

Populated Pre-Analysis Plan

This populated pre-analysis plan (PAP) focuses exclusively on the field experiment. The corresponding survey analyses are reported directly in Eames (2026) and are therefore not reproduced here. For Survey Experiment One, the PAP specified raw image-level averages and a regression comparing image categories with triplet, name, and respondent fixed effects. Eames (2026) notes that the reported analysis instead uses adjusted image-specific ratings, which are better suited to the survey’s image-validation purpose. The final amended plan for Survey Experiment Two specified the analysis in substantially greater detail, including exact variable definitions and the full set of 109 hypothesis tests. Eames (2026) implements and reports these analyses exactly as specified in the final amended plan and identifies any additional analyses as not pre-specified and therefore exploratory.

1 Pre-Specified Estimation Strategy

The PAP specified estimating average treatment effects using the following linear probability model:

$$y_{ij} = \delta MtF_i + \lambda NP_i + \gamma[MtF_i \times NP_i] + \mathbf{X}'_i\beta_1 + \mathbf{Z}'_j\beta_2 + \theta_{t(i)} + \phi_{o(i)} + \zeta_{c(i)} + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (1)$$

where y_{ij} indicates whether application i sent to job posting j receives a positive employer response; MtF_i (denoted DT_i in the PAP) indicates disclosure of a male-to-female (MtF) name change; NP_i indicates that the applicant does not pass as cisgender; X_i and Z_j are vectors of applicant and job-posting controls, respectively, that may influence baseline response rates; and $\theta_{t(i)}$, $\phi_{o(i)}$, and $\zeta_{c(i)}$ are headshot-twin, occupation, and city fixed effects.

To examine heterogeneity in discrimination, I pre-specified interacting each treatment component in equation (1) with a moderator, H_j :

$$y_{ij} = \delta MtF_i + \lambda NP_i + \gamma[MtF_i \times NP_i] + \pi[MtF_i \times H_j] + \kappa[NP_i \times H_j] + \xi[MtF_i \times NP_i \times H_j] + \mathbf{X}'_i\beta_1 + \mathbf{Z}'_j\beta_2 + \theta_{t(i)} + \phi_{o(i)} + \zeta_{c(i)} + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (2)$$

The PAP also allowed for using less granular treatment indicators in heterogeneity analyses if statistical power was limited. I pre-specified the following potential moderators:

- **Passing level:** based on Survey Experiment One image-specific ratings.
 - *Rationale:* The less one passes, the more discrimination one may face.

- Although pre-specified as a potential moderator, the strongly non-passing indicator S_i cannot be separately interacted with NP_i : because $S_i = 1$ only when $NP_i = 1$, $S_i \times NP_i = S_i$. I therefore treat passing strength as an extension of the average treatment effect analysis rather than as a heterogeneity analysis. Specifically, I augment equation (1) with S_i and $MtF_i \times S_i$, while retaining NP_i and $MtF_i \times NP_i$.
- **Local politics:** based on pre-specified state and/or city progressiveness index (weighted average of normalized local vote shares in the 2025 federal election, with party-specific progressiveness scores of 10 for the Greens, 9 for The Left, 8 for SPD, 3 for CDU/CSU, and 0 for AfD) or the combined normalized vote share of Greens, The Left, and SPD.¹
 - *Rationale:* Transgender people may experience heightened discrimination in more politically conservative areas (Eames 2024).
- **Occupation sex composition:** based on % male and female.
 - *Rationale:* Transgender people may experience heightened discrimination in male- or female-dominated occupations (Granberg et al. 2020).
- **Occupation customer interaction:** based on O*NET scores.
 - *Rationale:* Employers may be discriminating on behalf of their customers (they expect their customers to be discriminatory).
- **Occupation coworker interaction:** based on O*NET scores.
 - *Rationale:* Employers may be discriminating on behalf of their employees (they expect their employees to be discriminatory).
- **Contact person sex:** based on name and title (e.g., Frau Leonie is a female).
 - *Rationale:* There is some evidence that females are less discriminatory.
- **Job posting wage**
 - *Rationale:* Higher-paying employers may attract a more competitive group of applicants, which increases their ability to discriminate. On the other hand, these employers may be fundamentally different than lower-paying employers, and may value diversity and equity.
- **Job posting wage range**
 - *Rationale:* Employers with wide wage ranges may be able to defer discrimination to the wage-setting stage and thus exhibit less discrimination in hiring (Eames 2024).

¹The PAP specified the combined normalized vote share of CDU/CSU and AfD. Because higher values of that measure indicate less progressive politics, whereas higher values of the progressiveness index indicate more progressive politics, I instead report the combined normalized vote share of Greens, The Left, and SPD so that both measures have the same directional interpretation. Because vote shares are normalized across these five parties, the two measures sum to one and yield equivalent estimates with opposite coefficient signs.

- **Years of experience**
 - *Rationale:* This can provide insight into statistical discrimination.
- **Disclosure location**
 - *Rationale:* Employers may not even open an applicant’s documents if they disclose a name change in their introductory email.

2 Implementation Details

The pre-specified estimation strategy (above) did not provide the set of variables included in X_i or Z_j , describing them only as vectors of applicant and job posting controls, respectively, “that may influence baseline callback rates.” Table 1 defines the full set of control variables and fixed effects used in this populated PAP. Some variables originally contemplated as controls are instead implemented as fixed effects where more appropriate, including name triad, month, and day-of-week fixed effects.

Results are sensitive to the inclusion of treatment-arm indicators, which allow baseline response rates to differ across the three randomly assigned arms. I report specifications both with and without these indicators, but treat the former as preferred because it benchmarks each treatment against controls in the corresponding arm rather than against the pooled control group. I therefore refer to the control sets including and excluding the treatment-arm indicators as the Preferred Controls and Alternative Controls, respectively. Section 3 examines realized differences in control response rates across arms and their implications for the estimates.

The moderators examined in this populated PAP are defined in Table 2. Wage and wage range information was not readily available in sampled job postings, so this information was neither collected nor analyzed. The planned O*NET coworker-interaction measure also provided too little useful variation across the nine occupations. Seven occupations involve a significant amount of coworker interaction: nurse (95), retail salesperson (86), office clerk (83), mechatronics technician (83), server (81), warehouse worker (81), and cook (77) leaving only cleaner and truck driver occupations with clearly lower scores (64 each). This distribution does not provide a credible basis for distinguishing coworker-interaction heterogeneity from other occupational differences. I therefore omit these analyses rather than report poorly measured or weakly identified comparisons. The PAP did not specify an exact operational definition of passing level. I define it using adjusted image-level ratings from Survey Experiment One of the likelihood that each non-passing headshot was assigned male at birth. These ratings are based on headshot fixed effects from a regression that also includes respondent, rating position, and displayed name fixed effects (see Appendix Section A2.2.2 in Eames

(2026)). I classify the headshots above the median adjusted rating as strongly non-passing and the remaining as moderately non-passing.

The original PAP targeted 18,000 applications to 9,000 job postings but pre-specified an interim reassessment of statistical power between July 14 and 28, 2025. During that window, I used the first 6,016 applications to update the power calculations based on the observed control response rate and standard errors from the paired fixed effects specification. The updated calculations indicated that approximately 10,000 applications would provide minimum detectable effects comparable in relative terms to those targeted in the original plan. I therefore reduced the target to limit employer burden and accommodate a scheduled transition between research-assistant teams; the final sample contains 10,022 applications to 5,011 job postings. However, this decision was not registered until August 30, near the end of data collection. Sections 2.4 and 3.1 of Eames (2026) provide further details.

3 Control Response Rates Across Treatment Arms

The interaction estimate is sensitive to differences in control response rates across treatment arms. As shown in Table 3, control response rates are 45.8% in the male-to-female-only arm, 48.0% in the non-passing-only arm, and 49.2% in the combined arm. The unadjusted interaction is therefore -3.8 pp when all treatment effects are benchmarked against the pooled control response rate, compared with -6.9 pp when each is benchmarked against the corresponding arm-specific control rate. Thus, accounting for the arm-specific rates makes the interaction 3.2 pp more negative. Although random assignment makes the pooled and arm-specific comparisons equivalent in expectation, it does not ensure that the realized sets of postings assigned to each arm have identical baseline response propensities.

To assess whether an imbalance of this magnitude could plausibly arise by chance, I conduct a permutation test that recreates the assignment of treatment arms 9,999 times. In each permutation, I randomly reassign treatment arm labels across application template pairs within occupations while holding the following fixed: treatment status within each pair, employer response outcomes, and the number of postings represented by each template pair. I then recalculate the component of the unadjusted interaction attributable to differences in control response rates across arms: $D_c = c_{\text{Mtf}} + c_{\text{NP}} - c_{\text{Both}} - c_{\text{Pooled}}$. For the primary outcome, which includes interview requests and other positive employer responses, the observed value is -3.2 pp, and 11.4% of permutations produce an absolute value at least this large, yielding a two-sided randomization-inference p -value of 0.114. Thus, treating control outcomes as measures of baseline employer responsiveness, the observed imbalances are not unusual under the assignment mechanism. The importance of accounting for this arm-level variation is

reinforced by the strong association between outcomes within application pairs. Among treated applications, a positive response to the paired control applicant is associated with a 50.8 pp higher probability of receiving a positive response (standard error: 1.2 pp; $p < 0.001$), estimated including the application controls and fixed effects in Alternative Controls 1. Together, these results indicate that chance imbalances in shared posting-level responsiveness are both plausible and consequential, supporting the inclusion of treatment arm indicators.

A competing explanation is that the treatments generate differential spillovers that affect control applicants. If so, treatment arm indicators would incorporate these spillovers into measured discrimination rather than identify total treatment effects on treated applicants. However, the direction of the control rate differences runs counter to the applicant quality spillovers documented by Phillips (2019), who finds that applicants assigned to compete against higher quality experimental applicant pools receive more callbacks. If the treatments here reduced perceived applicant quality and generated this type of spillover, controls paired with more strongly penalized treated applicants would receive fewer positive responses. Instead, controls paired with the combined treatment have the highest response rate, even though applicants with both treatment signals face the largest penalty. This comparison does not rule out other forms of interference, but it provides no support for the spillover mechanism documented by Phillips. Taken together, the permutation results show that chance can plausibly account for the observed imbalances, while the direction of the differences provides no evidence that differential spillovers are responsible. I therefore treat specifications including treatment arm indicators as preferred, while also reporting estimates that exclude them.

4 Results

With the exception of the female-to-female name change check, each table reports the two control specifications side by side. Unprimed columns use Preferred Controls, which include treatment arm indicators, while primed columns use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The results are summarized below.

- **Female-to-female name change check:** reported in Table 4. This check tests whether employers penalize name change disclosure itself, helping distinguish a penalty for the transgender identity revealed by a male-to-female name change from a general disclosure penalty. There is no evidence that female-to-female name change disclosure affects employer responses. Because this disclosure occurs only among controls assigned to the non-passing-only arm, it is perfectly collinear with that arm indicator. I therefore report the adjusted estimate using Alternative Controls, which compare

these applicants with control applicants from the other two arms pooled.

- **Average discrimination:** reported in Table 5. The pooled treatment effect is -8.1 percentage points (pp). With Preferred Controls, male-to-female name change disclosure and non-passing appearance reduce response rates by 4.1 and 4.4 pp, respectively, with an additional 6.9 pp penalty when combined. With Alternative Controls, both component effects remain negative and significant, but the interaction is smaller and statistically insignificant.
- **Non-passing strength:** reported in Table 6. Moderately non-passing appearance has no statistically significant standalone effect, while strongly non-passing appearance produces an additional penalty of approximately 9.0 pp under both control specifications. The incremental interaction associated with strongly rather than moderately non-passing appearance is statistically insignificant.
- **Contact person sex:** reported in Table 7. The pooled treatment penalty is 4.5 pp larger when the listed contact is male. The disaggregated estimates show an approximately 5.0 pp larger non-passing penalty, while the corresponding differences in the name change and interaction effects are statistically insignificant.
- **Occupation characteristics:** reported in Tables 8 to 10. There is no statistically significant heterogeneity by customer-facing work or whether occupations are male- or female-dominated.
- **Local politics:** reported in Tables 11 to 14. There is no statistically significant heterogeneity across the state- or city-level political measures.
- **Experience and disclosure location:** reported in Tables 15 and 16. There is no statistically significant heterogeneity by additional work experience or whether the name change is disclosed in the email rather than the cover letter.

References

- Eames, T. (2024). Taryn versus Taryn (she/her) versus Taryn (they/them): A field experiment on pronoun disclosure and hiring discrimination. Available at SSRN.
- Eames, T. (2026). The cost of being seen: Identity, non-passing appearance, and hiring discrimination against transgender women. Available at SSRN.
- Granberg, M., Andersson, P. A., and Ahmed, A. (2020). Hiring discrimination against transgender people: Evidence from a field experiment. *Labour Economics*, 65:101860.
- Phillips, D. C. (2019). Do comparisons of fictional applicants measure discrimination when search externalities are present? Evidence from existing experiments. *The Economic Journal*, 129(621):2240–2264.

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Control Variables and Fixed Effects

Variable	Description
<i>Panel A: Characteristics that Vary Within Application Pairs</i>	
Local <i>Arbeitszeugnis</i>	Indicator variable: equal to one if the applicant’s <i>Arbeitszeugnis</i> is located in the job’s city rather than in Hannover.
Application Format 1	Indicator variable: equal to one if the applicant is assigned format 1 rather than format 2.
Vector of Cover Letter Indicators	Three indicator variables: equal to one if the applicant attaches Cover Letter 2, 3, or 4, with Cover Letter 1 omitted as the reference category.
Summary Listed	Indicator variable: equal to one if the applicant’s resume includes a brief professional summary.
High <i>Ausbildung</i> Grades	Indicator variable: equal to one if the applicant lists above average grades.
Vector of Recent Experience Indicators	Three indicator variables: equal to one if the applicant has three, four, or five years of experience in her current position, with two years omitted as the reference category. These indicators also determine the age of the submitted <i>Arbeitszeugnis</i> , which was issued at the end of the applicant’s previous employment.
IT Skills Listed	Indicator variable: equal to one if the applicant’s resume includes a list of IT skills.
General Competencies Listed	Indicator variable: equal to one if the applicant’s resume includes a list of general competencies.
Hobbies Listed	Indicator variable: equal to one if the applicant’s resume includes a list of hobbies.
Days Between Posting and Application	Integer: equal to the number of days between the date the job was posted and the date the application was emailed.
Days Between Posting and Application ²	Square of Days Between Posting and Application.
Sent First	Indicator variable: equal to one if the applicant’s application is sent first rather than second within the matched pair.
<i>Panel B: Characteristics that are Fixed Within Application Pairs</i>	
Birth Year 1998	Indicator equal to one if the applicant was born in 1998 rather than 2002.
High-Quality <i>Arbeitszeugnis</i>	Indicator equal to one if the applicant’s <i>Arbeitszeugnis</i> conveys a good or very good evaluation (4 or 5 on a five-level scale), rather than an adequate or satisfactory evaluation (2 or 3).
Fluent in English	Indicator equal to one if the applicant describes her English proficiency as fluent (<i>Verhandlungssicher</i> or <i>Fließend im Sprechen und Schreiben</i>).
Grades Not Listed	Indicator equal to one if the applicant does not report her <i>Ausbildung</i> grades.
Grades Not Applicable	Indicator equal to one if the applicant did not complete an <i>Ausbildung</i> and therefore has no <i>Ausbildung</i> grades to report.
Distance to City Centroid	Distance, in kilometers, between the centroid of the job location’s PLZ and the centroid of the nearest study city.
Log PLZ Population Density	Natural logarithm of the population density of the job location’s PLZ.
Sent Via Email	Indicator equal to one if the application was sent by email rather than through an employer job portal. This category contains 113 application pairs; see Section 2.4 in Eames (2026).
<i>Vector of Treatment Arm Indicators</i>	<i>Two indicators for treatment arm assignment: one for each single-signal treatment arm, with the combined-treatment arm omitted as the reference category.</i>
<i>Panel C: Fixed Effects</i>	
Headshot Twin	Fixed effects for each of the 30 headshot twins.
Name Triad	Fixed effects for each of the six name triads.
Occupation	Fixed effects for each of the nine study occupations.
City	Fixed effects for each of the 27 study cities.
Month	Fixed effects for the month in which the application was sent.
Day of Week	Fixed effects for the day of the week on which the application was sent.

Notes: Because results are sensitive to the treatment arm indicators shown in red italics, I report specifications both with and without them. These indicators account for chance differences in baseline response rates across the three randomly assigned treatment arms. The Preferred Controls include the indicators; the Alternative Controls exclude them.

Table 2: Heterogeneity Analysis: Potential Moderators

Category	Moderator	Definition
Hiring Contact	Male Hiring Contact	Indicator equal to one if the individual contact person listed in the job posting is identified as male.
Customer Interaction	Customer-Facing Occupation	Indicator equal to one if the applicant is applying in a customer-facing occupation (Nurse, Office Clerk, Retail Salesperson, or Restaurant Server).
Sex Composition	Male-Dominated Occupation	Indicator equal to one if the applicant is applying in a male-dominated occupation (warehouse worker, truck driver, or mechatronics technician).
Sex Composition	Female-Dominated Occupation	Indicator equal to one if the applicant is applying in a female-dominated occupation (nurse, office clerk, or cleaner).
Local Politics	Progressiveness Index	Weighted average of normalized local vote shares in the 2025 federal election, assigning the pre-specified progressiveness scores of 10 to Greens, 9 to The Left, 8 to SPD, 3 to CDU/CSU, and 0 to AfD. The index is constructed at the city and state levels.
Local Politics	Greens, The Left, and SPD Vote Share	Combined normalized vote share for Greens, The Left, and SPD. The measure is constructed at the city and state levels.
Applicant Work Experience	Birth Year 1998	Indicator equal to one if the applicant was born in 1998 rather than 2002 and therefore had accrued four additional years of potential work experience.
Name Change Disclosure Location	Email Disclosure	Indicator equal to one if the applicant discloses her name change in the submission email rather than in the attached cover letter.

Notes: All continuous moderators are mean-centered.

Table 3: Arm-Specific Response Rates and Treatment-Control Differences

Treatment Arm	Pairs	Positive Responses		Treated Minus Control	
		Control	Treated	Arm-Specific	Overall
Male-to-Female Only	1,594	730 (45.8%)	665 (41.7%)	−4.1 pp	−6.0 pp
Non-Passing Only	1,689	811 (48.0%)	735 (43.5%)	−4.5 pp	−4.2 pp
Male-to-Female + Non-Passing	1,728	851 (49.2%)	583 (33.7%)	−15.5 pp	−14.0 pp
Overall	5,011	2,392 (47.7%)	1,983 (39.6%)	−8.2 pp	−8.2 pp

Notes: Positive response columns report counts, with response rates in parentheses. The arm-specific difference compares each treated response rate with the control response rate in the same treatment arm. The overall difference instead uses the pooled control response rate of 47.7%. The interaction implied by the arm-specific comparisons is −6.9 pp, compared with −3.8 pp when the pooled control rate is used, a difference of 3.2 pp.

Table 4: Check: Effect of Female-to-Female Name Change

Variable	(1)	(2)
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>		
Female-to-Female Name Change	0.004 (0.015) [-0.025, 0.034]	0.001 (0.015) [-0.028, 0.029]
<i>Panel B: Specification Information</i>		
Observations	5,011	5,011
Control Mean	0.477	0.477
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>		
Preferred Controls		
Alternative Controls		✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (1) using only control applicants and replacing MtF_i , NP_i , and their interaction with FtF_i , an indicator for disclosing a female-to-female name change. Column (2) includes the Alternative Controls, rather than the Preferred Controls, described in Table 1 and therefore excludes treatment-arm indicators. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are reported in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 5: Average Discrimination Estimates

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)'	(2)'	(3)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>						
Treated	-0.081 *** (0.007) [-0.094, -0.067]			-0.081 *** (0.007) [-0.094, -0.067]		
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)		-0.065 *** (0.010) [-0.084, -0.045]	-0.041 ** (0.012) [-0.065, -0.016]		-0.074 *** (0.010) [-0.094, -0.055]	-0.063 *** (0.012) [-0.087, -0.039]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)		-0.067 *** (0.009) [-0.085, -0.049]	-0.044 *** (0.011) [-0.066, -0.022]		-0.054 *** (0.010) [-0.073, -0.035]	-0.043 *** (0.012) [-0.066, -0.020]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)			-0.069 *** (0.020) [-0.109, -0.030]			-0.027 (0.020) [-0.066, 0.012]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>						
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean	0.477	0.477	0.477	0.477	0.477	0.477
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>						
Preferred Controls	✓	✓	✓			
Alternative Controls				✓	✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (1). Columns (1)-(3) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(3)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 6: Average Discrimination Estimates by Non-Passing Strength

Variable	(1)	(2)	(1)'	(2)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>				
Male-to-Female Name Change	-0.065 *** (0.010) [-0.085, -0.046]	-0.041 *** (0.012) [-0.066, -0.017]	-0.075 *** (0.010) [-0.094, -0.055]	-0.064 *** (0.012) [-0.088, -0.040]
Non-Passing Appearance	-0.025 (0.014) [-0.053, 0.002]	0.003 (0.017) [-0.031, 0.037]	-0.013 (0.014) [-0.041, 0.015]	0.004 (0.018) [-0.031, 0.039]
Strongly Non-Passing	-0.079 *** (0.020) [-0.119, -0.040]	-0.090 *** (0.027) [-0.143, -0.038]	-0.079 *** (0.020) [-0.119, -0.040]	-0.091 *** (0.027) [-0.143, -0.038]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing		-0.080 ** (0.026) [-0.131, -0.030]		-0.039 (0.026) [-0.089, 0.012]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Strongly Non-Passing		0.022 (0.032) [-0.040, 0.085]		0.022 (0.032) [-0.040, 0.085]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>				
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean	0.477	0.477	0.477	0.477
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>				
Preferred Controls	✓	✓		
Alternative Controls			✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (1), with an additional indicator for strongly non-passing. Columns (1)-(2) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(2)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 7: Discrimination by Contact Person Sex

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)'	(2)'	(3)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>						
Treated	-0.062 *** (0.010) [-0.082, -0.043]			-0.062 *** (0.010) [-0.082, -0.043]		
Treated $\times$ Male Contact Person	-0.045 ** (0.014) [-0.073, -0.017]			-0.045 ** (0.014) [-0.073, -0.017]		
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)		-0.057 *** (0.014) [-0.085, -0.029]	-0.034 (0.018) [-0.068, 0.001]		-0.067 *** (0.014) [-0.095, -0.038]	-0.056 ** (0.017) [-0.090, -0.022]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)		-0.048 *** (0.014) [-0.075, -0.020]	-0.026 (0.016) [-0.057, 0.006]		-0.035 * (0.014) [-0.062, -0.008]	-0.025 (0.017) [-0.057, 0.008]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)			-0.068 * (0.029) [-0.125, -0.010]			-0.026 (0.028) [-0.081, 0.030]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Male Contact (π)		-0.013 (0.021) [-0.053, 0.027]	-0.017 (0.025) [-0.066, 0.032]		-0.013 (0.021) [-0.053, 0.027]	-0.017 (0.025) [-0.066, 0.032]
Non-Passing $\times$ Male Contact (κ)		-0.048 * (0.020) [-0.087, -0.008]	-0.051 * (0.024) [-0.098, -0.003]		-0.047 * (0.020) [-0.087, -0.008]	-0.052 * (0.024) [-0.099, -0.004]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing $\times$ Male (ξ)			0.010 (0.041) [-0.071, 0.091]			0.011 (0.041) [-0.070, 0.092]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>						
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean, Female Contact	0.492	0.492	0.492	0.492	0.492	0.492
Control Mean, Male Contact	0.464	0.464	0.464	0.464	0.464	0.464
Control Mean, Other	0.465	0.465	0.465	0.465	0.465	0.465
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>						
Preferred Controls	✓	✓	✓			
Alternative Controls				✓	✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (2); all specifications jointly include interactions with indicators for male contacts and for other contacts, defined as postings with no listed contact or a listed contact whose sex could not be classified; female contacts are the omitted reference category. For brevity, only interactions with the male-contact indicator are reported. Columns (1)-(3) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(3)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 8: Discrimination by Occupation Customer Interaction

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)'	(2)'	(3)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>						
Treated	-0.068 *** (0.009) [-0.087, -0.049]			-0.068 *** (0.009) [-0.087, -0.049]		
Treated $\times$ Customer-Facing	-0.025 (0.014) [-0.051, 0.002]			-0.025 (0.014) [-0.051, 0.002]		
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)		-0.056 *** (0.014) [-0.083, -0.028]	-0.040 * (0.017) [-0.074, -0.006]		-0.065 *** (0.015) [-0.094, -0.037]	-0.063 *** (0.018) [-0.098, -0.028]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)		-0.051 *** (0.013) [-0.077, -0.025]	-0.036 * (0.016) [-0.068, -0.004]		-0.038 ** (0.014) [-0.066, -0.010]	-0.035 * (0.017) [-0.069, -0.002]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)			-0.049 (0.029) [-0.105, 0.007]			-0.007 (0.030) [-0.065, 0.051]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Customer-Facing (π)		-0.018 (0.020) [-0.057, 0.021]	-0.001 (0.024) [-0.049, 0.047]		-0.018 (0.020) [-0.057, 0.021]	-0.001 (0.024) [-0.049, 0.046]
Non-Passing $\times$ Customer-Facing (κ)		-0.031 (0.019) [-0.068, 0.007]	-0.015 (0.023) [-0.061, 0.030]		-0.031 (0.019) [-0.069, 0.006]	-0.016 (0.023) [-0.061, 0.030]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing $\times$ CF (ξ)			-0.040 (0.040) [-0.118, 0.038]			-0.040 (0.040) [-0.118, 0.038]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>						
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean, CF Occupation	0.489	0.489	0.489	0.489	0.489	0.489
Control Mean, Non-CF Occupation	0.466	0.466	0.466	0.466	0.466	0.466
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>						
Preferred Controls	✓	✓	✓			
Alternative Controls				✓	✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (2). Columns (1)-(3) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(3)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 9: Discrimination by Occupation Sex Composition (Male-Dominated)

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)'	(2)'	(3)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>						
Treated	-0.087 *** (0.008) [-0.104, -0.071]			-0.087 *** (0.008) [-0.104, -0.071]		
Treated $\times$ Male-Dominated	0.019 (0.014) [-0.008, 0.047]			0.019 (0.014) [-0.008, 0.047]		
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)		-0.067 *** (0.012) [-0.091, -0.044]	-0.039 ** (0.015) [-0.069, -0.009]		-0.077 *** (0.012) [-0.101, -0.054]	-0.062 *** (0.015) [-0.090, -0.033]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)		-0.077 *** (0.012) [-0.100, -0.054]	-0.050 *** (0.014) [-0.078, -0.023]		-0.064 *** (0.012) [-0.087, -0.041]	-0.049 *** (0.014) [-0.077, -0.021]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)			-0.080 ** (0.025) [-0.129, -0.031]			-0.038 (0.024) [-0.085, 0.009]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Male-Dominated (π)		0.008 (0.022) [-0.034, 0.050]	-0.004 (0.026) [-0.056, 0.047]		0.008 (0.022) [-0.034, 0.050]	-0.005 (0.026) [-0.057, 0.047]
Non-Passing $\times$ Male-Dominated (κ)		0.031 (0.020) [-0.009, 0.071]	0.019 (0.025) [-0.030, 0.068]		0.031 (0.020) [-0.010, 0.071]	0.018 (0.025) [-0.031, 0.067]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing $\times$ Male (ξ)			0.031 (0.043) [-0.053, 0.115]			0.032 (0.043) [-0.052, 0.116]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>						
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean, MD Occupation	0.421	0.421	0.421	0.421	0.421	0.421
Control Mean, Non-MD Occupation	0.505	0.505	0.505	0.505	0.505	0.505
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>						
Preferred Controls	✓	✓	✓			
Alternative Controls				✓	✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (2). Columns (1)-(3) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(3)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 10: Discrimination by Occupation Sex Composition (Female-Dominated)

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)'	(2)'	(3)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>						
Treated	-0.077 *** (0.009) [-0.094, -0.059]			-0.077 *** (0.009) [-0.094, -0.059]		
Treated $\times$ Female-Dominated Occupation	-0.010 (0.014) [-0.037, 0.017]			-0.010 (0.014) [-0.037, 0.017]		
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)		-0.061 *** (0.013) [-0.087, -0.036]	-0.042 ** (0.016) [-0.074, -0.011]		-0.071 *** (0.013) [-0.098, -0.045]	-0.065 *** (0.017) [-0.098, -0.033]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)		-0.060 *** (0.012) [-0.085, -0.036]	-0.043 ** (0.015) [-0.072, -0.014]		-0.048 *** (0.013) [-0.073, -0.022]	-0.042 ** (0.016) [-0.073, -0.011]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)			-0.056 * (0.026) [-0.107, -0.005]			-0.014 (0.027) [-0.068, 0.039]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Female-Dominated (π)		-0.007 (0.020) [-0.046, 0.031]	0.004 (0.024) [-0.044, 0.052]		-0.007 (0.020) [-0.046, 0.032]	0.004 (0.024) [-0.043, 0.052]
Non-Passing $\times$ Female-Dominated (κ)		-0.016 (0.019) [-0.053, 0.022]	-0.003 (0.023) [-0.049, 0.043]		-0.015 (0.019) [-0.053, 0.023]	-0.003 (0.023) [-0.048, 0.043]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing $\times$ Female (ξ)			-0.030 (0.039) [-0.107, 0.048]			-0.030 (0.039) [-0.107, 0.047]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>						
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean, FD Occupation	0.483	0.483	0.483	0.483	0.483	0.483
Control Mean, Non-FD Occupation	0.473	0.473	0.473	0.473	0.473	0.473
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>						
Preferred Controls	✓	✓	✓			
Alternative Controls				✓	✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (2). Columns (1)-(3) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(3)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 11: Discrimination by State-Level Progressiveness Index

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)'	(2)'	(3)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>						
Treated	-0.081 *** (0.007) [-0.094, -0.067]			-0.081 *** (0.007) [-0.094, -0.067]		
Treated $\times$ Progressiveness Index	0.000 (0.008) [-0.016, 0.017]			0.000 (0.008) [-0.016, 0.017]		
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)		-0.065 *** (0.010) [-0.084, -0.045]	-0.041 *** (0.012) [-0.065, -0.016]		-0.074 *** (0.010) [-0.094, -0.055]	-0.063 *** (0.012) [-0.087, -0.039]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)		-0.067 *** (0.009) [-0.085, -0.049]	-0.044 *** (0.011) [-0.066, -0.022]		-0.054 *** (0.010) [-0.073, -0.035]	-0.043 *** (0.012) [-0.066, -0.020]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)			-0.069 *** (0.020) [-0.109, -0.030]			-0.027 (0.020) [-0.066, 0.012]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Progressiveness (π)		0.003 (0.013) [-0.022, 0.028]	-0.002 (0.015) [-0.032, 0.028]		0.003 (0.013) [-0.022, 0.027]	-0.003 (0.015) [-0.033, 0.027]
Non-Passing $\times$ Progressiveness (κ)		0.003 (0.013) [-0.022, 0.027]	-0.003 (0.015) [-0.032, 0.026]		0.002 (0.013) [-0.022, 0.027]	-0.003 (0.015) [-0.032, 0.026]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing $\times$ Prog. (ξ)			0.014 (0.026) [-0.037, 0.064]			0.014 (0.026) [-0.036, 0.064]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>						
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean, Progressiveness $\geq$ Mean	0.480	0.480	0.480	0.480	0.480	0.480
Control Mean, Progressiveness $<$ Mean	0.472	0.472	0.472	0.472	0.472	0.472
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>						
Preferred Controls	✓	✓	✓			
Alternative Controls				✓	✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (2). Columns (1)-(3) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(3)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The progressive index is the weighted normalized vote share of the five largest German parties, assigning 10 to the Greens, 9 to The Left, 8 to SPD, 3 to CDU/CSU, and 0 to AfD. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 12: Discrimination by State-Level Progressive Party Vote Share

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)'	(2)'	(3)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>						
Treated	-0.081 *** (0.007) [-0.094, -0.067]			-0.081 *** (0.007) [-0.094, -0.067]		
Treated $\times$ Vote Share	0.027 (0.089) [-0.148, 0.203]			0.027 (0.089) [-0.148, 0.203]		
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)		-0.065 *** (0.010) [-0.084, -0.045]	-0.040 ** (0.012) [-0.065, -0.016]		-0.074 *** (0.010) [-0.094, -0.055]	-0.063 *** (0.012) [-0.087, -0.039]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)		-0.067 *** (0.009) [-0.085, -0.049]	-0.044 *** (0.011) [-0.066, -0.022]		-0.054 *** (0.010) [-0.073, -0.035]	-0.043 *** (0.012) [-0.066, -0.020]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)			-0.069 *** (0.020) [-0.109, -0.030]			-0.027 (0.020) [-0.066, 0.012]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Vote Share (π)		-0.001 (0.134) [-0.263, 0.260]	0.030 (0.169) [-0.300, 0.361]		-0.002 (0.134) [-0.264, 0.260]	0.025 (0.169) [-0.306, 0.356]
Non-Passing $\times$ Vote Share (κ)		0.032 (0.132) [-0.228, 0.291]	0.053 (0.156) [-0.253, 0.359]		0.029 (0.132) [-0.230, 0.289]	0.048 (0.156) [-0.258, 0.354]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing $\times$ Share (ξ)			-0.058 (0.270) [-0.588, 0.472]			-0.053 (0.270) [-0.583, 0.477]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>						
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean, Vote Share $\geq$ Mean	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500
Control Mean, Vote Share $<$ Mean	0.470	0.470	0.470	0.470	0.470	0.470
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>						
Preferred Controls	✓	✓	✓			
Alternative Controls				✓	✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (2). Columns (1)-(3) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(3)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The progressive party vote share is the combined vote share of the Greens, The Left, and SPD, normalized across the five largest German parties: those three parties plus CDU/CSU and AfD. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 13: Discrimination by City-Level Progressiveness Index

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)'	(2)'	(3)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>						
Treated	-0.081 *** (0.007) [-0.094, -0.067]			-0.081 *** (0.007) [-0.094, -0.067]		
Treated $\times$ Progressiveness Index	-0.008 (0.010) [-0.028, 0.011]			-0.008 (0.010) [-0.027, 0.011]		
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)		-0.065 *** (0.010) [-0.084, -0.045]	-0.041 *** (0.012) [-0.065, -0.016]		-0.074 *** (0.010) [-0.094, -0.055]	-0.063 *** (0.012) [-0.087, -0.039]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)		-0.067 *** (0.009) [-0.085, -0.049]	-0.044 *** (0.011) [-0.066, -0.022]		-0.054 *** (0.010) [-0.073, -0.035]	-0.043 *** (0.012) [-0.066, -0.020]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)			-0.069 *** (0.020) [-0.109, -0.030]			-0.027 (0.020) [-0.066, 0.012]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Progressiveness (π)		-0.001 (0.015) [-0.030, 0.028]	-0.006 (0.018) [-0.041, 0.029]		-0.001 (0.015) [-0.030, 0.028]	-0.006 (0.018) [-0.041, 0.028]
Non-Passing $\times$ Progressiveness (κ)		-0.007 (0.014) [-0.035, 0.021]	-0.012 (0.017) [-0.045, 0.021]		-0.007 (0.014) [-0.035, 0.021]	-0.012 (0.017) [-0.045, 0.021]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing $\times$ Prog. (ξ)			0.013 (0.029) [-0.045, 0.070]			0.013 (0.029) [-0.045, 0.071]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>						
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean, Progressiveness $\geq$ Mean	0.496	0.496	0.496	0.496	0.496	0.496
Control Mean, Progressiveness $<$ Mean	0.446	0.446	0.446	0.446	0.446	0.446
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>						
Preferred Controls	✓	✓	✓			
Alternative Controls				✓	✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (2). Columns (1)-(3) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(3)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The progressive index is the weighted normalized vote share of the five largest German parties, assigning 10 to the Greens, 9 to The Left, 8 to SPD, 3 to CDU/CSU, and 0 to AfD. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 14: Discrimination by City-Level Progressive Party Vote Share

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)'	(2)'	(3)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>						
Treated	-0.081 *** (0.007) [-0.094, -0.068]			-0.081 *** (0.007) [-0.094, -0.068]		
Treated $\times$ Vote Share	-0.101 (0.092) [-0.281, 0.080]			-0.100 (0.092) [-0.281, 0.080]		
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)		-0.065 *** (0.010) [-0.084, -0.045]	-0.041 ** (0.012) [-0.065, -0.016]		-0.074 *** (0.010) [-0.094, -0.055]	-0.063 *** (0.012) [-0.087, -0.039]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)		-0.067 *** (0.009) [-0.085, -0.049]	-0.044 *** (0.011) [-0.066, -0.022]		-0.054 *** (0.010) [-0.073, -0.035]	-0.043 *** (0.012) [-0.066, -0.020]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)			-0.069 *** (0.020) [-0.109, -0.030]			-0.027 (0.020) [-0.066, 0.012]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Vote Share (π)		-0.058 (0.138) [-0.328, 0.212]	-0.023 (0.168) [-0.352, 0.306]		-0.058 (0.138) [-0.328, 0.212]	-0.025 (0.168) [-0.354, 0.304]
Non-Passing $\times$ Vote Share (κ)		-0.112 (0.134) [-0.374, 0.150]	-0.081 (0.157) [-0.389, 0.227]		-0.112 (0.133) [-0.374, 0.149]	-0.082 (0.157) [-0.390, 0.227]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing $\times$ Share (ξ)			-0.079 (0.270) [-0.608, 0.449]			-0.078 (0.270) [-0.606, 0.451]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>						
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean, Vote Share $\geq$ Mean	0.496	0.496	0.496	0.496	0.496	0.496
Control Mean, Vote Share $<$ Mean	0.454	0.454	0.454	0.454	0.454	0.454
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>						
Preferred Controls	✓	✓	✓			
Alternative Controls				✓	✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (2). Columns (1)-(3) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(3)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The progressive party vote share is the combined vote share of the Greens, The Left, and SPD, normalized across the five largest German parties: those three parties plus CDU/CSU and AfD. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 15: Discrimination by Years of Work Experience

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)'	(2)'	(3)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>						
Treated	-0.078 *** (0.010) [-0.097, -0.059]			-0.078 *** (0.010) [-0.097, -0.059]		
Treated $\times$ Four Additional Years	-0.006 (0.014) [-0.033, 0.021]			-0.006 (0.014) [-0.033, 0.021]		
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)		-0.060 *** (0.014) [-0.088, -0.033]	-0.031 (0.017) [-0.066, 0.003]		-0.070 *** (0.014) [-0.097, -0.043]	-0.054 ** (0.017) [-0.088, -0.020]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)		-0.069 *** (0.013) [-0.095, -0.044]	-0.042 ** (0.016) [-0.073, -0.011]		-0.057 *** (0.013) [-0.083, -0.031]	-0.042 ** (0.016) [-0.073, -0.010]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)			-0.081 ** (0.028) [-0.136, -0.025]			-0.038 (0.028) [-0.094, 0.017]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Four Additional Years (π)		-0.009 (0.020) [-0.048, 0.030]	-0.019 (0.025) [-0.067, 0.029]		-0.009 (0.020) [-0.048, 0.030]	-0.018 (0.025) [-0.067, 0.030]
Non-Passing $\times$ Four Additional Years (κ)		0.005 (0.019) [-0.032, 0.043]	-0.004 (0.023) [-0.050, 0.042]		0.006 (0.019) [-0.032, 0.043]	-0.003 (0.023) [-0.049, 0.043]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing $\times$ Four (ξ)			0.023 (0.040) [-0.055, 0.101]			0.023 (0.040) [-0.056, 0.101]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>						
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean, Born in 1998	0.488	0.488	0.488	0.488	0.488	0.488
Control Mean, Born in 2002	0.474	0.474	0.474	0.474	0.474	0.474
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>						
Preferred Controls	✓	✓	✓			
Alternative Controls				✓	✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (2). Columns (1)-(3) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(3)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 16: Discrimination by Disclosure Location

Variable	(1)	(2)	(1)'	(2)'
<i>Panel A: Coefficient Estimates</i>				
Male-to-Female Name Change (δ)	-0.057 *** (0.013) [-0.082, -0.031]	-0.050 ** (0.017) [-0.084, -0.016]	-0.077 *** (0.012) [-0.101, -0.053]	-0.077 *** (0.017) [-0.110, -0.043]
Non-Passing Appearance (λ)	-0.083 *** (0.012) [-0.106, -0.060]	-0.061 *** (0.016) [-0.092, -0.031]	-0.056 *** (0.010) [-0.077, -0.036]	-0.047 *** (0.013) [-0.072, -0.021]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing (γ)		-0.033 (0.028) [-0.088, 0.021]		-0.005 (0.026) [-0.055, 0.045]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Email Disclosure (π)	0.052 (0.027) [-0.001, 0.104]	0.057 (0.034) [-0.009, 0.124]	0.026 (0.025) [-0.023, 0.074]	0.043 (0.031) [-0.018, 0.104]
Male-to-Female $\times$ Non-Passing $\times$ Email Disclosure (ξ)		-0.038 (0.032) [-0.101, 0.026]		-0.038 (0.032) [-0.101, 0.026]
<i>Panel B: Sample Statistics</i>				
Observations	10,022	10,022	10,022	10,022
Control Mean	0.477	0.477	0.477	0.477
<i>Panel C: Control Variables</i>				
Preferred Controls	✓	✓		
Alternative Controls			✓	✓

Notes: This table reports estimates from the linear probability model in equation (2). Columns (1)-(2) use Preferred Controls, which include treatment-arm indicators; columns (1)'-(2)' use Alternative Controls, which exclude them. The dependent variable equals one for a positive employer response. Standard errors, clustered by application template pair, are reported in parentheses; 95% confidence intervals are in square brackets. Stars indicate statistical significance: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.