Interrupting Sexism at Work

What Drives Men to Respond Directly or Do Nothing? (Report)

Negin Sattari, PhD , Emily Shaffer, PhD , Sarah DiMuccio, PhD , Dnika J. Travis, PhD

You and your colleagues are in a meeting to discuss internal applicants for a newly developed role that is critical to managing efficiency in remote team operations. When reviewing a woman's qualifications, one of your colleagues makes a sexist comment.

What would you do? Would you say something to your colleague, or pull them aside later? Would you try to change the topic? Perhaps you would roll your eyes, or maybe even do nothing. What influences your choice?

> "
> **You need an organization that is open to challenge, is open to dissent, is not a 'yes sir, yes ma'am' type [of] organization. So, first of all, you have to value dissent and you have to value disagreement....That's something here that we struggle with...dissent is seen as high heresy. You need an underlying culture that values critique and values conflict.**
>
> — Mid-level director in education

> "
> **There might be an individual who...is working on...their identity as a male....But then they go to work, and [the] workplace is a male-dominated, potentially toxic culture, and it's difficult to translate those things into that community organizational change, let alone any sort of systemic change.**
>
> — Executive director in nonprofit

Men's Responses to Sexist Events
The likelihood of engaging in different types of interrupting behaviour:

46%
Directly interrupt

65%
Redirect

24%
Unassertively react

20%
Do nothing

Commitment[35]

- Demonstrated commitment to fighting gender discrimination.
- Sense of obligation to interrupt someone or something that is sexist.

Confidence[36]

- Feeling of skill at directly addressing people who act in biased ways.
- Belief in their own appearance of competence when interrupting a sexist behaviour.

- Feeling of personal responsibility to interrupt gender discrimination.

- Belief that it is important to interrupt gender discrimination.

- Self-identification as someone who interrupts sexism.

- Effectiveness when informing others that a behaviour is inappropriate.

- Feeling of confidence when interrupting biased behaviours.

Awareness of the Personal Benefits[37]

- Feeling that their efforts could make a difference.

- Demonstrating to themselves that they are not complicit.

Impact on the Common Good[38]

- Wishing to help others recognize their biases and change their behaviour.

- Conviction that by interrupting sexist behaviours they will help reduce workplace sexism and prejudice.

- Believing they can reduce the impact of sexism on women's opportunities.

Commitment

We found that 58% of men had high levels of commitment to interrupting sexism.[39] Not surprisingly, our findings show that these men report a greater likelihood of directly interrupting a colleague who made a sexist remark. Specifically, 65% of highly committed men said they would directly interrupt a colleague, compared to 19% of men who were less committed.[40]

65%

of highly committed men would directly interrupt a colleague

"

So I mean I grew up with that, and I think as I've evolved I've been very lucky to end up in an organization like Company A where that…is a value that we hold dear. And so for me to be true to who I am—as I'll call it an 'equity-seeking male'—I feel very comfortable here.

— Senior leader in professional services

"

When I hear things that marginalize other people, it triggers me. So I think that's why I'm more inclined to stick my neck out.

— Mid-level manager in energy

19%

of men who were less committed would directly interrupt a colleague

"

I see that as a problem, I see that as a challenge. And…I'm an immigrant, so there's a little bit of a personal…interest in this. So I got a bit more and more involved. So I do have quite a bit of… ability to influence the outcome, right? Not entirely changing it, but I can do my piece to help.

— Senior director in utility

"

I think for me it—it's values-driven first….I'm a big 'Do the right thing' kind of [guy]. If for no other reason, just for that.

— Executive director in government

Confidence

Men's level of confidence in their ability to interrupt sexism also plays a significant role in their willingness to directly interrupt sexist events. About a third (31%) of survey participants reported high levels of confidence in their ability to interrupt sexism.[41] Of these, 72% said that they would directly do so, whereas just 34% of men who reported being less confident said they would interrupt directly.[42]

Our interview participants frequently emphasized men's lack of confidence—in some cases caused by fear or discomfort—as a barrier to their engagement:

72%

of highly confident men said they would directly interrupt sexism

"

I think the one thing is, they're afraid….When I speak up and talk about the need to include men in the discussion, to have a really

34%

of less confident men said they would directly interrupt sexism

"

I think it's just a mob mentality. They're afraid to speak up because they don't want to be the outlier. And if everybody else is

good open discussion that is a safe discussion for men to have, I will have men come up and say, 'Thank you for saying that. I didn't know how to say it.'

— Senior leader in professional services

doing it, well, just be quiet and go along.

— Mid-level leader in energy transmission

59%

aware of the personal benefits would directly interrupt sexism

22%

less aware of these benefits would directly interrupt sexism

62%

who see an impact on the common good would directly interrupt sexism

20%

who see less of an impact would directly interrupt sexism

> "
> **I'm not trying to fix someone that's broken, I'm trying to raise awareness…And it's very rewarding when you have a conversation with someone and they say, 'Okay, well I get it, I'm going to try to change that.' So I think the motivation…really has to be around opening people's eyes that we're really better if we have a workplace that works for everybody.**
>
> — Senior director in energy

Actions Individuals Can Take

We asked our interviewees to share their learnings from their experiences with interrupting sexism. Here are a few insights that can help people successfully interrupt.

Silence is multifaceted; it is determined by both the estimated risk involved in speaking up, and how much time employees believe they have to decide whether to speak up or not. These decision points can be unconscious, automatic, deliberate, or purposeful.[54]

On an individual level, employees don't always make a calculated decision to remain silent. When they unexpectedly find themselves in a high-pressure situation, they may simply "freeze."[55] In other instances, they may consciously decide not to respond in the moment and take some time to consider what to do.

39%

of men working in organizations with high levels of silence report doing nothing

5%

of men in organizations with lower levels of silence report doing nothing

> "
> **The people may take their cues from the leader, but if you have a culture where there is fear of reprisal for speaking up or fear of reprisal for challenging the status quo, I think that creates that environment, I would say beyond just sexism, I mean choose an ism. And it creates an environment where those isms may be possible….I think it takes courage to shift a culture, and so if you don't have a culture that encourages courage to challenge the status quo to speak up, then you normalize certain behaviours.**
>
> — Senior director in financial services

A Climate of Futility: When Men Believe They Can't Make a Difference

In our survey, 45% of men indicated high levels of a climate of futility related to speaking up against sexism.[67] Furthermore, we found a direct link between participants' perception of futility and their likelihood of doing nothing to interrupt sexism: 36% of men who reported higher perceptions that their actions wouldn't make a difference said they would do nothing, whereas only 7% of men who didn't share that sense of futility reported doing nothing.[68]

As noted in the *Harvard Business Review*, "The desire to speak up is fundamentally about the wish to change something and make a difference. But, if you continue to cement employees' belief that speaking up is a waste of time, they'll save their breath."[69]

36%
of men who perceived high levels of futility said they would do nothing

7%
of men who perceived less futility would do nothing

"

In that organization…I didn't feel safe, and I didn't feel like there was any point….It felt like no matter what I did, nothing was going to change.

— Senior leader in mining

"

[I felt] you know, frustration, disappointment…in people and in… the organization sometimes that in the year 2020…people still think and talk that way. [And]…a little bit helpless where that individual being more senior, et cetera…[so] I didn't do anything about it.

— Senior director in food manufacturing

"

When new ideas come in, sometimes people will say, 'Oh, we've tried that before.' …The other thing is that you have to dress up the proposal in such a way that the other person…sees a benefit to them. …You need to be very careful not to put them on the defensive because in an environment where it's hyper-conservative and not a lot changes, or change happens ridiculously slow, you have to slowly…lead them.

— Entry-level engineer in energy transmission

"

It's about finding yourself in situations where you know that you should say something, but there's that little voice in your head that tells you not to rock the boat. It tells you to ignore it, to move on…[that] it's easier just to get past this, let them finish what they're doing and then keep moving on. And that I think comes from fear. Whether it's fear of embarrassment, whether it's fear of ostracization, fear of disrupting the status quo, fear of conflict, fear of not having the right words.

— Senior director in financial services

"

I think the biggest thing that people fear is job security and whether they're appearing to be too liberal or too annoying or…too righteous, if you will, by sticking our neck out and standing up for other people.

— Mid-level manager in energy

Actions Organizations Can Take

Our findings demonstrate the importance for organizations to cultivate an inclusive culture in which people feel safe and supported in interrupting sexism.

Here are four guidelines to encourage men to do so.

"

I think the final piece is some broader understanding that everybody has got accountability in this. It's not one versus the other, it's everybody. And how do you make that a systematic piece that you understand the value of why we would do this work, the impact of

not doing it, and your role as a leader, as an individual contributor, in supporting that.

— Mid-level manager in telecommunications

Endnotes

[1] Twenty-five items relating to the ways that men may interrupt sexism were submitted to an exploratory factor analysis using principal axis factoring with promax rotation. KMO and Bartlett's test indicated that the items were sufficiently related to proceed with the factor analysis. The analysis yielded four factors that explained 58.56% of the variance for the set of variables. Factor 1 was labeled "direct interrupting" with the following items loading strongly: I would report what happened, I would tell my colleague that what happened is a reportable offense, I would pursue a conversation with my colleague about what happened, I would try to educate my colleague about the implications of what happened, I would question my colleague about what happened, I would tell my colleague in the moment that what happened was inappropriate, I would make a note of what happened, I would tell my colleague later that I don't think what happened was okay, I would give the candidate career advice later. Factor 2 was labeled "unassertively react" with the following items loading strongly: I would use sarcasm to indicate my concern, I would try to express my concern non-verbally, I would use humor to express my concern, I would sigh and comment under my breath, I would show signs of disgust, I would show signs of surprise. Factor 3 was labeled "redirect" with the following items loading strongly: I would redirect the conversation to the candidate's qualifications, I would keep the conversation focused on the task at hand, I would remind my colleague that the candidate is qualified. Factor 4 was labeled "do nothing" with the following items loading strongly: I wouldn't say a thing, I would do nothing, I would hide my emotions, I would consider it inappropriate for me to do or say something, I would ignore my colleague in the moment, I would expect someone else to take responsibility for doing something. One item did not load strongly on any factor and was dropped.

[2] Multiple regression was carried out to investigate the impact of individual factors on men's endorsement of directly interrupting in response to a sexist comment. Results indicated that the model explained 44% of the variance after controlling for race and organizational rank and that the model was a significant predictor of directly interrupting, $F_{(6, 1315)} = 199.04$, $p < .001$. Commitment ($b = .28$, $t = 11.04$, $p < .001$), confidence ($b = .25$, $t = 8.23$, $p < .001$), awareness ($b = .14$, $t = 5.44$, $p < .001$), and impact ($b = .22$, $t = 5.96$, $p < .001$) significantly contributed to the model.

[3] Multiple regression was carried out to investigate the impact of organizational factors on men's likelihood of doing nothing in response to a sexist comment. Results indicated that the model explained 41% of the variance after controlling for race and organizational rank and that the model was a significant predictor of doing nothing, $F_{(5, 1316)} = 213.77$, $p < .001$. Silencing ($b = .40$, $t = 9.67$, $p < .001$), combativeness ($b = .19$, $t = 4.23$, $p < .001$), and futility ($b = .23$, $t = 10.86$, $p < .001$) significantly contributed to the model.

[4] Emily Shaffer, Negin Sattari, and Alixandra Pollack, *Interrupting Sexism at Work: How Men Respond in a Climate of Silence* (Catalyst, 2020).

[5] Peter Glick and Susan T. Fiske, "The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 70, no. 3 (1996): p. 491-512; Janet K. Swim and Laurie L. Cohen, "Overt, Covert, and Subtle Sexism: A Comparison Between the Attitudes Toward Women and Modern Sexism Scales," *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, vol. 21, no. 1 (1997): p. 103-118.

[6] Lilia M. Cortina, "Unseen Injustice: Incivility as Modern Discrimination in Organizations," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 33, no. 1 (2008): p. 55-75; Swim and Cohen.

[7] Note that sexism intersects with other axes of inequalities and discriminations such as racism, ageism, and classism in shaping individual experiences and underprivileges. Anthony G. Greenwald and Mahzarin R. Banaji, "Implicit Social Cognition: Attitudes, Self-Esteem, and Stereotypes," *Psychological Review*, vol. 102, no. 1 (1995): p. 4-27; Catalyst, *What Is Unconscious Bias?* (December 11, 2014).

[8] Brenda L. Russell and Kristin Y. Trigg, "Tolerance of Sexual Harassment: An Examination of Gender Differences, Ambivalent Sexism, Social Dominance, and Gender Roles," *Sex Roles*, vol. 50, nos. 7/8 (2004): p. 565-573.

[9] Business Fights Poverty, "Gender Equality is Everyone's Business: Engaging Men As Allies to Advance Gender Equality Across The Value Chain," (February 2020); Sandrine Devillard, Tiffany Vogel, Andrew Pickersgill, Anu Madgavkar, Tracy Nowski, Mekala Krishnan, Tina Pan, and Dania Kechrid, *The Power of Parity: Advancing Women's Equality in Canada*, (McKinsey Global Institute, June 2017).

[10] This study builds on Catalyst's research series, initiated in 2009 on engaging men in gender initiatives, which gave birth to Catalyst's MARC (Men Advocating Real Change) program for engaging men across industries in efforts to remove gender inequities in the workplace.

[11] Shaffer, Sattari, and Pollack.

[12] Council on Foreign Relations, Women's Workplace Equality Index (2018).

[13] Melissa Moyser, *Women and Paid Work*, (Statistics Canada, 2017).

[14] Devillard et al.

[15] See, for example, Cheryl R. Kaiser and Carol T. Miller, "A Stress and Coping Perspective on Confronting Sexism" *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 2 (June 2004): p. 168-178; J. Nicole Shelton, Jennifer A. Richeson, Jessica Salvatore, and Diana M. Hill, "Silence Is Not Golden: The Intrapersonal Consequences of Not Confronting Prejudice" in *Stigma and Group Inequality: Social Psychological Perspectives*, ed. Shana Levin and Colette van Laar (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers); Janet K. Swim and Lauri L. Hyers, "Excuse me—What Did You Just Say?!: Women's Public and Private Responses to Sexist Remarks" *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 35, no. 1 (1999): p. 68-88.

[16] Leslie Ashburn-Nardo, Kathryn A. Morris, and Stephanie A. Goodwin, "The Confronting Prejudiced Responses (CPR) Model: Applying CPR in Organizations" *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 7, no. 3 (September 2008): p. 332-342.

[17] Benjamin J. Drury and Cheryl R. Kaiser, "Allies Against Sexism: The Role of Men in Confronting Sexism" *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 70, no. 4 (2014): p. 637-652.

[18] The quotes presented in this table come from a separate online survey conducted by Catalyst to learn about men's and women's on-the-ground encounters with sexist incidences in the workplace and their reactions to such situations. A sample of 150 men and women in the US, Canada, UK, and other countries completed the survey. The quotes are not specific to Canada and are only used to provide real examples for the four categories of behaviours that emerged from our analysis of survey data in Canada.

[19] Non-management (including entry-level) employee in resources, utilities, and energy working in Australia.

[20] First-level manager in resources, utilities, and energy working in Ireland.

[21] Second-level manager in manufacturing working in the United States.

[22] First-level manager in manufacturing working in the United States.

[23] This scale was composed of 24 items assessing the behaviours that men would likely engage in when hearing a colleague making a sexist remark. These 24 items were divided into four subscales: Directly interrupt, redirect, unassertively interrupt, and do nothing. Participants responded to each item on a 1 ("not at all likely") to 6 ("extremely likely") scale.

[24] Interrupting sexism behaviours were measured on a 1 ("not at all likely") to 6 ("extremely likely") scale. Participants whose average on each subscale was 4 or higher were categorized as having a high likelihood of their behaviours falling within that subscale category.

[25] Sarah Fotheringham and Lana Wells, *Tomorrow's Men Today: Canadian Men's Insights on Engaging Men and Boys in Creating a More Gender Equal Future* (University of Calgary, Shift: The Project to End Domestic Violence, 2019).

[26] Fotheringham and Wells.

[27] Shaffer, Sattari, and Pollack.

[28] Glick and Fiske.

[29] Four items measured the likelihood that men would interrupt sexism in a way that is consistent with benevolent sexist beliefs. Example items include: "I would tell my colleagues to think about if this were their mother or daughter" and "I would ask my colleague to be more protective toward women." Scale responses ranged from 1 ("not at all likely") to 6 ("extremely likely"). An average of these 4 items was created for each participant and scores 4 or higher were considered as having a high likelihood to engage in the behaviour.

[30] Kathleen Connelly and Martin Heesacker, "Why is Benevolent Sexism Appealing?: Associations with System Justification and Life Satisfaction" *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, vol 36, no. 4 (August 2012): p. 432-443.

[31] Alice H. Eagly and Steven J. Karau, "Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders," *Psychological Review*, vol. 109, no. 3 (2002): p. 573-598.

[32] Connelly and Heesacker.

[33] Matthew D. Hammond, Chris G. Sibley, and Nickola C. Overall. "The Allure of Sexism: Psychological Entitlement Fosters Women's Endorsement of Benevolent Sexism Over Time," *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, vol. 5, no. 4 (September 2013): p. 422–29.

[34] Multiple regression was carried out to investigate the impact of individual factors on men's endorsement of directly interrupting in response to a sexist comment. Results indicated that the model explained 44% of the variance after controlling for race and organizational rank and that the model was a significant predictor of directly interrupting, $F_{(6, 1315)} = 199.04$, $p < .001$. Commitment ($b = .28$, $t = 11.04$, $p < .001$), confidence ($b = .25$, $t = 8.23$, $p < .001$), awareness ($b = .14$, $t = 5.44$, $p < .001$), and impact ($b = .22$, $t = 5.96$, $p < .001$) significantly contributed to the model.

[35] The commitment to confronting scale was developed by J. Nicole Shelton, Jennifer A. Richeson, Jessica Salvatore, and Diana M. Hill, "Silence Is Not Golden: The Intrapersonal Consequences of Not Confronting Prejudice," *Stigma and Group Inequality*, (2006): p. 79-96.

36 This scale was developed by Cheryl R. Kaiser and Carol T. Miller, "A Stress and Coping Perspective on Confronting Sexism," *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 2 (June 2004): p. 168-178.

37 To assess the personal benefits one may receive from interrupting sexism, we created a three-item measure. The scale has good internal consistency, α =.812.

38 Adapted from Kaiser and Miller.

39 Commitment to confronting sexism was measured by 5 items, which were averaged to create a composite and then dichotomized. Scale responses ranged from 1 ("not at all") to 6 ("very much"). The percentage presented here reflects scores averaging a 4 or higher.

40 Commitment significantly predicted directly interrupting, $b = .54$, $t(1491) = 30.25$, $p < .001$. A chi-squared analysis was conducted to test the difference in percentages. The observed values were significantly different than expected values, $X^2(1, 1493) = 311.02$, $p < .001$.

41 Confidence was measured on a 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 6 ("Strongly Agree") scale. Six items were averaged to create a composite score and then dichotomized. To dichotomize confidence in confronting sexism, scores averaging 4 or higher were considered as indicating "high confidence".

42 Confidence significantly predicted directly interrupting, $b = .64$, $t(1491) = 23.15$, $p < .001$. A chi-squared analysis was conducted to test the difference in percentages. The observed values were significantly different than expected values, $X^2(1, 1493) = 187.09$, $p < .001$.

43 The personal benefits scale was measured on a 1 ("Not at all") to 6 ("Very much") scale. Three items were averaged to create a composite score and then dichotomized. Scores averaging higher than 4 were considered to be high.

44 Thirteen items measured the perceived benefits to the common good. Responses to the scale ranged from 1 ("Not at all") to 6 ("Very much"). A composite score was created by computing an average of all items and then dichotomized. Scores averaging 4 or higher were considered to indicate a high belief in the benefits to the common good.

45 Personal benefits significantly predicted directly interrupting, $b = .51$, $t(1491) = 24.28$, $p < .001$. A chi-squared analysis was conducted to test the difference in percentages. The observed values were significantly different than expected values, $X^2(1, 1493) = 186.51$, $p < .001$.

46 Belief in the common good significantly predicted directly interrupting, $b = .73$, $t(1491) = 24.10$, $p < .001$. A chi-squared analysis was conducted to test the difference in percentages. The observed values were significantly different than expected values, $X^2(1, 1493) = 244.71$, $p < .001$.

47 Sarah J. Gervais, Amy L. Hillard, and Theresa K. Vescio, Confronting Sexism: The Role of Relationship Orientation and Gender," *Sex Roles*, vol. 63 (2010): p. 463-474.

48 Jennifer J. Kish-Gephart, James R. Detert, Linda Klebe Treviño, and Amy C. Edmondson, Silenced by Fear: The Nature, Sources, and Consequences of Fear at Work" *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, vol. 29 (2009): p. 163-193; Elizabeth Wolfe Morrison and Frances J. Miliken, Speaking Up, Remaining Silent: The Dynamics of Voice and Silence in Organizations," *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 40, no. 6 (August 2003): p. 1353-1358; James R. Detert, Ethan R. Burris, and David A. Harrison, Do Your Employees Think Speaking up Is Pointless?" *Harvard Business Review*, May 26, 2010.

49 Eight items measured perceived organizational silence. Responses to this scale ranged from 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 5 ("Strongly Agree"). A composite score was created by computing an average of all items and then dichotomized. Scores averaging 3 or higher were considered to indicate high organizational silence. Scale adapted from Elif Daşcı and Necati Cemaloğlu, "The Development of the Organizational Silence Scale: Validity-Reliability Study," *Journal of Human Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 1 (2016): p. 33-45.

50 Combative culture was measured using the Masculinity Contest Culture scale. Peter Glick, Jennifer L. Berdahl, and Natalya M. Alonso, Development and Validation of the Masculinity Contest Culture Scale," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 74, no. 3 (September, 2018): p. 449-476; Natalya M. Alonso, Playing to Win: Male-Male Sex-Based Harassment and the Masculinity Contest," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 74, no. 3 (September 2018): p. 477-499.

51 Perception of futility was measured by participants' endorsement that their efforts "wouldn't make a difference anyway." This item was adapted from Kaiser and Miller.

52 A climate of silence was measured by eight items on a 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 5 ("Strongly Agree") scale. The items were averaged to create a composite and then dichotomized. Scores averaging 3 or higher were considered as indicating "high silence."

53 Organizational silence significantly predicted doing nothing in response to sexism, $b = .68$, $t(1491) = 28.48$, $p < .001$. A chi-squared analysis was conducted to test the difference in percentages. The observed values were significantly different than expected values, $X^2(1, 1493) = 258.13$, $p < .001$.

54 Kish-Gephart et al.

55 Kish-Gephart et al.

56 Maria Vakola and Dimitris Bouradas, "Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Silence: An Empirical Investigation" *Employee Relations*, vol. 27, no. 5 (October 2005): p. 441-458.

57 Elizabeth Wolfe Morrison and Frances J. Milliken, "Organizational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World," *Academy of Management Review*, vol 25, no. 4 (October 2000): p. 706-725.

58 Sonya Fontenot Premeaux and Arthur G. Bedeian, "Breaking the Silence: The Moderating Effects of Self-Monitoring in Predicting Speaking Up in the Workplace" *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 40, no. 6 (September 2003): p. 1537-1562.

59 Combative culture was measured using 12 items on a 1 ("Not at all true of my organization") to 5 ("Entirely true of my organization") scale. An average was calculated to create a composite score and then dichotomized. Scores averaging a 3 or higher were considered to be indicative of a highly combative culture.

60 Robin J. Ely and Michael Kimmel, "Thoughts on the Workplace as a Masculinity Contest," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 74, no. 3 (September 2018): p. 628-634.

61 Jennifer L. Berdahl, Marianne Cooper, Peter Glick, Robert W. Livingston, and Joan C. Williams, "Work as a Masculinity Contest," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 74, no. 3 (September 2018): p. 422-448.

62 Glick, Berdahl, and Alonso; Alonso.

63 Combative culture significantly predicted doing nothing in response to sexism, $b = .70$, $t(1491) = 25.88$, $p < .001$. A chi-squared analysis was conducted to test the difference in percentages. The observed values were significantly different than expected values, $X^2(1, 1493) = 210.35$, $p < .001$.

64 Please note that the aspects of masculine norms, values, and practices presented in this table were derived based on our analysis of qualitative data gathered from our 27 interviews.

65 Jeanine Prime and Corinne A. Moss-Racusin, *Engaging Men in Gender Initiatives: What Change Agents Need to Know* (Catalyst, 2009).

66 Sophie L. Kuchynka, Jennifer K. Bosson, Joseph A. Vandello, and Curtis Puryear, Zero Sum Thinking and the Masculinity Contest: Perceived Intergroup Competition and Workplace Gender Bias," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 74, no. 3 (September 2018): p. 529-550.

67 Perceptions of futility were measured using one item on a 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 6 ("Strongly Agree") scale. Responses were then dichotomized with scores 4 or higher indicating a high perception of futility.

68 Perception of futility significantly predicted doing nothing in response to sexism, $b = .44$, $t(1491) = 22.84$, $p < .001$. A chi-squared analysis was conducted to test the difference in percentages. The observed values were significantly different than expected values, $X^2(1, 1493) = 182.97$, $p < .001$.

69 James R. Detert, Ethan R. Burris, and David A. Harrison, Do Your Employees Think Speaking up Is Pointless? *Harvard Business Review*, May 26, 2010.

70 Detert et al; Elizabeth Wolfe Morrison, Sarah L. Wheeler-Smith, and Dishan Kamdar, Speaking Up in Groups: A Cross-Level Study of Group Voice Climate and Voice" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 96, no. 1 (2011): p. 183-191.

71 Detert et al.

72 A moderation analysis was performed to examine the impact of a combative culture, work costs, and their interaction on doing nothing. The overall model was significant, $R^2 = .43$, $F(3, 1489) = 375.24$, $p < .001$. The main effect of combative culture was significant, $b = .38$, $t(1489) = 11.65$, $p < .001$. The main effect of work costs was also significant, $b = .32$, $t(1489) = 13.22$, $p < .001$. These main effects were qualified by a significant interaction, $b = .16$, $t(1489) = 8.89$, $p < .001$. Simple slopes indicated that where work costs are high, the link between combative climates and doing nothing is exacerbated – when work costs are high, $b = .59$, $t(1489) = 14.37$, $p < .001$; but when work costs are low, $b = .18$, $t(1489) = 4.47$, $p < .001$. The relationship between organizational silence and doing nothing was also moderated by work costs. The model was significant, $R^2 = .44$, $F(3, 1489) = 388.22$, $p < .001$. The main effect of organizational silence was significant, $b = .42$, $t(1489) = 13.98$, $p < .001$. The main effect of work costs on doing nothing was also significant, $b = .29$, $t(1489) = 11.51$, $p < .001$. The main effects were qualified by a significant interaction, $b = .12$, $t(1489) = 7.04$, $p < .001$. Tests of simple slopes indicated that where work costs are high, the link between organizational silence and doing nothing is exacerbated – when work costs are high, $b = .57$, $t(1489) = 14.96$, $p < .001$; but when work costs are low, $b = .27$, $t(1489) = 7.60$, $p < .001$. We also investigated whether work costs moderated the relationship between the perception of futility and doing nothing. The overall model was significant, $R^2 = .41$, $F(3, 1489) = 343.06$, $p < .001$. The main effect of a sense of futility was significant, $b = .23$, $t(1489) = 11.19$, $p < .001$. The main effect of work costs was also significant, $b = .39$, $t(1489) = 17.10$, $p < .001$. The main effects were qualified by a significant interaction, $b = .05$, $t(1489) = 4.68$, $p < .001$. Simple slopes tests revealed that in organizations where work costs are high, the link between a sense of futility and doing nothing is exacerbated – when work costs are high, $b = .30$, $t(1489) = 11.64$, $p < .001$; but when work costs are low, $b = .16$, $t(1489) = 6.46$, $p < .001$.

73 Catalyst's model of inclusive leadership identifies curiosity, humility, and courage as main elements of leading inward. For more details, see Dnika J. Travis, Emily Shaffer, and Jennifer Thorpe-Moscon, *Getting Real About Inclusive Leadership: Why Change Starts With You* (Catalyst, 2019).

74 Elizabeth Wolfe Morrison and Frances J. Milliken, "Organizational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World" *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 25, no. 4 (October 2000): p. 706–725.; Maria Vakola and Dimitris Bouradas, "Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Silence: An Empirical Investigation," *Employee Relations*, vol. 27, no. 5 (October 2005): p. 441–458.

75 Myrtle P. Bell, Mustafa F. Özbilgin, T. Alexandra Beauregard, and Olca Sürgevil, Voice, Silence, and Diversity in 21st Century Organizations: Strategies for Inclusion of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Employees," *Human Resource Management*, vol. 50, no. 1 (February 2011): p. 131–46.

76 Andrew Arnold, "Why Robots Will Not Take Over Human Jobs," *Forbes*, March 27, 2018; Lauren Pasquarella Daley, *Women and the Future of Work* (Catalyst, 2019).

77 Northwestern School of Education and Social Policy, "Team-Based Rewards Structures and Their Impact on Team Trust."