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Authors’ Note

It is an example of how trans community and researchers can work together, collaborating as equal partners in work that can inform advocacy, and potentially impact on public policy and enhance the lives of trans people.

This report adds significantly to our understanding of discrimination against trans people in Malaysia. Our field experiment methodology provides confirmation for what trans people have told us for years - that they are often shut out of the job market. But this study represents much more than its findings.

The Curtin and the Asia Pacific Transgender Network team worked together to develop the research proposal and secure funding for this project. While the funds are primarily managed by APTN, both teams worked together to select research assistants, to train them, and to manage the project. We collaborated to write the report. We were partners throughout.

In a world in which trans community members often feel ill-served, even exploited, by those who research their lives, this Job Audit represents a shining example of how things can be.

Catriona Davis-McCabe
Senior Lecturer, School of Psychology
Curtin University

Sam Winter
Associate Professor, School of Public Health
Curtin University

Joe Wong
Executive Director
Asia Pacific Transgender Network
Each country report is different in terms of its culture, community, and findings. However, overall the data shows that trans people in Asia and the Pacific often experience heightened levels of discrimination in the early stages of employment compared to similarly qualified cis people. The country reports provide a detailed and distinct data overview of the country considering the unique identities, cultures, and challenges trans people experience in each country. The country reports should be read in conjunction with the regional report to best understand the nuance of challenges that trans people experience in employment in different countries throughout Asia.

The reports make recommendations for employers in the position of hiring to accept and we urge that the recommendations are accepted and implemented by employers. We also hope that these country reports will be utilised by individuals and organisations in-country to advocate for greater protections of trans people. We hope that the research and information presented in these reports can inform legal, policy, and social reform that promotes equality in hiring and employment.

The data was gathered with trans people leading the process at every step and empowered trans individuals by training them as country leads in the project. APTN would like to thank all of the trans community participants and organisations who contributed to the development of this important publication. A heartfelt thanks to our country research assistants, Peeranee Suparak (Ami), Thailand, Chu Thanh Ha, Vietnam, Dorian Wilde, Malaysia and Singapore who have been pivotal in gathering the data for each of the countries. We also extend our gratitude to Edmund Settle, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Sam Winter and Catriona Davis, Curtin University for their financial and technical support in this project and to the community members and organisations that have provided insights and guidance in the development of the study.

We look forward to this report being utilised to break barriers, foster collaborations and spark greater dialogue surrounding workplace discrimination and policy changes to advance social protections and the livelihood of trans people.

Joe Wong
Executive Director
Asia Pacific Transgender Network
We conducted a correspondence audit study in the Singaporean job market of 2017. The study was approved by Curtin University's Human Research Ethics Committee.

Note: We use the term transgender (or simply trans) as an adjective describing persons who identify in a gender other than the one that matches the sex they have been assigned (usually at birth). We use the English term “trans women” to describe transfeminine people (sometimes referred to as mak nyah in Bahasa Malay), “trans men” to describe transmasculine people (also known as pengkid, pak nyah, abang, or tomboys), and the broader English phrasing “trans people” to describe these groups collectively. We use the term cisgender (or simply cis) to describe individuals who identify in the gender that matches the sex they were originally assigned (again usually at or shortly after birth). We use the term “use name” to refer to the name used by a trans person to be consistent with their gender identity, which is different from their legal name.

We conducted a correspondence audit study in the Malaysian job market of 2016 and 2017. The study was approved by Curtin University Human Research Ethics Committee. Pairs of resumes were sent to entry level job postings to examine how signals of gender identity (cis or trans) affect the likelihood of receiving a positive response to a job application. Resumes were piloted and matched for equivalence. Each resume was then assigned a gender identity marker, either trans or cis, at random. Applicants were marked as trans in two ways. First by way of an explicit gender identification as ‘transgender man’, ‘transgender woman’. Second by way of the presence or absence of a use name alongside the legal name. For all applicants, the legal name was included and for trans applicants, a use name was also included; no comparable object was included for cis applicants. In other words, a trans applicant was marked through the word “transgender” appended to their gender and by the inclusion of a use name, where cis applicants had neither of these markers. Applicants were marked as cis by way of a legal name only (no use name indicated) and gender (‘male’ or ‘female’). Four job sectors were targeted. Three were for university graduates; in business administration, psychology, and computer science. One was for school leavers. We found discrimination based on gender identity, with trans people significantly less likely to receive a positive response (including being invited to interview) than their cis counterparts.
Key Findings

I. Trans people are discriminated against when seeking employment in Malaysia. Alarmingly, this occurs even before the interview stage. Trans people are significantly less likely than cisgender people to receive a positive response to a job application.

II. Even with equal experience and qualifications, the cis applicants in our study received 50% more positive responses to job applications than trans applicants (159 versus 106).

III. A cis woman was 64% more likely to receive a positive response to a job application than a trans woman. A cis man was 37.5% more likely to receive a positive response to a job application than a trans man.

IV. Raw data underlined the scale of missed opportunities. The job market was challenging for all applicants. The 800 job applications resulted in only 103 invitations to interview for cis applicants.

Yet it was even more challenging for trans applicants. With only 62 trans applicants called to interview, it is clear that being trans resulted in 41 lost interview opportunities; despite both applicants being equally qualified and experienced.

V. Our data does not go beyond the initial application stage. It is expected that further discrimination against trans people occurs where they are fortunate enough to get an interview.
Employment of Trans People in Malaysia

Equal access to employment is not a reality for trans people across the world.\(^5\)

Trans people suffer from limited access to education;\(^6\) inaccurate, limited, or stigmatising legal identity documents;\(^7\) limited access to healthcare, adequately trained healthcare professionals, and to insurance coverage and time off for medical needs, which can lead to work-related issues such as underperformance and increased need for time off or flexibility;\(^8\) unstable home life;\(^9\) inconsistent access to housing;\(^10\) and trans-antagonistic violence, stigma and discrimination with limited avenues for redress.\(^11\) Collectively, these issues create a situation in which trans people struggle to find and keep gainful employment, and ultimately enter a cycle of oppression and disenfranchisement.

Trans people in Malaysia are not legally able to change their identity documents to reflect their self-defined gender, regardless of medical or social transition.\(^12\) Due to this, all trans applicants for employment must “out” themselves to employers during the application process when providing their name and identity information. This leads to increased exposure to harassment and degrading treatment for applicants.\(^13\) Furthermore, state-enacted Islamic laws in all 13 Malaysian states (some of which are contained in state Syariah law and apply only to Muslims, while others are part of the state criminal law) explicitly criminalise the gender expressions of trans women and (in five states) trans men. Gender affirmation surgeries are *haram* (forbidden).\(^14\) This means that for many trans people, presenting themselves in their gender identity for the purpose of employment means risking legal consequences such as fine, arrest, and detention.\(^15\) The situation is so dire that some trans Malaysians have been granted asylum on other countries based on the discrimination and harassment that they face.\(^16\)

Malaysian research to date on trans people’s access to employment has been limited to self-report data from trans respondent samples too small for statistical analysis, or to expanded personal testimonies.\(^17,18,19,20\) In these testimonies trans Malaysians have indicated significant personal struggle to complete their education as well as to obtain and keep legal employment, many resorting to sex work when other avenues fail.\(^21\) The one quantitative data point is from a 2001 study of 507 Malaysian trans women, in which over 60% indicated that they earned less than RM500 per month (approximately $132 USD at that time).\(^22\) Trans men also report facing difficulty securing employment due to their experiences of stigma and discrimination.\(^23\)

Due to the receipt of a large number of complaints from LGBT individuals, the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (In Bahasa Malay *Suruhanjaya Hak Asasi Manusia Malaysia* or *SUHAKAM*) asserted that,

“In the light of CEDAW,\(^24\) relevant laws should be reviewed to prevent discrimination of persons based on gender identity and sexual orientation. Article 8(2) of the Federal Constitution could be expanded to bar discrimination on the basis of gender identity and sexual orientation.”\(^25\)

SUHAKAM again mentioned the need for research on trans people and discrimination in their 2015 annual report, and research was conducted in 2016 involving interviews with 100 trans men and women. This research had not been published at the time of this writing.
In these testimonies trans Malaysians have indicated significant personal struggle to complete their education as well as to obtain and keep legal employment, many resorting to sex work when other avenues fail.
Previous Audit Research

Some of the most convincing field evidence for discrimination against minority groups has come from audit methodology, in which the experiences of members of a minority community are examined in a specific social situation, and are then compared with the experiences of persons in the general population when in that same situation.

There appear to have been only three audit studies examining discrimination against trans people seeking employment. One employed an in-person audit. The other two were correspondence tests. All were small-scale US studies.

The first was a small in-person employment audit conducted in 2008 by an organization called Make the Road NY. Twenty-four various retail stores in Manhattan were tested. Cisgender testers received 11 offers of employment, whilst transgender testers received only two, suggesting a massive level of discrimination against trans applicants. While the size and generalizability of this study is limited, results clearly indicate significant discrimination against trans people at the hiring level of employment.

Bardales conducted a correspondence test to assess discrimination against trans women. Bardales sent matching resumes - one with a trans marker, and one without - in response to 109 online job adverts within the customer service and food management job sectors in two cities in Texas. All applications were from women (trans or cis). Extrapolating from the figures provided by Bardales, it is apparent that cis applicants received responses 54.1% more often than trans applicants. As in the case of the Make the Road research in New York, this Texas study was of limited scope. It examined discrimination against women only, was confined to two job sectors, and in any case involved a relatively small number of applications. Questions therefore remain about its generalizability. The
researchers made equivalent resumes based on their own ideas, with no validation process.

Most recently, in a report entitled *Qualified and Transgender*, the District of Columbia (DC) Office of Human Rights (OHR) conducted a correspondence test examining trans hiring discrimination across a range of job sectors. It is important to note that DC has antidiscrimination policies in place to protect against such discrimination. The applications targeted 50 jobs. There were a total of 200 applications; four for each job, from cis and trans men and women, and other gender non-conforming persons. The authors reported that employers made responses in regard to 21 jobs, and that in ten of these there was clear evidence of discrimination against trans and gender non-conforming applicants. The worst discrimination appeared to be against trans male applicants reporting previous work-experience at a transgender advocacy organization. In terms of job sector, the restaurant industry appeared the most discriminatory among the job sectors examined. Once again, this study was small; limiting its generalizability. Moreover, the study explicitly ensured that each trans and gender nonconforming applicants were more highly qualified than the corresponding cis applicants. It is impossible to know what the impact of this aspect of the methodology may have been. However, it is likely that it may have enhanced the apparent employability of the trans applicants, thereby masking any discrimination on the basis of their gender identity status.

“The worst discrimination appeared to be against trans male applicants reporting previous work-experience at a transgender advocacy organization.”
Current Audit Research

A research assistant worked on the project over a period of eight months. The research assistant lived in Malaysia and was familiar with the local job market.

As a first step, we held an advisory group meeting with members of the trans community in Kuala Lumpur, in order to discuss the Malaysian job market, job applications and ideas for possible gender identity markers. We then developed resumes based on the feedback from the advisory group.

We developed pairs of resumes for each of the four job sectors (for university graduates in business administration (1), psychology (2), and computer science (3), as well as for a school leaver (4)). We tested whether the resumes in each pair were similarly attractive in their intended job market. We did so by sending resumes out in response to job advertisements and counting employer responses. We coded responses in terms of three positive response categories (‘call us’, ‘provide more information’, ‘come to an interview’), and two types of negative response (‘not interested’ and no response at all).

We used McNemar’s test for detecting a discrepancy in positive responses for the two resumes. This enabled us to assess whether any apparent difference in attractiveness was real or due to chance. Where one resume appeared more attractive than another we discussed possible reasons, made suitable changes, and then restarted the testing process, continuing in this way until we reached statistical equivalence.
Once the resumes in each pair were deemed statistically equivalent, we assigned to each resume a gender identity marker (either trans or cis) at random. Applicants were marked as either cis or trans in two ways. First by way of an explicit gender identification as ‘transgender man’, ‘transgender woman’, ‘man’, or ‘woman’. Second by way of the presence or absence of a use name alongside the legal name. For all applicants, the legal name was included and for trans applicants, a use name was also included; no comparable object was included for cis applicants. In other words, a trans applicant was marked through the word “transgender” appended to their gender and by the inclusion of a use name, where cis applicants had neither of these markers.

Over several months we sent out 1600 applications, two for each of 800 jobs, with 200 jobs in each of the four job sectors in two phases: one phase comparing a cis man and trans man applicant on a set of 100 jobs, and one phase comparing a cis woman and a trans woman on a second set of 100 jobs. The gender identity markers were rotated to mitigate impacts of differences between the two resumes in each set: one resume in the pair was allocated the trans marker or the cis marker for 25 applications, then the markers were switched for 25 applications. Over the data collection process, each resume was used an equal number of times by a cis man, cis woman, trans man and trans woman.
**Results & Discussion**

Table 1 summarises the raw data collected. It displays response data for cis and trans applications (male and female) in terms of three positive response categories ('call us', 'provide more information', 'come to an interview'). The table also provides pooled data, for the three positive response types combined, the two negative responses combined (no response and 'not interested'), and the four job sectors combined (see final rows).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Responses</th>
<th>Call Us (1)</th>
<th>Tell Us More (2)</th>
<th>Come For Interview (3)</th>
<th>All Positive Responses (1-3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cis</td>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>Cis</td>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>Cis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Degree Business Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Degree Psychology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Degree Computer Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from our data that trans people in our study were discriminated against when seeking employment. Despite equivalent qualifications and experience, trans applicants were across the four job sectors less likely than cis applicants to receive a positive response (either being invited to contact the employer, being asked for more information, or being called to interview) with trans applicants receiving 106 positive responses compared to...
159 for cis applicants to the same jobs. On the other hand, trans applicants were more likely to get a negative response (that the employer was not interested, or receive no response at all), with trans applicants receiving 694 negative responses compared to 641 for cis applicants. See Figures 1 and 2.

Overall the cis applicants received 50.0% more positive responses than the trans applicants (159 versus 106, respectively). The discrimination experienced by trans women appeared to be particularly severe. Cis women received 64.0% more positive responses than trans women (82 versus 50, respectively). The corresponding figure for men was 37.5% more positive responses (77 responses for cis men versus 56 responses for trans men).

The trend towards discrimination against trans applicants can be most readily seen in the case of requests to attend interview. See Figure 3. Cis applicants, though no more qualified and experienced than the trans applicants, nevertheless overall received 66.1% more requests to attend interview (103 versus 62, respectively). Again, the discrimination faced by trans women appeared particularly severe. Cis women received 72.4% more invitations to interview than trans women (50 versus 29, respectively). The corresponding figure for men was 60.6% (53 for cis men versus 33 for trans men).

Overall the cis applicants received 50.0% more positive responses than the trans applicants (159 versus 106, respectively). The discrimination experienced by trans women appeared to be particularly severe. Cis women received 64.0% more positive responses than trans women (82 versus 50, respectively). The corresponding figure for men was 37.5% more positive responses (77 responses for cis men versus 56 responses for trans men).

The trend towards discrimination against trans applicants can be most readily seen in the case of requests to attend interview. See Figure 3. Cis applicants, though no more qualified and experienced than the trans applicants, nevertheless overall received 66.1% more requests to attend interview (103 versus 62, respectively). Again, the discrimination faced by trans women appeared particularly severe. Cis women received 72.4% more invitations to interview than trans women (50 versus 29, respectively). The corresponding figure for men was 60.6% (53 for cis men versus 33 for trans men).

Discrimination was evident, to varying extents, in all four employment sectors examined. Figures 4a to 4d provide, for each of the four job sectors, percentages corresponding to those in Figure 3.

It is evident that discrimination was consistent and strong in three of the four sectors. The situation faced by computer science graduates appeared particularly severe, with cis applicants overall getting called to interview 127.3% more frequently trans applicants (25 versus 11, respectively). However, there was very clear discrimination in two of the other sectors, with cis applicants 72.7% more likely to get interviews in the business administration sector than trans applicants (38 versus 22, respectively), and 58.8% more likely in the school leaver sector (27 versus 17, respectively). The job sector
for psychology graduates offered the only comparatively bright spot in this generally dark picture, with cis applicants getting only 8.3% more invitations to interview than trans applicants (13 versus 12, respectively).

In two of the job sectors, computer science and school leaver, the discrimination faced by trans women seemed particularly severe, as compared with trans men. Cis women with degrees in computer science were 175% (11 versus 4, respectively) more likely to be called to interview than equivalently qualified and experienced trans women. The corresponding figure for men was 100% (14 versus 7 interview invitations respectively).

Among school leavers, cis women were 72.7% more likely to be called to interview than trans women (19 versus 11, respectively); the corresponding figure for men was 33.3% (8 versus 6, respectively). Among psychology graduates, cis women were 16.7% more likely than trans
women to receive an interview invitation (7 versus 6, respectively); for men there was no discrepancy at all.

The one remaining job sector showed a rather different pattern. In business administration trans men appeared to shoulder a higher burden of discrimination than trans women. Cis women were 62.5% more likely than trans women to get called to interview (13 versus 8, respectively). The corresponding figure for men was higher, at 78.6% (25 versus 14, respectively).

Finally, as a way of standing back and looking at the entire data (see Table 1), it is possible to calculate the relative likelihood of a trans applicant getting specific types of response, as compared with the likelihood for cis applicants. Figure 5 shows the results of this calculation. We see how discrimination against trans applicants is evident across the full spectrum of possible responses. At one end of the spectrum, trans applicants were disproportionately likely, as compared with cis applicants, to get a ‘not interested’ response or no response at all. At the other end of the spectrum, they were as we have seen, less likely to be called to interview. The more apparently negative response, the more likely it was that a trans applicant rather than a cis applicant would encounter it. The more apparently positive the response from an employer, the less likely it was, relative to a cis person, that a trans person would encounter it.

Figure 5.
Malaysia – Likelihood of a trans applicant getting a specific type of response, relative to the likelihood for a cis applicant. Negative responses comprise ‘not interested’ and no response at all.
Lost Opportunities

Overall, the results indicate when a gender identity marker is added to two equivalent resumes, the resume with the trans marker is considerably less likely to receive a positive response than the one with a cis marker. This shows direct evidence of discrimination based on gender identity; it also highlights the actual lost opportunities experienced by trans people when seeking employment in Malaysia.

When we explore the raw data (Table 1), we can see how many opportunities opened up for cis applicants, but not for equally qualified and experienced trans applicants. The cis applicants received 50% more positive responses than the trans applicants. From the employer responses, this reflects 53 actual lost opportunities for the trans applicants. Of the 53 lost opportunities, 21 impacted on trans men and 32 on trans women.

If we look more specifically at invitations to interview (the most positive of responses observed in this study) we see that 103 cis applicants were invited to interview, as compared with only 62 trans applicants. This represents 41 missed interview opportunities.

It is worth remembering again that, before the gender identity markers were added, these resumes had been carefully piloted to be equivalently attractive in the job market. The jobs targeted by our applications were real jobs, and, as far as the employers were concerned, these were real applicants. Those 41 missed interview opportunities therefore represented 41 cases in which those involved in recruitment had made decisions that had the effect of denying opportunities to applicants they believed to be trans. In any given case we are unable to say whether an opportunity that was denied was as a result of the applicant’s transgender status. However, the general picture is clearly one of discrimination against trans applicants.
“The jobs targeted by our applications were real jobs, and, as far as the employers were concerned, these were real applicants. Those 41 missed interview opportunities therefore represented 41 cases in which those involved in recruitment had made decisions that had the effect of denying opportunities to applicants they believed to be trans.”
Some job sectors were more discriminatory than others. Computer science was the worst, for both men and women. It was also the one that seemed to differentially discriminate against trans women the most, with trans women encountering dramatically more discrimination than did even trans men. The discriminatory environments presented by certain job sectors, and the differentially greater discrimination that may be faced by trans women, deserve further scrutiny.

This study examined job discrimination at the first stage of a search for a job – submitting a job application. We are not able to draw conclusions on what the experiences are for those trans applicants who are fortunate enough to gain an interview. The Make the Road research reviewed earlier suggests that, when trans people come face to face with potential employers, they face discrimination afresh.

Finally, a word of caution. Across much of the world an increasing amount of recruitment is being done through agencies hired by companies for the purpose, and through recruitment software (some of it making use of Artificial Intelligence). Consequently, the relatively poor response rates evident for trans people in this study may reflect prejudice and discrimination in the agencies hired to recruit employees, or the programming of software being used in recruitment. In effect, a company that advertises a job and which appears at first glance to be discriminating against trans applicants may not actually be directly responsible for the discrimination at all. Indeed, it may not even be aware that discrimination is being perpetrated.

Comments from the Research Assistant: We collected qualitative data from the research assistant about their experience during the data collecting phase. The data collection had quite an impact on them.

“As a transgender person, there were many moments in this research where I felt frustrated with the percentages of responses being so much higher for cisgender applicants compared to transgender applicants... it is still frustrating to be confronted with these facts on an almost daily basis for the past 6 months.” (Research assistant final internal report)
Recommendations

The findings in this study indicate that the job market for trans applicants is not equivalent to that for cis applicants in Malaysia. There are several steps of note that the trans community and allies may take to prepare trans applicants for existing obstacles.

The findings in this study indicate that the job market for trans applicants is not equivalent to that for cis applicants in Malaysia. There are several steps of note that the trans community and allies may take to prepare trans applicants for existing obstacles.

The first of these is to develop a lobbying strategy with government, based on evidence of discrimination in hiring, using these findings. Specifically, it may be useful to engage federal or state governments, specific federal or state legislators and policymakers, lawyers involved in employment litigation, and others involved in the drafting of legislation. In Malaysia, Article 8 of the Constitution states “All persons are equal before the law and entitled to the equal protection of the law.” While there is not an explicit mention of protection on the basis of gender identity or expression, this broad clause can be used to address discrimination experienced on these grounds. Furthermore, allies in gender-based discrimination contexts may be valuable partners in preparing concerted responses to employment discrimination issues and their legislation and adjudication.

Secondly, it is vital to prepare trans job applicants for the types of discrimination they may face entering the job market, with specific attention paid to trans women and to the more difficult job sectors (e.g. computer science degree holders). Resume-writing classes, community discussions on discrimination and discriminatory employers, and community-sponsored classes to improve one’s qualifications may be of use.

Finally, there is a clear need for education and sensitivity trainings for businesses, especially those with international ties and existing non-discrimination clauses. Trans community activists can develop a curriculum for this sensitisation and work with allies (such as business organisations, chambers of commerce, and university preparatory programs) to provide it to employers, both to build and improve relationships and trust between the trans community and the business sector and to decrease incidents of implicit and explicit bias in hiring within these companies.
## Recommendations for Breaking Down Existing Barriers Include:

1. Developing a lobbying strategy with government, based on evidence of discrimination in hiring, using these findings. Specifically, it may be useful to engage state governments, specific state legislators and policymakers, lawyers involved in employment litigation, and others involved in the drafting of legislation;

2. Performing an audit on the job hiring practices;

3. Developing trans cultural and trans competent hiring standards or practice with groups or unions;

4. Promoting best workplace standards and employers;

5. Building awareness, capacity and knowledge in fields that will help trans applicant secure a job, such as, resume-writing classes, community discussions on discrimination and discriminatory employers, and community-sponsored classes to improve one’s qualifications may be of use;

6. Creating more social and media awareness on job employment challenges faced by trans people;

7. Developing a curriculum amongst trans activist and advocates for this sensitisation and work with allies (such as corporate sectors, organisations, chambers of commerce, and university preparatory programs) to provide it to employers, both to build and improve relationships and trust between the trans community and the corporate sector and to decrease incidents of implicit and explicit bias in hiring within these companies.
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15 Ibid.
30 None of our applications (cis or trans) resulted in an employer responding with a offer a job.

31 To calculate the relative likelihood, the number of responses for trans applicants was divided by the number of responses for cis applicants. The result was multiplied by 100 to enable us to express the relative likelihood as a percentage.