

James Madison University

**JMU Scholarly Commons**

---

Senior Honors Projects, 2020-current

Honors College

---

12-19-2020

## On the basis of gender: Discrimination against transgender people in the hiring process

Aaron N. Baillargeon  
*James Madison University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/honors202029>



Part of the [Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Baillargeon, Aaron N., "On the basis of gender: Discrimination against transgender people in the hiring process" (2020). *Senior Honors Projects, 2020-current*. 117.  
<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/honors202029/117>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Honors Projects, 2020-current by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [dc\\_admin@jmu.edu](mailto:dc_admin@jmu.edu).

On the Basis of Gender: Discrimination Against Transgender People in the Hiring Process

---

An Honors College Project Presented to  
the Faculty of the Undergraduate  
College of Health and Behavioral Studies  
James Madison University

---

by Aaron Noah Baillargeon

December 2020

---

---

Accepted by the faculty of the Department of Psychology, James Madison University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Honors College.

FACULTY COMMITTEE:

HONORS COLLEGE APPROVAL:

---

Project Advisor: Tracy E. Zinn, Ph. D.,  
Professor, Psychology

---

Bradley R. Newcomer, Ph.D.,  
Dean, Honors College

---

Reader: Kala J. Melchiori, Ph. D.,  
Assistant Professor, Psychology

---

Reader: Mary Thompson, Ph. D.,  
Associate Professor, English

---

---

PUBLIC PRESENTATION

This work is accepted for presentation, in part or in full, at the Association for Psychological Science Annual Conference on May 21–24, 2020.

**Table of Contents**

Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
Introduction	5
Methods	10
Results	16
Discussion	18
Appendix A	22
Appendix B	23
Appendix C	24
Appendix D	25
Appendix E	26
Appendix F	27
References	29

**Acknowledgements**

First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Tracy Zinn, for being an excellent mentor and support system to me not only through the process of completing this project, but for the past three years of my undergraduate career. I would not be where I am today without your guidance. I would also like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Kala Melchiori and Dr. Mary Thompson, for their input and assistance throughout this project. Thank you to Dr. Kevin Apple and the James Madison University Department of Psychology for awarding me the Department of Psychology Research Grant, without which this project would not have been possible. For their professional insight and advice, thank you to Karen Baillargeon of the National Security Agency's Diversity, Equality, and Inclusion Office and Beck Bailey of the Human Rights Campaign. Finally, thank you to all of my friends and my Sisters in Tau Beta Sigma who have had to listen to me talk about this project for the last two years. Your patience and support has been very much appreciated.

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

### **Abstract**

The study investigated the effect of a job applicant's gender identity (male or female) and gender history (cisgender or transgender) on the evaluated quality of the applicant and the likelihood of the applicant being hired for a vacant software engineer position. Participants from the worker pool of Amazon's Mechanical Turk evaluated the quality of a fictitious job applicant based on a mock resume and background check created for the purposes of this study, then completed the Social Dominance Orientation. There was no significant effect of gender identity or gender history on the evaluated quality of the job applicant or on the likelihood of the participant to hire the applicant, which is inconsistent with existing literature on employment discrimination against transgender individuals in America.

**On the Basis of Gender: Discrimination of Transgender People in the Hiring Process**

**Introduction**

On October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2019, the Supreme Court of the United States heard oral arguments on *R.G. & G.R. Harris Funeral Homes Inc. v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission*, a case involving a transgender woman who was fired from her job at a funeral home just two weeks after coming out as transgender, meaning a person who does not identify with their sex assigned at birth. The woman in question, Ms. Aimee Stephens, had been an employee of the funeral home for six years and had no major issues in her work record. When the funeral home's owner was asked for the reason for Ms. Stephens' dismissal, he replied, "Well, because [she] was no longer going to represent [herself] as a man. [She] wanted to dress as a woman" (Liptak, 2016). The argument being considered by the Supreme Court is not whether Ms. Stephens was discriminated against or not, but rather if it is legal for an employer to discriminate against transgender people based on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This case is a landmark case for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) rights in the United States, and the Supreme Court's decision could be either a major victory for transgender Americans, or a huge blow to their rights.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a U.S. civil rights and labor law establishing five protected classes: race, color, religion, sex, and national origin; and prohibiting discrimination on the basis of any of these five classes (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2016). While the law covers many potential areas of discrimination, Title VII prohibits employment discrimination. Although the wording of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not include transgender people in explicit terms, federal agencies such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) have stated in court cases such as *Macy v. Holder* and *Lusardi v. Department of the*

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

*Army* that transgender people are protected from employment discrimination under Title VII, and that discrimination against a transgender individual falls under discrimination on the basis of sex (EEOC, 2011; EEOC, 2013). These court precedents, however, are the only existing protections nationwide for transgender individuals in the workplace, and they are not binding for employers as an explicit federal law would be. Although 22 states and Washington D.C. prohibit discrimination on the basis of gender identity, transgender individuals have no explicit legal protections at the federal level against discrimination, and workplace discrimination against transgender individuals is still commonplace (Human Rights Campaign, 2020).

In the current literature regarding discrimination in the workplace, there are ample studies examining discrimination against women in the hiring process (for review, see Bisom-Rapp & Sargeant, 2014). There are also numerous studies on employment discrimination against gay and lesbian individuals. For example, Clarke and Arnold (2018) examined how sexual orientation influences the perceived fit of male applicants for male- and female-stereotyped jobs. However, there is a dearth of studies looking at employment discrimination against transgender individuals, in part because national surveys do not collect data about transgender individuals, making it difficult to examine their experiences (James et al., 2016). Furthermore, most studies in the area are summaries of transgender individuals' self-reported instances of discrimination against them rather than experimental studies (Grant et al., 2011).

### **Discrimination of Transgender Individuals**

In 2016, the National Center for Transgender Equality published the report of the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey (USTS). With over 27,000 respondents, this is the largest survey examining the experiences of transgender Americans to date (James et al., 2016). The survey was a way for individuals to report how they experienced various aspects of daily life, such as

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

employment, education, healthcare, and family life. Although the USTS has begun to fill a hole in research pertaining to transgender individuals, there still remains a lack of literature regarding how cisgender individuals, or people who exclusively identify as their sex assigned at birth, perceive transgender individuals and interact with them. Most current research into discrimination against members of the LGBT community focus on the experiences of gay and lesbian individuals (James et al., 2016). The existing research also severely lacks experimental research on discrimination against transgender individuals. In fact, to date, there are no published experimental studies focusing on transgender people.

In the area of employment, 15% of USTS respondents were unemployed at the time of the survey – a rate three times higher than the unemployment rate in the general U.S. population (James et al., 2016). In the year of the survey, over one-quarter of respondents who held or applied for a job reported being fired, denied a promotion, or not being hired for a job because of their gender identity (James et al., 2016). Combined with other forms of harassment and discrimination, 30% of respondents who had a job in the year of the survey reported some form of mistreatment due to their gender identity, and over three-quarters of respondents actively took steps to avoid mistreatment in the workplace, such as hiding or delaying their transition (James et al., 2016). Based on these data on employment discrimination against transgender people, it was predicted that participants would evaluate transgender applicants as being lower quality than cisgender applicants, and that participants would be less likely to hire transgender applicants.

### **Effects of Gender Identity on Personnel Selection**

Discrimination against hiring women in the workplace has been well characterized by years of research (for review, see Bisom-Rapp & Sargeant, 2014). Particularly in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields, men outnumber women at nearly every level

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

in nearly every field, despite girls and boys taking science and mathematics courses at roughly equal levels in high school (Hill et al., 2010). The difference appears to begin in undergraduate degree programs, where women are less likely to seek degrees in STEM fields despite having similar levels of interest in the subjects as men. In some areas such as computer science, women make up just 20% of individuals receiving a degree in the subject. In these fields considered to be “male-type,” women are typically viewed as less competent than their male counterparts (Hill et al., 2010). When given the option to hire a man or a woman who are equally competent on mathematics, both men and women are significantly more likely to choose to hire the man (Reuben et al., 2014).

The current study examined the evaluation of applicants for a “male-type” job in the STEM field. It was predicted that participants would evaluate female applicants as lower quality than male applicants, and that participants would be less likely to hire female applicants.

### **Current Study: Interaction Between Transphobia and Sexism**

In addition to examining the effect of gender identity on the decision to hire, the proposed study will examine how gender identity (i.e., male or female) may interact with gender history (i.e., cisgender or transgender) in the hiring process; that is, if other forms of discrimination such as sexism interact with transphobia, or if they are two separate effects. The existing reports of employment discrimination against transgender individuals do not break down the instances of discrimination based on gender identity, but when it comes to fatal violence against transgender people, of those who have been murdered in the past seven years, 9 out of 10 transgender victims were transgender women (Human Rights Campaign, 2019). Although employment discrimination and fatal violence are not remotely the same thing, it is expected that if transgender women are more frequently victims of discrimination and hatred that end in their

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

deaths, then they may also be more likely to experience less severe forms of discrimination, such as in the hiring process. It was predicted that there would be a quantitative interaction between gender history and gender identity on both the rated quality of applicants and on the participants' likelihood to hire the applicants, such that female applicants will be rated lower than male applicants in both transgender and cisgender conditions, but the magnitude of that difference would be greater in the transgender condition than in the cisgender condition.

## Methods

### Participants

Data for this study were collected from 542 participants via the Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) worker pool. The MTurk pool was selected to target a range of demographics comparable to the general U.S. population (Burnham et al., 2018). One participant who identified as transgender was excluded from data analysis, and 157 participants were excluded for failing to correctly answer the attention check questions. All participants were provided monetary compensation in the amount of \$0.10 for their participation, and participants who correctly answered the attention check questions and thus provided useable data were compensated an additional \$0.90. The participants whose responses were used for data analysis ranged in age from 18 to 72,  $M = 36.89$ ,  $SD = 11.86$ ; 41.7% identified as male and 57.6% identified as female, with 0.3% responding as “questioning” and 0.5% declining to respond. When asked about race, participants were allowed to select all applicable racial categories; 76.0% were white, 9.1% were Hispanic/Latino, 7.8% were African-American, 1.8% were Native American, 12.5% were Asian or Pacific islander, 1.8% were Middle Eastern, 0.3% selected “other” but declined to elaborate, and 1.3% declined to respond.

### Materials and Measures

#### *Cover Text*

Due to the nature of the study, deception was used in an effort to avoid a social desirability bias in participants’ responses. A cover story modeled after one created by Moss-Racusin et al. (2012) was used, saying that real applicants to a software engineer position have volunteered their resume and background information in exchange for feedback on the quality of their resume (see Appendix A). This cover story was used in an effort to encourage participants

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

to both read carefully and to provide their honest opinion. Along with the cover story, participants received a mock job description for a government Software Engineer position (see Appendix B), and were told it was the job description for the vacancy that the applicants had applied to. The Software Engineer job description was based on current listings for similar positions on the U.S. Government's public hiring website (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, n.d.).

### *Application Materials*

Participants received a mock resume (see Appendix C) and a background check (see Appendix D). The resume was included to lend credibility to the cover story and serve as distractor information, while the background check contained the experimental manipulations that revealed the job applicants' gender identity and gender history. All participants viewed the same resume, with only the name on the resume changing between conditions. The distractor information in the background check remained the same for all four conditions, but any information pertaining to name or assigned gender at birth changed. The gender identity of the applicant, as opposed to their assigned gender at birth, was represented by the applicant's name as listed on the resume and the top of the background check. The names for both the male and female applicants were chosen from the list of top 10 baby names in 1991 according to the U.S. Census (Social Security Administration, n.d.). The applicants' gender history was represented in two ways:

1. A previously used name. Cisgender applicants had no previous names, whereas transgender applicants will have a name associated with the gender they were assigned at birth, used from the date of their birth until they were 19 years of age.

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

2. Selective Service Registration. Individuals assigned male at birth after December 31, 1959 are required to register for the Selective Service. The Cisgender Male and Transgender Female applicants will both have a registration number for the Selective Service, whereas the Cisgender Female and Transgender Male applicants will not.

All information included in the background check was based on Standard Form 86 (SF-86), the questionnaire used in conducting background checks of people under consideration for national security positions (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2016). The resumes were modeled after a multitude of sample resumes for Software Engineering positions available online, and were written to make the applicants qualified for the position, but not excessively so, based on literature suggesting that presenting applicants as slightly less qualified allowed for greater variability in participants' evaluations of the applicants (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012).

### ***Resume Rating***

Participants rated the resume shown to them on eight different factors (quality of work, dedication, getting along with co-workers, leadership, ambition, responsibility, well-roundedness, and intelligence) on a Likert scale from 1-6, with 1 being *Strongly Disagree* and 6 being *Strongly Agree* (e.g., "This applicant is ambitious.") (Nemanick & Clark, 2003). In addition, a ninth item was included, reading, "I would be likely to hire this applicant for the vacant position," rated on the same Likert scale as the eight factors. In the original study using these items, the measure had a Chronbach's alpha of 0.88 for the first eight items, indicating that responses to those items could be averaged together into one factor, termed "quality of applicant," ( $\alpha = .90$  in current study), with the ninth question being a stand-alone question regarding the decision to hire (Nemanick & Clark, 2003). For the full measure, see Appendix E.

### ***Social Dominance Orientation***

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

Participants completed the Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) to examine their self-reported political and social attitudes (Pratto et al., 1994). The SDO is a 16-item measure in which participants rate their feelings towards the items on a Likert scale from 1-7, with 1 being *Very Negative* and 7 being *Very Positive*. A sample item from the SDO is “If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems” ( $\alpha = 0.95$ , current study). For the full measure, see Appendix F.

### **Procedure**

Participants selected to participate in the study by choosing it from a list of tasks available on MTurk. Through the Qualtrics software, participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions (Transgender Female Applicant, Transgender Male Applicant, Cisgender Female Applicant, or Cisgender Male Applicant) when they clicked on the link to the study.

### ***Instructions***

Participants first read the informed consent for the study. In the informed consent, participants were told that they were being asked to participate in a study on hiring practices in STEM fields. By clicking “next page,” they agreed to participate in the study. The participants then read the cover story, including the instructions for reading the materials carefully, the information that additional monetary compensation would be provided for accurately answering questions about the materials, and a brief description of the kinds of questions they would be asked about the materials (see Appendix A). Following that, they were presented with the job description (see Appendix B), the applicant’s resume (see Appendix C), and the applicant’s background check (see Appendix D), all on the same page. The page with these documents was timed so that participants were unable to advance to the next page until a minimum of one

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

minute had passed, in order to allow participants time to read the materials and prevent people from clicking through the pages without properly attending to the materials.

### *Attention Check*

Once the participants read the documents, they were asked to answer the following attention check questions to ensure that they read the information carefully, and to ensure that they picked up on the manipulations in the background check:

1. Has the applicant ever served in the U.S. Military?
2. Did the applicant use any previous names?
3. If yes, what was the applicant's previous name? Provide first, middle, and last name.
4. What was the applicant's final cumulative GPA?

Participants who failed to correctly answer the attention check questions regarding the manipulations in the background check were provided no additional compensation for participating and their data was excluded from final analysis, as it could not be guaranteed that they noted the gender history of the applicant.

### *Measures*

Following the attention check questions, participants rated the applicant and resume on the aforementioned Likert scale (see Appendix C), then rated their likeliness to hire the applicant. Finally, participants were asked to complete the SDO (see Appendix D) and demographics. Immediately preceding the demographic questions was a question to check participants' understanding of the study materials, asking, "Was this job applicant transgender?" The demographic questions asked were the participants' race, age, gender identity (including

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

whether they identify as transgender or not), sexuality, highest level of education completed, and political affiliation.

### ***MTurk Completion***

In order to claim compensation and have the task registered as “complete” in MTurk, participants were taken to a page that randomly generated a unique five-digit code that participants were instructed to copy and paste into an entry box on the MTurk webpage. This code allowed the list of people attempting to claim compensation for the study to be cross-checked with the data submitted through Qualtrics to ensure that those who claimed compensation did in fact submit their data. Individuals with codes reported on MTurk that had no matching data set were not compensated.

### ***Debrief***

Once participants completed all responses and were given a completion code, the final web page thanked participants for their participation and informed them of the true purpose of the study. The reason for the deception was explained, and participants were told that the applicants in the study were fabricated for the purposes of the study, not real people as the cover text originally stated. The debrief also provided the contact information of the principal investigator and the project advisor, and indicated that they may contact the principal investigator or their advisor if they had questions about the purpose, methods, or results of the study.

## Results

Data collected in the study were analyzed using a 2x2 between-groups ANOVA to compare both the quality of applicant items and the likelihood of hiring the applicant across all four conditions. The first hypothesis was that there would be a main effect of gender history on the evaluated quality of the applicant and on the likelihood to hire. For the quality of applicant, there was no significant main effect of gender history,  $F(1, 380) = 3.01, p = 0.08$ . There was also no significant main effect of gender history on the likelihood to hire,  $F(1, 380) = 0.186, p = 0.667$ .

The second hypothesis was that there would be a main effect of gender identity on the evaluated quality of the applicant and on the likelihood to hire. For the quality of applicant, there was no significant main effect of gender identity,  $F(1, 380) = 0.451, p = 0.503$ . There was also no significant main effect of gender identity on the likelihood to hire,  $F(1, 380) = 0.197, p = 0.657$ .

The third hypothesis was that there would be a quantitative interaction between gender history and gender identity on the evaluated quality of the applicant and on the likelihood to hire. There was no significant interaction on the evaluated quality of the applicant,  $F(1, 380) = 0.133, p = 0.716$ . There was also no significant interaction on the likelihood to hire,  $F(1, 380) = 0.103, p = 0.749$ .

In addition to the hypotheses, a post hoc regression was used to see if participants' scores on the SDO could be used to predict their willingness to hire the applicant. Overall, the regression model was significant,  $F(1, 382) = 27.789, p < 0.001$ , and SDO scores were negatively correlated to likelihood to hire the applicant regardless of gender history or gender identity,  $\beta = -0.260, t = -5.272, p < 0.001$ . The regression was still significant when looking at

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

participants who evaluated cisgender applicants,  $F(1, 230) = 3.878, p = 0.050$ , though the correlation was weaker,  $\beta = -0.129, t = -1.969, p = 0.050$ . When looking at participants who evaluated transgender applicants, the regression was significant,  $F(1, 150) = 33.431, p < 0.001$ , and the correlation was much stronger,  $\beta = -0.427, t = -5.782, p < 0.001$ .

### **Discussion**

Based on the existing body of literature regarding employment discrimination against transgender individuals reviewed in the introduction, it was expected that the data would support the hypotheses that gender history and gender identity have an effect on participants' evaluated quality of applicants and likelihood to hire the applicants, where transgender applicants and female applicants would be rated as lower in quality and less likely to be hired. However, the results do not support any of the predictions, which does not line up with the amount of employment discrimination reported by transgender individuals (James et al., 2016).

The methods used in this study deviated from existing practices in hiring discrimination studies in order to reveal the gender history of the applicants, which is not something that would be found in a resume alone. Because of this, it is possible that the background check was not sufficient enough or effective enough in revealing whether the job applicant was transgender or not; when asked at the end of the survey about the gender history of the applicant, 23.7% of total participants reported that they were "unsure" if the job applicant was transgender. However, the uncertainty was mostly confined to participants evaluating cisgender applicants — 37.9% of participants evaluating a cisgender applicant reported that they were unsure if the applicant was transgender, compared to only 2.00% of participants evaluating transgender applicants. Of the participants evaluating transgender applicants, 94.7% correctly reported that the job applicant they evaluated was transgender.

Another possible explanation is that the study was unable to overcome a social desirability bias. Although the literature shows that transgender individuals are still very much discriminated against, the general attitude towards LGBT individuals has been becoming more positive in recent years (Lewis et al., 2017). A 2015 survey showed that across political party

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

lines, American voters supported passing a federal law protecting LGBT individuals from various types of discrimination, including employment discrimination (Human Rights Campaign, 2015). This indicates that the general social attitude towards LGBT individuals is a favorable one, so even if participants were prejudiced against transgender individuals, they may have refrained from answering the study questions truthfully to present themselves as being more in line with social norms than they really are (for review, see Krumpal, 2011).

It is also possible that the format of the study contributed to the data not supporting the hypotheses, in that the study was done entirely online with the job applicants being evaluated represented by no more than a few pieces of paper. Although participants may have had an implicit bias against transgender individuals, learned by virtue of living in a society that discriminates against transgender individuals, they may have learned to have a more positive attitude towards transgender individuals, possibly as a result of the general social norm moving more in the favor of LGBT people (Lewis et al., 2017; Wilson et al., 2000). Implicit attitudes are attitudes where the origin is generally unknown and they are activated automatically with little-to-no attempt to control the response, whereas explicit attitudes are learned later and require some degree of motivation to activate (Wilson et al., 2000). If people have both an implicit attitude and explicit attitude about a particular subject, the implicit attitude is the one that automatically activates, unless the person has sufficient capacity and motivation to override their implicit attitude with their explicit attitude (Wilson et al., 2000). Wilson's study (2000) showed that when people were not under a time limit when evaluating individuals, they were able to override their implicit attitudes with their explicit attitudes. In this study, if participants had explicitly positive attitudes about transgender individuals, because there was no time limit and they were completing the study on their own terms (e.g., from a location of their choice, during a

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

time of day of their choice), then they would have had ample capacity to override their implicit biases with their explicit attitudes towards transgender individuals. Future research may benefit from providing only a short amount of time in which participants can evaluate the job applicant, forcing them to rely more on their automatic, implicit attitudes to make the evaluation.

An additional factor allowing participants to rely more on their explicit processes is the fact that no images were ever given, so participants were able to imagine the job applicant in any way they chose. If images had been given, it is possible that the results may differ, specifically if the images provided for the transgender job applicants were of people who did not “pass” as the gender they identify with, where passing is defined as “appear[ing] to belong to one or more social subgroups other than the one(s) to which one is normally assigned by prevailing legal, medical and/or socio-cultural discourses” (Moynihan, 2010, as cited in Anderson et al., 2019, p. 49). Showing images of transgender individuals who do not pass may allow participants’ implicit biases to win out over their explicit attitudes if the job applicant they are assigned to evaluate is visibly transgender, as opposed to their gender history represented only on paper.

One limitation beyond those that may have contributed to the findings being inconsistent with other literature, as previously discussed, is that this was a study about discrimination during the hiring process, but the participants were not guaranteed to ever have been in a position to hire someone. It is possible that the trends seen in existing literature regarding the rampant employment discrimination against transgender people are related specifically to people who are hiring, and that similar trends are not seen when looking at a more general population, as this study did. Future research could be done with participants who have had experience hiring people for a job vacancy in order to increase the external validity of the study.

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

Even though public attitudes towards LGBT individuals are becoming more positive, transgender individuals in America continue to report facing discrimination and prejudice in the area of employment (James et al., 2016; Lewis et al., 2017). It is a topic at the forefront of the modern political climate, with cases on the matter being brought before the Supreme Court while individual states continue to pass laws to make up for the lack of federal protections; and yet, there is a noticeable lack of experimental literature surrounding the experiences of transgender individuals. There are a number of possible reasons that the results of this study were inconsistent with existing literature on discrimination against transgender individuals, but it is a step towards filling this gap in the literature, and provides a basis for future research to be done on how transgender individuals are treated as compared to cisgender individuals during the hiring process.

**Appendix A**

*Cover Text*

In this study, we are interested in examining how various factors in a resume are evaluated when a job applicant's qualifications are being assessed. To study this, we have asked **real applicants** to a software engineer position to volunteer information about themselves, including their resumes and some background information, for evaluation in this study. In exchange for volunteering their information, the applicants will be receiving feedback on the quality of their resumes as it was evaluated in the study.

You will be provided the job description for the vacancy these individuals are applying to fill, and assigned to read the resume and background of one randomly selected applicant. Please imagine that you are evaluating the individual as if you were in charge of hiring for this vacant position. After reading the resume and background of your assigned applicant, you will be asked questions about what you read and asked for your evaluation of the individual's application quality, so **please read all materials carefully**.

This job has been applied to by both highly qualified and competitive applicants, as well as some applicants who may be less qualified or less competitive, so please **do not be afraid to provide your honest opinion** on the quality of the resume you are assigned to read. Applicants will be receiving feedback on their resumes based on the evaluations done by participants like you, and as this survey is anonymous, the feedback will also be entirely anonymous and unable to be traced back to you. Your feedback will assist these individuals in moving forward in their careers, whether they are selected for this job or not.

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

### **Appendix B**

#### *Mock Job Description*

Seeking an innovative Software Engineer to join a development team dedicated to building and enhancing systems for use by staff members, other organizations, and the general public.

Responsibilities include:

- Serving as an internal technical advisor on the design and application of electronic information and computer system
- Analyzing computer technical problems, evaluating potential modifications to existing systems, and developing plans to address problems and concerns in an efficient, cost-effective manner
- Accepting performance-based criticism and being able to work on a flexible schedule, sometimes including long hours, nights, and weekends, as well as being willing to accept overtime on short notice

Required Qualifications:

- A Bachelor's degree or higher in Computer Science or related field
- Three or more years experience in building and maintaining web applications
- A desire to study new and emerging technologies for potential use in future development projects.
- Successfully passing a background check

## Appendix C

### *Resume for the Male Gender Identity Conditions*

#### **David Miller**

901 Black Seam Ct. Midlothian, VA 23113  
(804) 232-8430  
[damiller91@gmail.com](mailto:damiller91@gmail.com)

---

#### **Education**

*Virginia Commonwealth University — B.S. in Computer Science*  
Minor in Computer Engineering  
Graduated May 2013  
Final Cumulative GPA: 3.04

#### **Skills**

*Languages:* Java, Python, HTML, JavaScript, C, C++  
*Operating Systems:* Windows, Linux, Unix, MacOS/iOS

#### **Relevant Coursework**

Introduction to Operating Systems  
Software Engineering: Specification and Design  
Programming Languages  
Software Engineering: Project Management  
Computer and Network Security

#### **Work Experience**

*Prometheus Computer Systems — Software Engineer*  
*Richmond, VA (February 2017 – Present)*

Worked in a small team to design and develop core elements of internal company software to improve information security.

*Townsend Web Solutions — Web Infrastructure Engineer*

*Richmond, VA (January 2016 – May 2016)*

Worked on global team to develop and maintain Java-based platform after company migration from C++ framework.

*RiverBend Software Inc. — Assistant Application Developer*

*Richmond, VA (May 2013 – December 2015)*

Helped develop user interface design and testing for both web- and mobile-based MacOS/iOS applications.

*RiverBend Software Inc. — Web Development Intern*

*Richmond, VA (Summer 2012)*

Worked on a small team to analyze the efficiency of current internal data entry/management tools and begin development of improved framework.

#### **Affiliations**

RamDev Software Development Club  
Webmaster (Fall 2012–Spring 2013)  
Linux User Group of VCU

#### **References available upon request**

TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

Appendix D

Background Check for the Transgender Male Condition

Form 01  
Revised October 2019

**BACKGROUND CHECK QUESTIONNAIRE**

Page 1 of 1

---

**Full Name**  
Provide your full legal name. If your name has no middle name, write "NMN".

Last name <b>Miller</b>	First name <b>David</b>	Middle name <b>Andrew</b>
----------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

---

**Date of Birth**      **Place of Birth**

Provide your date of birth.      Provide your place of birth.

(Month/Day/Year) <b>08/27/1991</b>	City <b>Wyndham</b>	County <b>Henrico</b>	State <b>VA</b>	Country <b>United States</b>
---------------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	---------------------------------

---

**Social Security Number**  
Provide your Social Security Number.

[REDACTED]

---

**Other Names Used**  
Have you used any other names?       YES     NO (If "NO," skip to Contact Information)

**Complete the following if you responded "YES" TO having used other names.**  
Provide all previous names used and the dates for which they were used. If your name has no middle name, write "NMN".

1) Last name <b>Miller</b>	First name <b>Sarah</b>	Middle name <b>Elizabeth</b>
From (Month/Year) <b>08/1991</b>	To (Month/Year) <b>02/2011</b>	Maiden name?      Provide the reason(s) the name was changed. <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <b>Gender transition from female to male</b>

---

**Contact Information**  
Provide your contact information. At least one phone number and one email address is required.

Primary email address <b>damiller91@gmail.com</b>	Secondary email address <b>N/A</b>
Primary phone number <b>(804) 232-8430</b>	Secondary phone number <b>N/A</b>

HOME     WORK     CELL     
  HOME     WORK     CELL

---

**Citizenship**  
 I am a citizen of the United States.       I am not a citizen of the United States.

---

**Places of Residence**  
List all places you have lived, beginning with your current residence and working back 10 years, or until your 18<sup>th</sup> birthday. Do not list residences prior to your 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, unless needed to provide a minimum 2 years of residence history.

1) Provide the dates of residence.

From (Month/Year) <b>08/2013</b>	To (Month/Year) <b>Present</b>	Is/was this residence... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owned by you <input type="checkbox"/> Rented/leased by you
Provide the address. (If outside the U.S., provide City and Country. If inside the U.S., provide City, State, and Zip Code.)		
Street <b>901 Black Swan Ct.</b>	City <b>Midlothian</b>	State    Zip Code    Country <b>VA    23113</b>

2) Provide the dates of residence.

From (Month/Year) <b>08/2009</b>	To (Month/Year) <b>08/2013</b>	Is/was this residence... <input type="checkbox"/> Present <input type="checkbox"/> Owned by you <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rented/leased by you
Provide the address. (If outside the U.S., provide City and Country. If inside the U.S., provide City, State, and Zip Code.)		
Street <b>835 W. Franklin St.</b>	City <b>Richmond</b>	State    Zip Code    Country <b>VA    23284</b>

---

**Selective Service Record**  
Were you born a male after December 31, 1959?       YES     NO (If "NO," skip to Military History)

**Complete the following if you responded "YES" to having been born a male after December 31, 1959.**  
Have you registered with the Selective Service System?       YES     NO  
If "YES," provide your registration number.

---

**Military History**  
Have you ever served in the U.S. Military?       YES     NO (If "NO," skip to Certification)

---

**Certification**  
My statements on this form are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that a knowing and willful false statement on this form can be punishable by fines or imprisonment.

Signature <b>David A. Miller</b>	Date Signed (mm/dd/yyyy) <b>02/19/2020</b>
-------------------------------------	---

# TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

## Appendix E

*Resume Rating Scale, Developed by Nemanick & Clark, 2003*

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
This applicant's work is of high quality.	<input type="radio"/>					
This applicant is dedicated to their work.	<input type="radio"/>					
This applicant would get along well with their co-workers.	<input type="radio"/>					
This applicant is well-suited to leadership roles.	<input type="radio"/>					
This applicant is ambitious.	<input type="radio"/>					
This applicant is responsible.	<input type="radio"/>					
This applicant is well-rounded.	<input type="radio"/>					
This applicant is intelligent.	<input type="radio"/>					
I would be likely to hire this applicant for the vacant Software Engineer position.	<input type="radio"/>					

# TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

## Appendix F

*Social Dominance Orientation, Developed by Pratto et al., 1994*

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

# TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Inferior groups should stay in their place.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It would be good if groups could be equal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Group equality should be our ideal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
All groups should be given an equal chance in life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Increased social equality is beneficial to society.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No one group should dominate in society.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**References**

- Anderson, A. D., Irwin, J. A., Brown, A. M., & Grala, C. L. (2019). “Your Picture Looks the Same as My Picture”: An Examination of Passing in Transgender Communities. *Gender Issues*, 37(1), 44–60. doi: 10.1007/s12147-019-09239-x
- Bisom-Rapp, S., & Sargeant, M. (2014). It’s complicated: Age, gender, and lifetime discrimination against working women — the U.S. and the U.K. as examples. *The Elder Law Journal*, 22(1), 1–110. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2367859
- Burnham, M. J., Le, Y. K., & Piedmont, R. L. (2018). Who is Mturk? Personal characteristics and sample consistency of these online workers. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 21(9-10), 934–944. doi: 10.1080/13674676.2018.1486394
- Clarke, H. M., & Arnold, K. A. (2018). The influence of sexual orientation on the perceived fit of male applicants for both male- and female-typed jobs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00656
- Grant, J. M., Mottet, L. A., Tanis, J., Harrison, J., Herman, J. L., & Keisling, M. (2011). *Injustice at every turn: A report of the national transgender discrimination survey*. Washington: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force & The National Center for Transgender Equality.
- Hill, C., Corbett, C., & St. Rose, A. (2010). *Why so few? Women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics*. Washington, D.C.: AAUW.
- Human Rights Campaign. (2019). A national epidemic: Fatal anti-transgender violence in America. Retrieved from <https://www.hrc.org/resources/a-national-epidemic-fatal-anti-trans-violence-in-the-united-states-in-2019>.
- Human Rights Campaign. (2015, March 17). HRC Poll Shows Overwhelming Support for Federal LGBT Non-Discrimination Bill. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

<https://www.hrc.org/press/hrc-poll-shows-overwhelming-support-for-federal-lgbt-non-discrimination-bil>

Human Rights Campaign. (2020, April 15). State maps of laws and policies. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from <https://www.hrc.org/state-maps/employment>.

James, S. E., Herman, J. L., Rankin, S., Keisling, M., Mottet, L., & Anafi, M. (2016). The report of the 2015 U.S. transgender survey. Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality.

Krumpal, I. (2011). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: a literature review. *Quality & Quantity*, 47(4), 2025–2047. doi: 10.1007/s11135-011-9640-9

Lewis, D. C., Flores, A. R., Haider-Markel, D. P., Miller, P. R., Tadlock, B. L., & Taylor, J. K. (2017). Degrees of Acceptance: Variation in Public Attitudes toward Segments of the LGBT Community. *Political Research Quarterly*, 70(4), 861–875. doi: 10.1177/1065912917717352

Liptak, A. (2019, April 22). Supreme court to decide whether landmark civil rights law applies to gay and transgender workers. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/22/us/politics/supreme-court-gay-transgender-employees.html>

Lusardi v. Department of the Army (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission September 23, 2013) (Dist. file).

Macy v. Holder (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission December 9, 2011) (Dist. file).

Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(41), 16474–16479. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1211286109

## TRANSGENDER HIRING DISCRIMINATION

- Nemanick, J. R., & Clark, E. M. (2003). The differential effects of extracurricular activities on attributions in résumé evaluation. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10* (3), 206-217. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00210
- Pratto, Felicia, Sidanius, Stallworth, and Malle. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67* (4), 741-763.
- Reuben, E., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2014). How stereotypes impair womens careers in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*(12), 4403–4408. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1314788111
- Social Security Administration. (n.d.). Popular names in 1991. Retrieved from <https://www.ssa.gov/cgi-bin/popularnames.cgi>.
- U.S. Department of the Interior. (2016, March 22). Civil rights act of 1964 (U.S. National Park Service). Retrieved from <https://www.nps.gov/articles/civil-rights-act.htm>.
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (2016, November). PDF. Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (n.d.). Shape America's Future. Retrieved October 2019, from <https://www.usajobs.gov/>
- Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A Model of Dual Attitudes. *Psychological Review, 107*(1), 101–126. doi: 10.1037/0033-295x.107.1.101