trump, requiring the State

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28403

Department, during the litigation, to keep allowing applicants to choose the passport sex marker, including X, which directly preserves feasibility on the document side [13]. As of July, the State Department's website explicitly stated that applicants could select M/F/X, indicating the passport division's continued implementation of a three-gender-marker system [14]. This produced a mismatch across federal agencies, which needs reconciliation checks and steady back-filling to resolve conflicts [15].

4. Four external factors in the environment

The X policy is under heated debate and some back-and-forth. The following looks at how the environment amplifies or eases the tension.

(1)Politics and law. The federal government still recognizes three markers in passports, giving a unified reference for cross-border and cross-agency coordination. Yet, state-level differences remain obvious and spill into education, public health, and custodial settings. Earlier in the year, the Eastern District of Kentucky issued a stay against the 2024 Title IX final rule, which had nationwide implications, leading numerous institutions to reinstate the previous regulatory framework pending further judicial review [16]. In late August, the Department of Education found that Denver Public Schools' "all-gender bathrooms" violated Title IX and required correction, while the district said it would assess responses—this shows a current enforcement tilt toward a biological-sex reading [17]. Concurrently, South Carolina petitioned the Supreme Court for an urgent review of school bathroom regulations, suggesting that disputes at various levels are likely to persist [18].

(2)Administration and economy. System upgrades are hard to avoid: expanding fields, updating interfaces, adjusting forms and copy, and training staff. Short-term costs appear; in the long run, it still takes down disputes, rework, and appeal rates—this drop in "hidden costs" is a primary source of administrative efficiency [2].

(3)Society and culture. Different generations, education levels, and regions understand X differently. For example, in 2024, Arkansas ended the X option on driver's licenses by an emergency rule and tied changes more tightly to birth certificates, so local applicants face stricter prerequisites [19]. A nationwide map shows that only some states, plus DC, offer X on driver's licenses; this explains why the same federal passport holder can meet different counter-window experiences when moving across states [20]. As noted earlier, communication and presentation also shape understanding. Inquiries and pedagogical resources consistently demonstrate that quotidian, amicable depictions mitigate resistance; a more tranquil consensus is more readily achievable if communication emphasizes tangible benefits, such as "reduced trips and minimized inadvertent obstacles," as opposed to theoretical ideological conflicts [7].

(4)Technology and data. To move X forward, systems must read a three-value field and stay compatible with historical data. Cross-agency reconciliation checks should be on by default; the gender field should be shared only when necessary, with targeted audits watching high-risk calls. To ensure seamless international transit, airlines and border control authorities must conduct interoperability exercises to guarantee accurate data capture at initial checkpoints and facilitate error tracking [2]. This data is often scattered across stacks; alignment is not trivial.

With this map filled in, the passport case is basically framed. Next comes a side-by-side look at sports to see how institutional goals shape the pace of gender-diversity reforms.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28403

5. Comparison with sports grouping

The contrast starts with what counts as “success.” Passports care most about aligned information and smooth flow; if fields are recognized, interfaces connect, and conflicts are handled, the main goal is done [2]. Sports prioritize equity and safety, necessitating ongoing evaluations rooted in exercise physiology; regulations establish sport-specific benchmarks. In early February, the NCAA revised its guidelines for student-athlete participation, imposing stricter constraints on transgender women's involvement in official women's competitions, while permitting certain groups to engage in training and associated advantages; the board publicized the decision, which took immediate effect, distinctly differentiating "training rights" from "competition eligibility." [21]. International track and field moved earlier: since 2023, World Athletics bars those who underwent male puberty from the women’s category and sets a lower testosterone cap with a more extended compliance period; by 2025, it launched another consultation on eligibility and testing—showing the balance of “safety, fairness, inclusion” is still being adjusted [22, 23]. Because a passport follows administrative recognition logic—data consistency and smooth procedure—while sports follow distributive logic—verifiable boundaries and project-specific thresholds—their paths diverge; still, policies are not fully aligned across domains. Sometimes, each can borrow the other’s clarity or patience.

6. Implementation methods for the X policy

(1)A coordinated route with the passport as the anchor

Building on the comparison, the steps can be made concrete. Treat the federal passport as the starting point for consistency. Update systems so the gender field stably reads M/F/X and remains backwards-compatible with historical data; make cross-agency reconciliation and call-logging default behavior so that every read can be traced and conflicts can be quickly located and fixed. When federal passport data and local document data diverge, set a short and clear workflow: use federal data as the baseline for back-fill and alignment, cutting the back-and-forth explanations for applicants.

Then connect documents to services. Public-service teams can make a one-page checklist of departments, materials, and timelines for name/gender changes; schools and employers should finish field updates and access controls, so “recognition” truly lands as “easier procedures” [12]. For more sensitive places like custody or intake, write safety, dignity, and resources into an operational evaluation form, using transparent scoring and review instead of rough impressions. In the realm of communication, employing scenario-driven instruction proves more efficacious: elucidate the precise location for economizing a journey and the methodology for completing designated forms; visual aids can showcase tranquil, authentic depictions of everyday life—the principle of familiarity occasionally diminishes opposition more effectively than fervent argumentation [7]. This route echoes earlier research: one end lowers error and conflict rates by design; the other lowers misunderstanding and hostility by presentation.

(2)Metrics, Data Governance, and Correction

To ensure the passport policy's functionality and adaptability, a comprehensive set of measurable indicators is crucial. Twelve operational metrics track progress, identify issues, and guide adjustments. Key examples include the refusal rate (applications rejected due to gender marker) and appeal rate (appeals excluding repeat complaints), reported quarterly and annually. Targets are ≤1.0% for refusal and ≤0.8% for appeals; exceeding these for two consecutive quarters triggers a review.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28403

Consistency is vital, monitored via mismatches between passport data and USCIS records, and inconsistencies with state IDs/birth records. These are updated on varying schedules and compared to identify trends. Given differing sources, these discrepancies are reported separately in annual reviews. For instance, USCIS's continued recognition of only M/F markers recently caused conflicts [18].

Operational performance is gauged by processing time for passport updates with an "X" marker and the stability of corrected gender markers post-resolution. Technical safeguards include monitoring data transfer failure rates and problematic entries. Outreach success is measured by gender marker compatibility among external institutions (target: 90%) and staff training completion (target: >95%). Public responsiveness is assessed via complaints related to gender fields and timely completion of rectifications. Data access adheres to a principle of necessity, with systems flagging unusual access patterns.

(3)Research Boundaries and Ethics

This paper mainly cites established research consensuses and current news, lacking local surveys or experiments, so generalization should be cautious. Ethically, anti-discrimination and harm reduction are the baseline. In sensitive contexts like sports and custody, fairness and safety decisions should be evidence-based, avoiding singling out individuals to "prove a point." [3]. With this baseline, the layered thresholds and case-by-case evaluation proposed above stand on firmer ground. Sometimes recommendations have been contested, but transparency helps.

7. Conclusion

From goal-setting to execution, the pace and friction points across dimensions in the X-gender passport policy make clear the complexity that appears once gender identification enters institutional governance. This is not only a tweak to technical procedures but a dynamic stitching of social understanding, legal principles, and administrative logics under negotiation.

As a federal identification system, the passport already follows a practical route of “anchoring—alignment—connection—friction reduction.” Backend moves like field expansion, interface compatibility, and front-desk pieces such as service linkage and step-by-step checklists show the system’s plasticity when a policy tries to land. In the PEST view, the political consensus, fiscal capacity, cultural understanding, and technical readiness that the rollout relies on are still uneven—especially state-by-state splits and cross-domain coordination—which need gradual harmonization built on transparent audits and metric monitoring.

SWOT analysis reveals strengths in rapid deployment in low-risk sectors (passports, healthcare, education), fostering institutional momentum. However, high-stakes areas (sports, custodial placement) require more validation and clearer guidelines. Phased implementation, distinguishing administrative recognition from distributive rules, is prudent. The X-gender passport tests governance's response to social diversity and its balance of consistency and adaptability. Policy success hinges on translating recognition into functional mechanisms: supportive regulations, aligned data, and improved user experience.

References

[1] Schiappa, E. (2022). The transgender exigency: Defining sex and gender in the 21st century (Ch. 3). Routledge.
[2] U.S. Department of State. (2025, July 2). Sex marker in passports. Retrieved from https: //travel.state.gov/content/travel/en/passports/passport-help/sex-marker.html
[3] Schiappa, E. (2022). The transgender exigency (Ch. 7: Sports). Routledge.
[4] orld Economic Forum. (2023). Global gender gap report 2023.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD28403

[5] Schiappa, E. (2022). The transgender exigency (Ch. 2). Routledge.
[6] Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90(5), 751–783.
[7] Schiappa, E., Gregg, P. B., & Hewes, D. E. (2005). The parasocial contact hypothesis. Communication Monographs, 72(1), 92–115.
[8] Drescher, J. (2012). The removal of homosexuality from the DSM. Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health.
[9] Walters, M. (2005). Feminism: A very short introduction. Oxford University Press.
[10] Li, Y. (2000). Women's movement and change of women's status in China. Journal of International Women's Studies, 1(1), 30–40.
[11] Adam, B. D. (1995). The rise of a gay and lesbian movement (Rev. ed.). Twayne Publishers.
[12] Stryker, S. (2017). Transgender history: The roots of today's revolution (2nd ed.). Seal Press.
[13] U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts. (2025, June 17). Orr v. Trump (preliminary injunction reported via GLAD).
[14] U.S. Department of State. (2025, July 2). Sex marker in passports [Official page].
[15] USCIS. (2025, April 2). Recognizing male and female sexes in identity documents (Policy Manual Update).
[16] McGuireWoods. (2025, January 9). Title IX final rule vacated nationwide [Client alert].
[17] AP News. (2025, August 29). Education Department says Denver schools' all-gender bathrooms violate Title IX.
[18] POLITICO. (2025, August 28). South Carolina asked the Supreme Court to allow the school bathroom policy.
[19] Arkansas Advocate. (2024, August 23). Gender-neutral IDs prohibited in Arkansas.
[20] LGBT MAP. (2025, September 4). Identity document laws and policies [State map].
[21] NCAA. (2025, February 6). NCAA announces transgender student-athlete participation policy change.
[22] World Athletics. (2023, March 23). Council press release on female eligibility & DSD rules.
[23] Reuters. (2025, February 10). World Athletics begins consultation on transgender & DSD regulations.