

# Populated Pre-Analysis Plan

Taryn Eames\*

March 4, 2024

## Abstract

This document reports from a Pre-Analysis Plan registered with the American Economic Association Randomized Control Trial Control Registry (Trial #11183 available [here](#)), as described in that document. The Pre-Analysis plan is meticulously followed, and results are reported and summarized. Elaboration is minimal and context, contribution, and discussion are reported here.

---

\*PhD Candidate, Department of Economics, University of Toronto, 150 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada (email: [taryn.eadie@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:taryn.eadie@mail.utoronto.ca); will be updated to [taryn.eames@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:taryn.eames@mail.utoronto.ca) shortly). This study could not have been completed without tireless research assistance from Siu Lun Cheong, Hanru He, YuHui Li, Minh Thuy Phi, and Sarah Zahir. I am grateful to Philip Oreopoulos who helped me access the resources needed to complete this project. I thank Philip Oreopoulos and David Price for invaluable suggestions and feedback throughout the study. I also thank Peter Cziraki for a Research Fellowship associated with this study and Andr s Tilcsik for helpful advice. Ethics approval was obtained from the University of Toronto Social Sciences, Humanities and Education Research Ethics Board (Human Research Protocol #44259).

Following Duflo et al. (2020), this “Populated” Pre-Analysis Plan (PAP) reports the results associated with Eames (2023) as outlined in that PAP.<sup>1</sup> One slight deviation is taken from Eames (2023) where I said “to test S5, logit (1) will be run separately for applicants with low (2 years or less) or high (3 years or more) relevant work experience.”<sup>2</sup> In the results shown here, cutoffs for high and low “relevant” experience have been modified: low is 1 year or less, high is 2 years or more. In the pilot week of data collection, I constructed resumes which had a higher probability of relevant experience. After seeing that rates of positive employer response were high, probabilities were modified; as such, few resumes have 3 or more years of relevant experience. All data collected for the study are based on updated experience probabilities (each resume has four work experiences—resumes have a 25% chance of having their most recent experience in the occupation of interest; they have an approximately 43% chance of having one of their first three experiences in the occupation of interest).

## 1 Data Collection

Data collection proceeded as outlined in the Pre-Analysis Plan. Applicant names, occupations, geographies, and randomization method described in Eames (2023) were used through the project. During the data collection period (May 18, 2023 to October 20, 2023) the target sample size was surpassed: in total, 3,970 resume pairs were distributed (compared to a target of 3,240). Further, in some cases occupation targets were modified given the availability of job postings across geographies.

Table 1 shows paired application counts and percentages by occupation between target and actual. Table 2 and 3 show actual paired application counts by occupation, geography, and treatment: as intended, the sample is balanced overall.

## 2 Empirical Strategy

I report results from the empirical strategy outlined in Eames (2023). This strategy is described below.

---

<sup>1</sup>Eames (2023) is Trial #11183 pre-registered with the American Economic Association Randomized Control Trial Control Registry

<sup>2</sup>Work experience is considered “relevant” when it is in the occupation being applied to. For example, janitorial experience is considered relevant when applying to a janitor position.

## 2.1 Main Analysis

To estimate discrimination against applicants who disclose nonbinary or binary pronouns (Hypotheses P1 and P2 from Eames 2023), the following logistic regression is run:

$$(1) \quad z = \alpha_j + \gamma NB_i + \lambda B_i + X_i' \beta_1 + Z_j' \beta_2 + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

where  $\alpha_j$  are firm fixed effects,  $NB_i$  is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the resume has nonbinary “they/them” pronouns listed,  $B_i$  is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the resume has binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns listed,  $X_i$  is a vector of resume characteristics that may influence baseline employer response,  $Z_j$  is a vector of firm and job posting characteristics which many influence baseline employer response, and  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  is an error term. Resume characteristics in vector  $X_i$  are described in Table 4; job posting and firm characteristics in vector  $Z_j$  are described in Table 5. Note that I reference including firm size as a control in the PAP, but I was unable to get this data. Multiple specifications are run, where some include and some exclude  $(\alpha_j, X_i, Z_j)$ ; when “excluding”  $\alpha_j$  it is replaced with intercept  $\alpha$ . Estimates  $\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\lambda}$  can be interpreted as discrimination against applicants who disclose pronouns.

To determine the extent to which discrimination against applicants who disclose “they/them” pronouns is rooted in gender identity (Hypothesis P3 in Eames 2023), the following logistic regression is run excluding control observations (i.e., all resumes list pronouns):

$$(2) \quad z = \alpha + \delta NB_i + X_i' \beta_1 + Z_j' \beta_2 + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

Similar to equation (1), multiple specifications are run.

For the remaining hypotheses (denoted  $k$  below), (1) is run separately for each group being compared. In addition, the following logistic regression is run:

$$(3.k) \quad z = \alpha_j + \gamma_1 NB_i + \gamma_2 [NB_i \cdot I_k] + \lambda_1 B_i + \lambda_2 [B_i \cdot I_k] + X_i' \beta_1 + Z_j' \beta_2 + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

where  $I_k$  represents a vector of interaction variables associated with each secondary hypothesis  $k$ . These interactions are indicator variables (e.g., to test if discrimination magnitude differs politically,  $I_k = R_j$  which equals 1 if the job posting is located in a Republican geography) and are described in Table 6. Where possible, a second version of regression (4) is investigated which replaces indicator variables with continuous variables described in Table 7. Note that I reference including firm size as a continuous interaction replacement for job posting text in the PAP, but I was unable to get this data. Similar to equation (1), multiple specifications are run.

A final regression is run including all interactions simultaneously:

$$(4) \quad z = \alpha_j + \gamma_1 NB_i + \gamma_2 [NB_i \cdot I] + \lambda_1 B_i + \lambda_2 [B_i \cdot I] + X_i' \beta_1 + Z_j' \beta_2 + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

where  $I$  is a vector including all interaction variables in  $I_k, k \in [1, 6]$ . As with equation (1), multiple specifications are run. As with equation (4), a second version is run which replaces indicator variables with continuous variables where possible.

## 2.2 Robustness Check

I use the Neumark (2012) method to address a critique of correspondence studies presented by Heckman and Siegelman (1993) and Heckman (1998). To elaborate, Heckman and Siegelman (1993) and Heckman (1998) show that if the variance of unobservable determinants of productivity differs between treatment and control groups, correspondence studies can find spurious estimates of discrimination. Neumark (2012) develops a method to address this critique which relies on an additional identifying assumption: some applicant characteristics affect perceived productivity and their impact does not vary between groups. Under this assumption (with testable implications), discrimination estimates can be disaggregated into a level part that includes taste-based and first-moment statistical discrimination, and a variance part that includes second-moment statistical discrimination.

To do this, I leverage a heteroskedastic logistic model rather than the heteroskedastic probit model Neumark (2012) uses, where marginal effects can be similarly disaggregated (as noted by Neumark). Using the same notation and methodology as Neumark (2012), consider a model where the latent variable  $Y^* = P(Y = 1)$  depends on a vector of variables  $S$  (indexed by  $k$ ) with coefficients  $\psi$ , and the variance depends on a vector of variables  $T$  with coefficients  $\theta$ .<sup>3</sup> With the elements of  $T$  arranged such that the  $k$ th element is  $S_k$ , then the overall partial derivative of  $P(Y = 1)$  with respect to  $S_k$  is:

$$(5) \quad \frac{\partial P(Y = 1)}{\partial S_k} = \frac{\left( \frac{\psi_k - X'\psi \cdot \theta_k}{\exp(T'\theta)} \right) \cdot \exp\left( \frac{-X'\psi}{\exp(T'\theta)} \right)}{\left[ 1 + \exp\left( \frac{-X'\psi}{\exp(T'\theta)} \right) \right]^2}$$

The level part is then:

$$(5') \quad \frac{\left( \frac{\psi_k}{\exp(T'\theta)} \right) \cdot \exp\left( \frac{-X'\psi}{\exp(T'\theta)} \right)}{\left[ 1 + \exp\left( \frac{-X'\psi}{\exp(T'\theta)} \right) \right]^2}$$

While the variance part is:

$$(5'') \quad \frac{\left( \frac{-X'\psi \cdot \theta_k}{\exp(T'\theta)} \right) \cdot \exp\left( \frac{-X'\psi}{\exp(T'\theta)} \right)}{\left[ 1 + \exp\left( \frac{-X'\psi}{\exp(T'\theta)} \right) \right]^2}$$

---

<sup>3</sup>That is,  $Var(\varepsilon) = [\exp(T'\theta)]^2$

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Main Analysis

Panel A of Table 8 reports regression results for equation (1). Note that the interpretation of regression coefficients in specification (E) is unique: when including job posting fixed effects, resume pairs with concordant employer responses are automatically excluded from analysis, and only pairs with discordant employer responses are retained. Hence, marginal effects reported in (E) are conditional on discordant employer responses and, as such, are much larger. Specification (D) is the preferred specification: it includes resume and firm controls, but does not include firm fixed effects. Panel A shows strong evidence of discrimination against applicants who disclose nonbinary “they/them” pronouns. In the preferred specification (D), discrimination is estimated to be 5.4 percentage points (with a 95% confidence interval of 3.8 to 7.1 percentage points). By comparison, whether there is discrimination against presumed cisgender applicants who disclose “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns is inconclusive: the point estimate in preferred specification (D) is -1.7 percentage points but this is statistically insignificant (the 95% confidence interval is -3.9 to 0.6 percentage points). Hence, this does not imply a precise zero: while I can rule out positive discrimination, there could be no discrimination or moderate discrimination.

Panel B of Table 8 reports regression results for equation (2). Note that since control resumes are excluded, it is not possible to fit specification (E)—the vast majority of firms are only sent one set of paired resumes. Panel B shows evidence that applicants who disclose nonbinary pronouns are discriminated against even when controlling for the pronoun disclosure. There could be political or other signals associated with the act of pronoun disclosure: rather than applicants’ nonbinary gender identity leading to discrimination, it may be the fact that pronoun disclosure is occurring at all. I find that applicants who disclose “they/them” pronouns are discriminated against even when compared to presumed cisgender applicants who disclose pronouns. Discrimination is estimated to be 3.7 percentage points in the preferred specification (with a 95% confidence interval of 0.8 to 6.6 percentage points).

Considering discrimination heterogeneity, Table 9 shows that discrimination is higher (about double) against applicants who disclose “they/them” pronouns in Republican geographies. Note that in Panel C, the Republican interaction equals 1 if the job posting is in Spokane, WA; Provo, UT, or Colorado Springs, CO. This is true despite each residing in the same state as a paired Democratic geography (Seattle, WA; Salt Lake City, UT; Denver, CO) and two of three pairs being neighbouring cities. By contrast, discrimination against presumed cisgender applicants who disclose pronouns is inconclusive. The point estimate for change in positive employer response is -1.3 percentage points, but the 95% confidence

interval ranges from -5.8 to 3.2 percentage points.

Remaining discrimination heterogeneity is similarly inconclusive, shown in Tables 10 to 14. This study is unable to conclude that discrimination is higher or lower against applicants who are implied male or female, with more or less relevant experience, by occupation worker composition, by occupation customer interaction, and by key phrases contained in occupation job posting text. This is unsurprising, given limited power.

Results are similar when including all interactions, shown in Tables 15 and 16.

### **3.2 Robustness Check**

Panel B of Table 17 shows that discrimination estimates are robust to the Heckman Siegelman critique for nonbinary applicants. The unbiased “levels” estimate is that disclosing “they/them” pronouns reduces positive employer response by 5.3 percentage points. This is statistically significant at the 5% level, with a 95% confidence interval of 1.1 to 9.4 percentage points. Further, Panel C does not show evidence that Neumark (2012)’s identifying assumption is violated (null hypotheses are never rejected). By comparison, the unbiased estimate of discrimination against presumed cisgender applicants who disclose binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns is unsurprisingly statistically insignificant.

## 4 References

- Duflo, E., Banerjee, A., Finkelstein, A., Katz, L. F., Olken, B. A., and Sautmann, A. (2020). In praise of moderation: Suggestions for the scope and use of Pre-Analysis Plans for RCTs in economics. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w26993>. Working Paper.
- Eames, T. (2023). Nonbinary hiring discrimination and the politicization of pronouns: A resume audit study. AEA RCT Registry. May 17, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1257/rct.11183-2.0>.
- Heckman, J. J. (1998). Detecting discrimination. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(2):101–116.
- Heckman, J. J. and Siegelman, P. (1993). The Urban Institute audit studies: Their methods and findings.
- National Center for O\*NET Development (2023). Work activities: Performing for or working directly with the public. O\*NET OnLine. <https://www.onetonline.org/find/descriptor/result/4.A.4.a.8>. Accessed February 5, 2023.
- Neumark, D. (2012). Detecting discrimination in audit and correspondence studies. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 47(4):1128–1157.
- Ruggles, S., Flood, S., Sobek, M., Backman, D., Chen, A., Cooper, G., Richards, S., Rogers, R., and Schouweiler, M. (2023). OCC and OCCSOC: Codes for occupation (OCC) and SOC occupation (OCCSOC) in the 2000 Census and the ACS/PRCS samples from 2000 onward. IPUMS USA: Version 14.0. Minneapolis, MN. <https://usa.ipums.org/usa/vol11/occtooccsoc18.shtml>. Accessed February 5, 2023.

## Tables and Figures

Table 1: Paired Applications by Occupation: Target versus Actual

Occupation	Target Application Counts			Actual Application Counts		
	Percentage	Count	Average per City	Percentage	Count	Average per City
Receptionist	6.7%	216	36	7.5%	299	50
Cashier	5.0%	162	27	4.4%	177	30
Housekeeper	6.7%	216	36	5.7%	229	38
Certified Nursing Assistant	10.0%	324	54	9.6%	381	64
Administrative Assistant	5.0%	162	27	5.5%	218	36
Retail Salesperson	11.7%	378	63	12.5%	500	83
Server	6.7%	216	36	5.0%	200	33
Cook	8.3%	270	45	8.7%	346	58
Baker	3.3%	108	18	2.3%	93	16
Assembler / Fabricator	3.3%	108	18	4.2%	166	28
Construction Worker	5.0%	162	27	5.4%	215	36
Truck Driver	10.0%	324	54	9.9%	396	66
Warehouse Worker	8.3%	270	45	8.4%	335	56
Janitor	5.0%	162	27	5.4%	217	36
Landscaper	5.0%	162	27	5.3%	213	36

Note: percentage is the percentage of target and actual applications submitted in the occupation of interest. Average per city is count divided by six, rounded to the nearest integer.

Table 2: Count of Paired Resumes, Nonbinary “they/them” Pronoun Treatment

Occupation	Actual Application Count per Occupation and City						
	Seattle	Spokane	Salt Lake City	Provo	Denver	Colorado Springs	All
Receptionist	36	33	30	35	32	35	201
Cashier	25	24	23	23	23	21	139
Housekeeper	25	23	25	32	24	22	151
Certified Nursing Assistant	48	45	34	50	45	39	261
Administrative Assistant	26	25	23	21	27	25	147
Retail Sales	56	53	57	57	53	58	334
Server	23	25	20	22	19	23	132
Cook	31	42	41	41	33	39	227
Baker	9	12	14	12	10	9	66
Assembler / Fabricator	19	17	17	17	20	15	105
Construction Worker	23	24	22	24	23	25	141
Truck Driver	45	47	50	43	42	40	267
Warehouse Worker	37	38	37	33	35	37	217
Janitor	24	23	24	31	30	30	162
Landscaper	26	26	25	20	26	22	145
Total	453	457	442	461	442	440	2695



Table 3: Count of Paired Resumes, Binary “he/him” or “she/her” Pronoun Treatment

Occupation	Actual Application Count per Occupation and City						
	Seattle	Spokane	Salt Lake City	Provo	Denver	Colorado Springs	All
Receptionist	14	16	21	15	18	14	98
Cashier	5	5	8	5	7	8	38
Housekeeper	13	15	13	7	14	16	78
Certified Nursing Assistant	16	19	28	13	19	25	120
Administrative Assistant	10	11	14	15	9	12	71
Retail Sales	28	29	27	27	30	25	166
Server	10	9	12	11	15	11	68
Cook	27	16	17	17	25	17	119
Baker	6	3	3	4	6	5	27
Assembler	9	10	11	11	7	13	61
Construction Worker	12	12	14	13	13	10	74
Truck Driver	21	18	15	25	24	26	129
Warehouse Worker	19	17	20	23	21	18	118
Janitor	12	12	14	6	6	5	55
Landscaper	9	10	10	15	10	14	68
Total	211	202	227	207	224	219	1290

Table 4: Resume Characteristics ( $X_i$  Control Variables)

Variable	Type	Description
Occupation	Fixed Effect	Fixed effects for each of the 15 occupations being applied for
Location	Fixed Effect	Fixed effects for each of the six cities being applied within
Research Assistant	Fixed Effect	Fixed effects for each Research Assistant who found and applied to the job posting
Sent first	Indicator	Equals 1 if the resume was sent first
Resume lag	Discrete	Equals 0 if the resume was sent first, and the hours between the first and second application if the resume was sent second
Resume lag <sup>2</sup>	Discrete	Above squared
GED	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant achieved a GED
Associate's	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant achieved an Associate's degree
Bachelor's	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant achieved a Bachelor's degree
High Score High School	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant went to a high school with test scores rated 'A' by Niche
Low Score High School	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant went to a high school with test scores rated 'C' or below by Niche
Worked in HS	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant worked during high school
Years relevant	Discrete	Equals the number of years of "relevant" work experience.
Years relevant <sup>2</sup>	Discrete	Above squared
Current relevant	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's most recent work experience is "relevant"
Current most common	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's most recent work experience is "most common"
Current common	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's most recent work experience is "common"
Prior most common	Discrete	Equals the years of "most common" experience, omitting most recent experience
Prior most common <sup>2</sup>	Discrete	Above squared
Prior common	Discrete	Equals the years of "common" experience, omitting most recent experience
Prior common <sup>2</sup>	Discrete	Above squared
Summary	Indicator	Equals 1 if the resume includes a summary or objective section
Skill: communication	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's resume lists "clear communicator" as a skill
Skill: computer	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's resume lists "computer skills (tech savvy)" as a skill
Skill: detail oriented	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's resume lists "detail oriented" as a skill
Skill: fast learner	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's resume lists "fast learner" as a skill
Skill: fast-paced	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's resume lists "thrives in fast-paced settings" as a skill
Skill: leader	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's resume lists "leadership abilities" as a skill
Skill: organized	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's resume lists "organized and efficient" as a skill
Skill: team player	Indicator	Equals 1 if the applicant's resume lists "team player" as a skill

Note: Work experience is considered "relevant" if it is in the position being applied for (e.g., if an applicant is applying to a janitor position, janitorial experience is "relevant"). Work experience is considered "most common" if it is in the position observed to be most common among non-"relevant" past experiences. This position is occupation-specific, and identified from a resume-scraping process: of the 12 most frequent positions identified for each occupation, this position is most commonly observed before the worker obtained a job in the occupation of interest. Work experience is defined as "common" if it is the second or third most common position. Identifying relevant and common positions is done to control for past work experience in a way that is consistent across occupations. These variables are included in lieu of position fixed effects because experience in a given position influences the probability of positive employer response heterogeneously across occupations. For example, cashier experience may be seen as generally relevant when applying as a sales associate but generally irrelevant when applying as a janitor.

Table 5: Firm and Job Characteristics ( $Z_j$  Control Variables)

Variable	Type	Description
Occupation	Fixed Effect	Fixed effects for each of the 15 occupations being applied for
Location	Fixed Effect	Fixed effects for each of the six cities being applied within
Research Assistant	Fixed Effect	Fixed effects for each Research Assistant who found and applied to the job posting
Estimated applications	Discrete	Equals the lower bound of the range of applicants estimated to have applied to the job posting (this was scraped from the job board website, values range from 1 to 1,496). Equals 0 if the job board website did provide an estimated application range
Estimated applications <sup>2</sup>	Discrete	Above squared
Missing estimated applications	Indicator	Equals 1 if the job board did not provide an estimated application range
Relative income	Continuous	The lower bound of estimated income expressed as a percent of the occupation-specific average
Relative income <sup>2</sup>	Continuous	Above squared
Relative income difference	Continuous	The difference between the upper and lower estimated income bounds expressed as a percent of the occupation-specific average
Relative income difference <sup>2</sup>	Continuous	Above squared
Missing estimated income	Indicator	Equals 1 if the job posting did not include an associated income range

Table 6: Interaction Variables

$I_k$	Notation	Variable	Description
$I_1$	$R_j$	Republican Geography	Equals 1 if the job is located in a Republican geography (Spokane, WA; Provo, UT; Colorado Springs, CO)
$I_2$	$M_i$	Implied Male	Equals 1 if the applicant is implied to be male (through name assignment)
$I_3$	$RLE_i$	Relevant Experience	Equals the years of “relevant” experience the applicant has. Note that work experience is defined as “relevant” if it is in the position being applied for (e.g., if an applicant is applying to a janitor position, years of janitorial experience)
$I_4$	$MD_j$	Male-Dominated	Equals 1 if the applicant is applying in a male-dominated occupation (construction worker, truck driver, warehouse worker, janitor, landscaper)
$I_4$	$FD_j$	Female-Dominated	Equals 1 if the applicant is applying in a female-dominated occupation (receptionist, cashier, housekeeper, certified nursing assistant, administrative assistant)
$I_5$	$HC_j$	High Customer-Facing	Equals 1 if the applicant is applying in a high customer interaction occupation (receptionist, cashier, retail salesperson, server)
$I_5$	$LC_j$	Low Customer-Facing	Equals 1 if the applicant is applying in a low customer interaction occupation (certified nursing assistant, administrative assistant, baker, assembler / fabricator, warehouse worker, janitor, landscaper)
$I_6$	$EO_j$	Equal Opportunity	Equals 1 if the job posting includes the text “EOE,” “EEO,” “Equal Opportunit,” “Equal-Opportunit,” “Equal Employment,” or “Equal-Employment”
$I_6$	$GS_j$	LGBTQ	Equals 1 if the job posting includes the text “gender identity,” “gender expression,” “sexual orientation,” “sexuality,” “LGBT,” “LBGT,” “transgender,” or “queer”
$I_6$	$SB_j$	Small Business	Equals 1 if the job posting includes the text “small bus,” “small-bus,” “small com,” “small-com,” “small firm,” “small-firm,” “small empl,” “small-empl,” “local bus,” “local-bus,” “locally own,” “locally-own,” “locally op,” “locally-op,” “family bus,” “family-bus,” “family own,” “family-own,” “small, independent bus,” “small independent bus,” “small team,” “small but growing,” or “small and busy”

Table 7: Interaction Variables (Continuous Versions)

$I_k$	Indicator Variable	Replacement	Description
$I_1$	$R_j$	Vote Share	Equals the Republican vote share in a CBSA, adjusted such that Republican and Democratic vote shares sum to 1
$I_4$	$MD_j, FD_j$	Sex Difference	Equals the difference between the percentage of the workforce in the occupation who is female minus the percentage who is male
$I_5$	$HC_j, LC_j$	O*NET Score	O*NET score representing the importance of “performing for people or working directly with the public. This includes serving customers in restaurants and stores, and receiving clients or guests” (National Center for O*NET Development 2023). A crosswalk matching occupation codes between ACS and O*NET was sourced from Ruggles et al. (2023). For the Cook, Truck Driver, and Warehouse Worker occupations, ACS codes were mapped to multiple O*NET occupation codes. In these cases, O*NET score was averaged across mapped codes.

Table 8: Estimates of Discrimination Against Applicants who Disclose Pronouns

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
<i>Panel A: Disclosing pronouns compared to not disclosing</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.054*** (0.008)	-0.054*** (0.008)	-0.055*** (0.008)	-0.054*** (0.008)	-0.255*** (0.042)
Binary Pronouns	-0.018 (0.012)	-0.017 (0.012)	-0.016 (0.012)	-0.017 (0.012)	-0.111** (0.055)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
<i>Panel B: Disclosing nonbinary compared to binary pronouns</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.036** (0.015)	-0.036** (0.015)	-0.038*** (0.014)	-0.037** (0.015)	
Observations	3985	3985	3985	3985	
Resume Controls		X		X	X
Firm Controls			X	X	X
Job Posting FE					X

Note: Panel A reports average marginal effects for the associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns and binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex, compared to not disclosing pronouns. Marginal effects are derived from the logistic regression described in equations (1). Panel B reports average marginal effects associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns compared to applicants who disclose binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex. Marginal effects are derived from the logistic regression described in equation (2); only treated observations are included. In all panels, the dependent variable is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the applicant received a positive employer response. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level for all regressions, and reported in parentheses. Stars indicate statistical significance: \*\*\* 1% level, \*\* 5% level, \* 10% level.

Table 9: Estimates of Discrimination Against Applicants who Disclose Pronouns: by Geographic Politics

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
<i>Panel A: Regressions include applications in Democratic geographies only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.038 *** (0.011)	-0.038 *** (0.011)	-0.037 *** (0.011)	-0.037 *** (0.011)	-0.193 (0.290)
Binary Pronouns	-0.010 (0.016)	-0.009 (0.016)	-0.010 (0.016)	-0.012 (0.016)	-0.037 (0.119)
Observations	3998	3998	3998	3998	722
<i>Panel B: Regressions include applications in Republican geographies only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.070 *** (0.011)	-0.071 *** (0.013)	-0.073 *** (0.011)	-0.072 *** (0.013)	-0.332 *** (0.082)
Binary Pronouns	-0.028 * (0.016)	-0.025 (0.016)	-0.022 (0.016)	-0.022 (0.016)	-0.130 * (0.078)
Observations	3972	3972	3972	3972	738
<i>Panel C: Regressions include all applications, indicator interaction</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.029** (0.012)	-0.036*** (0.011)	-0.036*** (0.011)	-0.035*** (0.011)	-0.251*** (0.067)
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.029** (0.012)	-0.036*** (0.011)	-0.036*** (0.011)	-0.035*** (0.011)	-0.179*** (0.054)
Nonbinary $\times$ Republican	-0.052*** (0.017)	-0.038** (0.016)	-0.039** (0.016)	-0.040** (0.016)	-0.156* (0.080)
Binary Pronouns	-0.002 (0.017)	-0.009 (0.016)	-0.009 (0.016)	-0.010 (0.016)	-0.096 (0.074)
Binary $\times$ Republican	-0.034 (0.024)	-0.017 (0.023)	-0.015 (0.023)	-0.013 (0.023)	-0.030 (0.106)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
<i>Panel D: Regressions include all applications, continuous interaction</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	0.008 (0.035)	-0.007 (0.030)	-0.007 (0.029)	-0.005 (0.030)	-0.060 (0.149)
Nonbinary $\times$ Vote Share	-0.129* (0.070)	-0.097 (0.059)	-0.099* (0.059)	-0.103* (0.059)	-0.391 (0.282)
Binary Pronouns	0.028 (0.050)	-0.001 (0.044)	-0.001 (0.044)	-0.005 (0.044)	-0.052 (0.194)
Binary $\times$ Vote Share	-0.094 (0.097)	-0.033 (0.088)	-0.031 (0.088)	-0.024 (0.088)	-0.122 (0.386)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
Resume Controls		X		X	X
Firm Controls			X	X	X
Job Posting FE					X

Note: This table reports average marginal effects associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns and binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex, compared to not disclosing pronouns. Panels A and B are derived from the logistic regression described in equation (1) with different data subsets; Panels C and D from (3.1). The dependent variable is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the applicant received a positive employer response. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level for all regressions, and reported in parentheses. Stars indicate statistical significance: \*\*\* 1% level, \*\* 5% level, \* 10% level.

Table 10: Estimates of Discrimination Against Applicants who Disclose Pronouns: by Implied Sex

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
<i>Panel A: Regressions include implied male applicants only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.053 *** (0.011)	-0.053 *** (0.012)	-0.053 *** (0.011)	-0.053 *** (0.012)	-0.267 *** (0.067)
Binary Pronouns	-0.015 (0.016)	-0.017 (0.016)	-0.017 (0.016)	-0.018 (0.016)	-0.156 * (0.089)
Observations	3988	3988	3988	3988	684
<i>Panel B: Regressions include implied female applicants only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.055 *** (0.011)	-0.056 *** (0.012)	-0.058 *** (0.011)	-0.057 *** (0.012)	-0.300 (0.552)
Binary Pronouns	-0.022 (0.016)	-0.019 (0.016)	-0.016 (0.016)	-0.018 (0.016)	-0.087 (0.107)
Observations	3982	3982	3982	3982	722
<i>Panel C: Regressions include all applications</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.055*** (0.011)	-0.056*** (0.011)	-0.057*** (0.011)	-0.056*** (0.011)	-0.262*** (0.054)
Nonbinary $\times$ Implied Male	0.001 (0.016)	0.003 (0.016)	0.004 (0.016)	0.004 (0.016)	0.015 (0.075)
Binary Pronouns	-0.021 (0.016)	-0.018 (0.016)	-0.017 (0.016)	-0.017 (0.016)	-0.106 (0.075)
Binary $\times$ Implied Male	0.006 (0.024)	0.002 (0.024)	0.001 (0.024)	0.000 (0.024)	-0.015 (0.106)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
Resume Controls		X		X	X
Firm Controls			X	X	X
Job Posting FE					X

Note: This table reports average marginal effects associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns and binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex, compared to not disclosing pronouns. Panels A and B are derived from the logistic regression described in equation (1) with different data subsets; Panel C from (3.2) The dependent variable is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the applicant received a positive employer response. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level for all regressions, and reported in parentheses. Stars indicate statistical significance: \*\*\* 1% level, \*\* 5% level, \* 10% level.



Table 11: Estimates of Discrimination Against Applicants who Disclose Pronouns: by Experience

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
<i>Panel A: Regressions include applicants with <math>\geq 2</math> years of relevant experience only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.071 *** (0.014)	-0.070 ** (0.029)	-0.071 *** (0.014)	-0.072 ** (0.029)	-0.314 (4.465)
Binary Pronouns	-0.010 (0.020)	-0.013 (0.021)	-0.010 (0.020)	-0.009 (0.021)	-0.024 (0.109)
Observations	2852	2852	2852	2852	578
<i>Panel B: Regressions include applicants with <math>&lt; 2</math> years of relevant experience only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.045 *** (0.010)	-0.046 *** (0.010)	-0.046 *** (0.009)	-0.046 *** (0.010)	-0.252 ** (0.128)
Binary Pronouns	-0.024 * (0.014)	-0.020 (0.014)	-0.021 (0.014)	-0.020 (0.014)	-0.156 (0.111)
Observations	5118	5118	5118	5118	848
<i>Panel C: Regressions include all applicants</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.047*** (0.011)	-0.048*** (0.011)	-0.047*** (0.011)	-0.047*** (0.011)	-0.245*** (0.054)
Nonbinary $\times$ Years Relevant	-0.006 (0.007)	-0.006 (0.007)	-0.007 (0.007)	-0.007 (0.007)	-0.009 (0.032)
Binary Pronouns	-0.026 (0.016)	-0.022 (0.017)	-0.025 (0.016)	-0.024 (0.016)	-0.126 (0.080)
Binary $\times$ Years Relevant	0.007 (0.011)	0.005 (0.011)	0.008 (0.010)	0.007 (0.011)	0.013 (0.048)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
Resume Controls		X		X	X
Firm Controls			X	X	X
Job Posting FE					X

Note: This table reports average marginal effects associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns and binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex, compared to not disclosing pronouns. Panels A and B are derived from the logistic regression described in equation (1) with different data subsets; Panel C from (3.3). The dependent variable is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the applicant received a positive employer response. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level for all regressions, and reported in parentheses. Stars indicate statistical significance: \*\*\* 1% level, \*\* 5% level, \* 10% level.

Table 12: Estimates of Discrimination Against Applicants who Disclose Pronouns: by Worker Composition

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
<i>Panel A: Regressions include applications to male-dominated occupations only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.053 *** (0.013)	-0.056 *** (0.014)	-0.052 *** (0.013)	-0.055 *** (0.014)	-0.261 *** (0.080)
Binary Pronouns	-0.011 (0.019)	-0.010 (0.019)	-0.014 (0.019)	-0.013 (0.019)	-0.141 (0.110)
Observations	2752	2752	2752	2752	476
<i>Panel B: Regressions include applications to non-dominated occupations only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.065 *** (0.014)	-0.064 *** (0.015)	-0.068 *** (0.014)	-0.066 *** (0.015)	-0.321 (0.380)
Binary Pronouns	-0.030 (0.020)	-0.025 (0.020)	-0.023 (0.020)	-0.021 (0.020)	-0.007 (0.095)
Observations	2610	2610	2610	2610	526
<i>Panel C: Regressions include applications to female-dominated occupations only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.045 *** (0.014)	-0.047 *** (0.014)	-0.046 *** (0.013)	-0.047 *** (0.014)	-0.237 (0.249)
Binary Pronouns	-0.015 (0.021)	-0.019 (0.021)	-0.012 (0.021)	-0.020 (0.021)	-0.104 (0.208)
Observations	2608	2608	2608	2608	500
<i>Panel D: Regressions include all applications, indicator interactions</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.047*** (0.015)	-0.060*** (0.014)	-0.064*** (0.014)	-0.062*** (0.014)	-0.292*** (0.061)
Nonbinary $\times$ Male Dominated	-0.032 (0.022)	0.003 (0.021)	0.010 (0.021)	0.006 (0.021)	0.030 (0.094)
Nonbinary $\times$ Female Dominated	0.011 (0.023)	0.014 (0.020)	0.018 (0.021)	0.017 (0.021)	0.096 (0.087)
Binary Pronouns	-0.013 (0.021)	-0.026 (0.019)	-0.024 (0.019)	-0.023 (0.019)	-0.111 (0.094)
Binary $\times$ Male Dominated	-0.0219 (0.0293)	0.0171 (0.0291)	0.0110 (0.0287)	0.0113 (0.0287)	0.0134 (0.133)
Binary $\times$ Female Dominated	0.007 (0.031)	0.014 (0.030)	0.014 (0.030)	0.009 (0.029)	-0.010 (0.130)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
<i>Panel E: Regressions include all applications, continuous interactions</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.054*** (0.008)	-0.054*** (0.008)	-0.055*** (0.008)	-0.054*** (0.008)	-0.254*** (0.042)
Nonbinary $\times$ Sex Difference	0.0208 (0.0142)	0.0049 (0.0130)	0.0026 (0.0131)	0.0047 (0.0131)	0.0354 (0.0607)
Binary Pronouns	-0.017 (0.012)	-0.017 (0.012)	-0.016 (0.012)	-0.016 (0.012)	-0.111** (0.055)
Binary $\times$ Sex Difference	0.018 (0.019)	0.002 (0.019)	0.008 (0.019)	0.004 (0.019)	0.000 (0.083)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
Resume Controls		X		X	X
Firm Controls			X	X	X
Job Posting FE					X

Note: This table reports average marginal effects associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns and binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex, compared to not disclosing pronouns. Panels A to C are derived from the logistic regression described in equation (1) with different data subsets; Panels D and E from (3.4). The dependent variable is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the applicant received a positive employer response. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level for all regressions, and reported in parentheses. Stars indicate statistical significance: \*\*\* 1% level, \*\* 5% level, \* 10% level.

Table 13: Estimates of Discrimination Against Applicants who Disclose Pronouns: by Customer Interaction

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
<i>Panel A: Regressions include applications to high customer-facing occupations only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.059 *** (0.015)	-0.059 *** (0.016)	-0.063 *** (0.014)	-0.062 *** (0.016)	-0.326 (0.294)
Binary Pronouns	-0.019 (0.021)	-0.015 (0.021)	-0.009 (0.022)	-0.010 (0.021)	0.075 (0.106)
Observations	2352	2352	2352	2352	472
<i>Panel B: Regressions include applications to medium customer-facing occupations only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.034 ** (0.014)	-0.031 ** (0.014)	-0.032 ** (0.014)	-0.030 ** (0.014)	-0.137 (0.087)
Binary Pronouns	-0.028 (0.021)	-0.028 (0.021)	-0.031 (0.021)	-0.031 (0.021)	-0.210 (0.175)
Observations	2372	2372	2372	2372	416
<i>Panel C: Regressions include applications to low customer-facing occupations only</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.053*** (0.016)	-0.034** (0.014)	-0.032** (0.015)	-0.033** (0.015)	-0.139** (0.070)
Nonbinary $\times$ High Customer Facing	-0.016 (0.023)	-0.025 (0.021)	-0.031 (0.020)	-0.027 (0.021)	-0.143 (0.096)
Nonbinary $\times$ Low Customer Facing	0.008 (0.022)	-0.031* (0.019)	-0.034* (0.019)	-0.032* (0.019)	-0.180* (0.104)
Binary Pronouns	-0.046** (0.022)	-0.028 (0.021)	-0.032 (0.021)	-0.031 (0.021)	-0.189* (0.102)
Binary $\times$ High Customer Facing	0.020 (0.034)	0.015 (0.032)	0.021 (0.032)	0.021 (0.032)	0.186 (0.134)
Binary $\times$ Low Customer Facing	0.060* (0.033)	0.019 (0.029)	0.026 (0.029)	0.023 (0.029)	0.076 (0.124)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
<i>Panel E: Regressions include all applications, continuous interactions</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.035 (0.027)	-0.055** (0.024)	-0.053** (0.024)	-0.054** (0.024)	-0.271*** (0.102)
Nonbinary $\times$ O*NET Score	-0.0003 (0.0004)	0.0000 (0.0004)	0.0000 (0.0004)	0.0000 (0.0004)	0.0003 (0.0017)
Binary Pronouns	0.001 (0.037)	-0.019 (0.034)	-0.019 (0.034)	-0.020 (0.034)	-0.257 (0.163)
Binary $\times$ O*NET Score	-0.0003 (0.0006)	0.0000 (0.0006)	0.0000 (0.0006)	0.0001 (0.0006)	0.0028 (0.0027)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
Resume Controls		X		X	X
Firm Controls			X	X	X
Job Posting FE					X

Note: This table reports average marginal effects associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns and binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex, compared to not disclosing pronouns. Panels A to C are derived from the logistic regression described in equation (1) with different data subsets; Panels D and E from (3.5). The dependent variable is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the applicant received a positive employer response. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level for all regressions, and reported in parentheses. Stars indicate statistical significance: \*\*\* 1% level, \*\* 5% level, \* 10% level.

Table 14: Estimates of Discrimination Against Applicants who Disclose Pronouns: by Job Posting Text

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
<i>Panel A: Regressions include applications to job postings mentioning “equal opportunity”</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.037 ** (0.017)	-0.041 ** (0.018)	-0.036 ** (0.016)	-0.038 ** (0.018)	-0.227 (0.189)
Binary Pronouns	-0.048 * (0.026)	-0.049 * (0.027)	-0.051 ** (0.026)	-0.054 ** (0.027)	-0.067 (0.120)
Observations	1644	1644	1644	1644	342
<i>Panel B: Regressions include applications to job postings mentioning LGBTQ</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.040 * (0.023)	-0.048 * (0.026)	-0.045 ** (0.023)	-0.048 * (0.026)	-0.191 (2.609)
Binary Pronouns	-0.015 (0.032)	-0.013 (0.035)	-0.008 (0.033)	-0.018 (0.034)	0.106 (1.891)
Observations	936	936	936	936	178
<i>Panel C: Regressions include applications to job postings mentioning small business</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.078 *** (0.026)	-0.077 *** (0.029)	-0.069 *** (0.026)	-0.068 ** (0.029)	-0.259 (0.182)
Binary Pronouns	0.056 (0.040)	0.056 (0.042)	0.033 (0.039)	0.036 (0.040)	0.026 (0.238)
Observations	798	798	798	798	136
<i>Panel D: Regressions include applications to job postings mentioning none of the above</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.056 *** (0.009)	-0.056 *** (0.010)	-0.057 *** (0.009)	-0.057 *** (0.010)	-0.268 (0.359)
Binary Pronouns	-0.016 (0.014)	-0.015 (0.014)	-0.013 (0.014)	-0.014 (0.014)	-0.079 (0.106)
Observations	5600	5600	5600	5600	1056
<i>Panel E: Regressions include all applications</i>					
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.057*** (0.009)	-0.057*** (0.010)	-0.059*** (0.009)	-0.058*** (0.010)	-0.270*** (0.047)
Nonbinary $\times$ Equal Opportunity	0.026 (0.025)	0.030 (0.025)	0.031 (0.025)	0.031 (0.025)	0.054 (0.108)
Nonbinary $\times$ LGBTQ	-0.005 (0.032)	-0.005 (0.031)	-0.006 (0.031)	-0.005 (0.031)	0.023 (0.140)
Nonbinary $\times$ Small Business	-0.024 (0.027)	-0.029 (0.026)	-0.021 (0.027)	-0.024 (0.027)	0.100 (0.126)
Binary Pronouns	-0.020 (0.014)	-0.018 (0.014)	-0.016 (0.014)	-0.016 (0.014)	-0.084 (0.064)
Binary $\times$ Equal Opportunity	-0.058* (0.035)	-0.058 (0.036)	-0.066* (0.034)	-0.060* (0.035)	-0.216 (0.174)
Binary $\times$ LGBTQ	0.056 (0.052)	0.047 (0.050)	0.060 (0.051)	0.047 (0.050)	0.171 (0.219)
Binary $\times$ Small Business	0.083* (0.044)	0.095** (0.044)	0.074* (0.042)	0.080* (0.043)	-0.137 (0.175)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
Resume Controls		X		X	X
Firm Controls			X	X	X
Job Posting FE					X

Note: this table reports average marginal effects associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns and binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex, compared to not disclosing pronouns. Panels A to D are derived from the logistic regression described in equation (1) with different data subsets; for Panels E and F from (3.6). The dependent variable is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the applicant received a positive employer response. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level for all regressions, and reported in parentheses. Stars indicate statistical significance: \*\*\* 1% level, \*\* 5% level, \* 10% level.

Table 15: Estimates of Discrimination Against Applicants who Disclose Pronouns: All Interactions (Indicator Variables)

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Nonbinary Pronouns	-0.003 (0.027)	-0.017 (0.025)	-0.018 (0.025)	-0.016 (0.025)	-0.111 (111.197)
Nonbinary $\times$ Implied Male	0.003 (0.016)	0.003 (0.016)	0.004 (0.016)	0.004 (0.016)	0.025 (0.517)
Nonbinary $\times$ Republican	-0.036** (0.016)	-0.037** (0.016)	-0.039** (0.016)	-0.038** (0.016)	-0.151 (192.454)
Nonbinary $\times$ High Customer Facing	-0.045* (0.024)	-0.028 (0.022)	-0.032 (0.022)	-0.030 (0.022)	-0.127 (254.807)
Nonbinary $\times$ Low Customer Facing	0.003 (0.022)	-0.036* (0.019)	-0.040** (0.019)	-0.038** (0.019)	-0.204 (647.954)
Nonbinary $\times$ Male Dominated	-0.059** (0.023)	0.001 (0.023)	0.006 (0.023)	0.003 (0.023)	0.055 (29.927)
Nonbinary $\times$ Female Dominated	0.005 (0.023)	0.019 (0.021)	0.024 (0.021)	0.022 (0.021)	0.107 (121.227)
Nonbinary $\times$ Relevant Experience	-0.005 (0.007)	-0.005 (0.007)	-0.007 (0.007)	-0.007 (0.007)	-0.020 (5.286)
Nonbinary $\times$ Equal Opportunity	0.025 (0.025)	0.030 (0.025)	0.028 (0.025)	0.031 (0.025)	0.047 (21.474)
Nonbinary $\times$ LGBTQ	0.000 (0.032)	-0.005 (0.031)	-0.002 (0.032)	-0.005 (0.031)	0.011 (1.006)
Nonbinary $\times$ Small Business	-0.025 (0.027)	-0.031 (0.026)	-0.025 (0.026)	-0.026 (0.026)	0.087 (97.532)
Binary Pronouns	-0.028 (0.036)	-0.042 (0.034)	-0.044 (0.034)	-0.043 (0.034)	-0.205 (511.021)
Binary $\times$ Implied Male	0.003 (0.024)	0.001 (0.024)	0.000 (0.024)	0.001 (0.024)	-0.048 (46.467)
Binary $\times$ Republican	-0.024 (0.023)	-0.022 (0.023)	-0.019 (0.023)	-0.018 (0.023)	-0.055 (46.835)
Binary $\times$ High Customer Facing	0.001 (0.036)	0.027 (0.036)	0.028 (0.036)	0.030 (0.036)	0.211 (663.685)
Binary $\times$ Low Customer Facing	0.066* (0.034)	0.022 (0.030)	0.027 (0.030)	0.027 (0.030)	0.081 (70.632)
Binary $\times$ Male Dominated	-0.038 (0.032)	0.023 (0.034)	0.020 (0.033)	0.018 (0.034)	0.115 (169.281)
Binary $\times$ Female Dominated	-0.014 (0.031)	0.011 (0.031)	0.007 (0.031)	0.005 (0.031)	0.037 (10.897)
Binary $\times$ Relevant Experience	0.007 (0.011)	0.006 (0.011)	0.009 (0.011)	0.008 (0.011)	0.031 (8.338)
Binary $\times$ Equal Opportunity	-0.048 (0.037)	-0.058 (0.036)	-0.061* (0.035)	-0.060* (0.036)	-0.215 (840.489)
Binary $\times$ LGBTQ	0.037 (0.051)	0.046 (0.051)	0.046 (0.050)	0.044 (0.050)	0.142 (304.062)
Binary $\times$ Small Business	0.101** (0.045)	0.099** (0.045)	0.082* (0.043)	0.085* (0.044)	-0.130 (316.530)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
Resume Controls		X		X	X
Firm Controls			X	X	X
Job Posting FE					X

Note: This table reports marginal effects for the average applicant associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns and binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex, compared to not disclosing pronouns. Marginal effects derived from the logistic regression described in equation (5). The dependent variable is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the applicant received a positive employer response. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level for all regressions, and reported in parentheses. Stars indicate statistical significance: \*\*\* 1% level, \*\* 5% level, \* 10% level.

Table 16: Estimates of Discrimination Against Applicants who Disclose Pronouns: All Interactions (Continuous Variables)

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Nonbinary Pronouns	0.038 (0.045)	-0.007 (0.040)	-0.004 (0.040)	-0.004 (0.040)	-0.132 (0.188)
Nonbinary $\times$ Implied Male	0.002 (0.016)	0.003 (0.016)	0.004 (0.016)	0.004 (0.016)	0.023 (0.075)
Nonbinary $\times$ Vote Share	-0.124* (0.070)	-0.093 (0.060)	-0.097* (0.059)	-0.097 (0.059)	-0.338 (0.283)
Nonbinary $\times$ O*NET Score	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.001 (0.002)
Nonbinary $\times$ Sex Difference	0.028* (0.015)	0.005 (0.013)	0.005 (0.013)	0.005 (0.013)	0.027 (0.062)
Nonbinary $\times$ Relevant Experience	-0.006 (0.007)	-0.006 (0.007)	-0.007 (0.007)	-0.007 (0.007)	-0.013 (0.032)
Nonbinary $\times$ Equal Opportunity	0.024 (0.025)	0.029 (0.025)	0.027 (0.025)	0.030 (0.025)	0.049 (0.111)
Nonbinary $\times$ LGBTQ	0.000 (0.032)	-0.007 (0.031)	-0.004 (0.031)	-0.007 (0.031)	0.018 (0.140)
Nonbinary $\times$ Small Business	-0.026 (0.027)	-0.030 (0.026)	-0.024 (0.027)	-0.025 (0.027)	0.098 (0.125)
Binary Pronouns	0.050 (0.068)	-0.005 (0.058)	-0.006 (0.057)	-0.009 (0.058)	-0.112 (0.299)
Binary $\times$ Implied Male	0.004 (0.024)	0.002 (0.024)	0.000 (0.024)	0.001 (0.024)	-0.042 (0.109)
Binary $\times$ Vote Share	-0.096 (0.097)	-0.043 (0.089)	-0.035 (0.088)	-0.036 (0.089)	-0.227 (0.400)
Binary $\times$ O*NET Score	-0.001 (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	0.002 (0.003)
Binary $\times$ Sex Difference	0.017 (0.020)	0.001 (0.020)	0.002 (0.020)	0.002 (0.020)	-0.018 (0.087)
Binary $\times$ Relevant Experience	0.007 (0.011)	0.006 (0.011)	0.009 (0.011)	0.008 (0.011)	0.024 (0.047)
Binary $\times$ Equal Opportunity	-0.051 (0.036)	-0.058 (0.036)	-0.061* (0.035)	-0.060* (0.036)	-0.224 (0.182)
Binary $\times$ LGBTQ	0.042 (0.051)	0.046 (0.051)	0.047 (0.050)	0.045 (0.050)	0.163 (0.220)
Binary $\times$ Small Business	0.091** (0.044)	0.095** (0.045)	0.079* (0.043)	0.081* (0.044)	-0.151 (0.173)
Observations	7970	7970	7970	7970	1586
Resume Controls		X		X	X
Firm Controls			X	X	X
Job Posting FE					X

Note: This table reports marginal effects for the average applicant associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns and binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex, compared to not disclosing pronouns. Marginal effects derived from the logistic regression described in equation (5). The dependent variable is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the applicant received a positive employer response. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level for all regressions, and reported in parentheses. Stars indicate statistical significance: \*\*\* 1% level, \*\* 5% level, \* 10% level.

Table 17: Heteroskedastic Logistic Discrimination Estimates (Neu-  
mark’s Bias Correction)

	Nonbinary Pronouns	Binary Pronouns
<i>Panel A: Logistic coefficient estimates</i>		
Coefficient Estimate	-0.054*** (0.008)	-0.017 (0.013)
<i>Panel B: Heteroskedastic logistic coefficient estimates</i>		
Total Estimate	-0.056*** (0.008)	-0.016 (0.013)
Levels Estimate	-0.053** (0.021)	-0.032 (0.035)
Variance Estimate	-0.004 (0.020)	0.016 (0.034)
<i>Panel C: Tests</i>		
Overidentification test p-value ( $X_i$ coefficient ratios are equal for treatment and control)	0.953	0.969
Standard deviation of unobservables (treatment / control)	0.981	1.086
S.D. test p-value (ratio of standard deviations = 1)	0.881	0.654
Observations	7970	7970
Resume Controls	X	X
Firm Controls		
Job Posting FE		

Note: This table reports marginal effects for the average applicant associated with disclosing nonbinary “they/them” pronouns and binary “he/him” or “she/her” pronouns congruent with name-implied sex, compared to not disclosing pronouns. Panel A is derived from logistic regression described in equation (1) with resume controls; Panel B is derived from a heteroskedastic version of the same logistic regression and decomposed as described in equation (5). The dependent variable is an indicator variable which equals 1 if the applicant received a positive employer response. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level for all regressions, and reported in parentheses. Stars indicate statistical significance: \*\*\* 1% level, \*\* 5% level, \* 10% level.