UC Merced

UC Merced Previously Published Works

Title

Confronting and Reducing Sexism: A Call for Research on Intervention

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7fv3k41w>

Journal

Journal of Social Issues, 70(4)

ISSN

0022-4537

Authors

Becker, JC
Zawadzki, MJ
Shields, SA

Publication Date

2014-12-01

DOI

10.1111/josi.12081

Peer reviewed

Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 70, No. 4, 2014, pp. 603–614
doi: 10.1111/josi.12081

Confronting and Reducing Sexism: A Call for Research on Intervention

Julia C. Becker*

University of Osnabrueck

Matthew J. Zawadzki

University of California, Merced

Stephanie A. Shields

The Pennsylvania State University

This article presents the current state of research on confronting and reducing sexism. We first provide a systematic overview about prior work on confronting sexism. We identify gaps in the literature by outlining situational and contextual factors that are important in confronting sexism and introduce how these are addressed in the current volume. Second, we review prior work on reducing sexism. Compared to research on reducing other forms of prejudice, research on interventions to reduce sexism is rare. We explain why mechanisms that are successful in reducing other forms of prejudice cannot simply be adapted to reducing sexism. We then outline how the articles of this issue promote research, theory, and policy on reducing sexism. In conclusion, the aim of this issue is to bring together novel theoretical approaches as well as empirically tested methods that identify key antecedents and consequences of diverse ways of confronting and reducing sexism.

Sexism can be defined as “individuals’ attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, and organizational, institutional, and cultural practices that either reflect negative assessments of individuals based upon their gender or support unequal status of women and men” (Swim & Hyers, 2009, p. 407; see also Barreto, Ryan, & Schmitt, 2009; Rudman & Glick, 2008). This special issue brings together and

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Julia C. Becker, Department of Psychology, Social Psychology, University of Osnabrueck, Seminarstr. 20, 49074 Osnabrueck, Germany. Tel: 0049-541-969-4870 [e-mail: julia.becker@uni-osnabrueck.de].

promotes research, theory, and policy on confronting and reducing sexism. We have divided the issue into separate sections for confronting and reducing sexism as they are related, but also differ, in how they operate and can effect change. Confronting sexism is a volitional process aimed at expressing one's dissatisfaction with sexist treatment to the person or group responsible for it (Kaiser & Miller, 2004; Shelton, Richeson, Salvatore, & Hill, 2006). Thus, confronting sexism can potentially reduce sexism by educating the perpetrator to prevent future encounters with sexism (e.g., Hyers, 2007) or more broadly through changing social norms (e.g., Blanchard, Crandall, Brigham, & Vaughn, 1994). While confronting sexism is most often a short-term and spontaneous response in reaction to a sexist incident, planned interventions to reduce sexism target a certain group of people with the defined goal of changing individual's endorsement of sexist beliefs and respective behaviors. In addition, interventions are often developed from theory rather than being, like confrontation, a response in the moment.

The main aim of the first section of this issue (Confronting Sexism) is to bring together research that identifies key aspects of situations and individuals that are associated with confronting sexism, and highlight variables that moderate the target's and ally's confronting behavior. The aim of our second section (Interventions for Reducing Sexism) is to present articles that examine optimal ways to reduce sexism, identify factors that affect the efficacy of interventions, and highlight structural and cultural influences that bolster sexism and prevent the acceptance of interventions.

Across all papers, consequences of confronting and reducing sexism for women are discussed. Although sexism can also be directed at men, women are overwhelmingly the main target of sexism and have historically suffered as a result of it. In contrast, men have different experiences with sexism compared to women (see, for instance, Brinkman & Rickard, 2009), and sexism against men may actually work as a means to stabilize gender inequality and to further disadvantage women (e.g., Glick & Fiske, 1999). However, a goal across both sections is to highlight the situated nature of gender and the social location of a person in studying experiences of and responses to sexism, and the feasibility and efficacy of interventions to reduce sexist attitudes and behaviors. This is important because, as theory and research on intersectionality shows (e.g., Cole, 2009; Shields, 2008), the various social identities we embody profoundly influence our beliefs about and our experience of gender, and thereby, sexism. Each contribution to this special issue incorporates discussion of the relevance of the research to experiences of individuals at different intersectional positions. Research on sexist attitudes and behavior, confronting sexism, and interventions to reduce sexism have, implicitly or explicitly, almost exclusively focused on white, middle-class experience. In this issue, we explicitly aim to consider how efforts to reduce sexism may play out differently or need to be tailored specifically for particular target groups. In the

following section, we first review research on confronting and reducing sexism and then connect past research with the contributions in this special issue.

An Overview of Research on Confronting and Reducing Sexism

In addition to confronting, women have a variety of options to deal with gender discrimination. For example, they can engage in cognitive coping strategies (for an overview, see Major, Quinton, & McCoy, 2002) or they can respond with humor, sarcasm, or nonverbal responses that do not clearly communicate their displeasure with sexist treatment. However, when faced with sexism, behavioral coping such as directly challenging and confronting the perpetrator(s) by communicating one's displeasure with sexist treatment is one of the most important tools to address interpersonal gender discrimination because it is externally focused and therefore has the potential to reduce sexism (for an overview, see Hyers, 2007; Swim & Hyers, 1999). There are a number of recent studies that have focused on psychological antecedents and consequences of directly confronting sexism.

Confronting prejudice can have positive as well as negative consequences for the confronter. Targets who confront prejudice can potentially experience a range of positive psychological outcomes such as an increased sense of competence, self-esteem, empowerment (Gervais et al., 2010; Swim & Thomas, 2005), and satisfaction (Hyers, 2007). Thus, confronting discrimination can be seen as a way of coping with a stressful situation (Miller & Kaiser, 2001). Another positive outcome of confronting prejudice is that confronting can reduce stereotype use in perpetrators (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006) and observers (Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). In the case of racism, for instance, people who were confronted with their racism reported negative emotions, guilt, and discomfort and reduced their subsequent usage of stereotypic responses (Czopp et al., 2006). Moreover, confronting can increase the perpetrator's compensatory efforts to increase mutual liking between the confronter and the confronted (Mallett & Wagner, 2011) and the confronter is perceived as competent by female and male observers (Becker, Glick, Ilic, & Bohnet, 2011).

Although women are generally inclined to confront sexism when imagining a sexist encounter, in reality most women remain silent despite these positive consequences (Swim & Hyers, 1999; Swim, Eysell, Quinlivan Murdoch, & Ferguson, 2010). Several models and explanations have been offered to explain why women do not confront sexism. Staircase-models such as the "ask, answer and announce" model (Stangor et al., 2003) or the "confronting prejudiced responses" model (Ashburn-Nardo, Morris, & Goodwin, 2008) suggest that an individual faces different hurdles in confronting sexism. For instance, they suggest that before taking action, individuals have to detect discrimination, deem the incident an "emergency," take responsibility to confront, and decide how to confront. Whether or not they detect discrimination is strongly dependent on the type of incident the

woman was faced with. For example, women were less likely to confront sexism when sexism involved unwanted sexual attention compared to sexist comments (Ayres, Friedman, & Leaper, 2009). Cultural norms also influence the likelihood of women's confronting. Lee, Soto, Swim, and Berntstein, (2012) found that African American women were more likely to directly confront racist behavior than were Asian American women, though there was no difference between the groups in likelihood to respond indirectly. Group differences in unwillingness to confront was accounted for by Asian American women's culturally consistent desire to maintain peace with their interaction partner.

Major barriers to confronting include social costs to the confronter (e.g., Kaiser & Miller, 2004; Swim et al., 2010). Female confronters of sexism and black confronters of racism are often perceived as overreacting, whiny, oversensitive troublemakers, interpersonally cold, or fearful of retaliation (e.g., Becker et al., 2011; Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Dodd, Giuliano, Boutell, & Moran, 2001; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Kaiser & Miller, 2001, 2003). Female confronters are also less liked by men (Dodd et al., 2001), and the confronting target is at risk to be perceived as self-interested and egoistic. Thus, not surprisingly, evidence suggests that confrontations by nontargets can be more effective than confrontations by targets (Czopp & Monteith, 2003). In sum, although there is already important literature on confronting prejudice, the role of situational moderators and context effects has been neglected. For instance, women have a variety of options to confront sexism—they can confront directly or indirectly, they can confront in a friendly manner or act aggressively. Yet, little is known about “optimal” ways of confronting, about how confrontation is perceived in different social contexts. One aim of this special issue is to promote research on situational and contextual factors that are important in confronting sexism, particularly as they may inform development of tailored interventions. Additionally, this issue presents work on the importance of others—allies, observers, organizational climates—in considering when confrontation occurs and how it is perceived. A second goal of this special issue is to further promote the idea that addressing sexism, including confronting it, is the responsibility of everyone—not just the targets of sexism.

Compared to research on confronting sexism and reducing other forms of prejudice, research on interventions to reduce sexism is rare. Some have argued that sexism has a special status compared to other types of prejudice such those based on racial ethnicity, age, or disability (Fiske & Stevens, 1993). Specifically, Fiske and Stevens (1993) argue that gender is special because of the enormous prescriptive aspects of gender stereotypes, the inherent power asymmetries between women and men (physically as well as power over resources), close contact, and the sexual and biological facets of intimate relationships. In line with this reasoning, people do react differently when they are confronted about racial-biased versus gender-biased responses. In one study, for example, participants felt more guilt

and less amusement, and displayed more apologetic responses when they were confronted about racial-biased responses compared to gender-biased responses (Czopp & Monteith, 2003).

Thus, mechanisms that are successful in reducing other forms of prejudice (e.g., ethnic prejudice; racism), such as intergroup contact, cannot simply be adapted to sexism research. For instance, the most prominent intervention to reduce prejudice toward an outgroup is through bringing the two outgroups together in an intergroup contact situation (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Among other things, intergroup contact reduces prejudice by reducing intergroup anxiety. Yet, women and men are in continuous close contact and thus are unlikely to experience anxiety when being around one another because of unfamiliarity. Even when women and men are not involved in a heterosexual romantic relationship or do not have close other-sex friends, they have at least contact with each other in their family, work, or school. Moreover, most often, women and men like each other (Jackman, 1994). For example, Glick and Fiske (1996) argue that the intimate close contact between women and men creates a situation in which men are dependent on women's "dyadic power" that produces a special form of prejudice, namely benevolent sexism. Benevolent sexism is a subtle expression of male dominance and expressed in a protective behavior toward women and an idealization of women as caregivers and romantic partners (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Thus, it would be odd to create an intergroup contact situation between women and men in order to increase intergroup liking. Furthermore, the ascribed status men are generally given (at least in U.S. society) is hard to do away with, even when people are put in groups ostensibly as "equals," because interactions within groups tend to occur in ways that reproduce individuals' status outside that situation (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). Obviously, attempts to reduce benevolent sexism must be different from attempts to reduce negative attitudes toward other nondominant groups.

In conclusion, prejudice reduction research may have neglected sexism because prominent interventions such as intergroup contact or the reduction of intergroup anxiety cannot be applied to reducing sexism. To our knowledge there are only a few studies that have examined specific ways to reduce sexism. Most studies have looked at the effect of providing individuals with certain information to change their attitudes. For example, Shields, Zawadzki, and Johnson (2011) introduced the Workshop Activity for Gender Equity Simulation in the Academy (WAGES-Academic), which is a simulation of the cumulative effects of unconscious bias in the academic workplace. By playing WAGES-Academic, participants discover their bias and experientially learn that the accumulation of apparently minor biases hinder advancement, that different gender-relevant factors are significant at each stage in work life, that stereotypes impair the ability to notice bias, and that cumulative patterns reveal inequality. Results show that participants who play WAGES-Academic show increased knowledge and retention

of gender equity issues (Zawadzki, Danube, & Shields, 2012), and show reduced endorsement of sexist attitudes both immediately after playing WAGES and 1 week later (Zawadzki, Shields, Danube, & Swim, 2013). In another intervention, Becker and Swim (2011) reduced women's endorsement of modern, neosexist, and benevolent sexist beliefs by asking them to keep sexism diaries as a means to heighten their sensitivity for sexism in their everyday lives. Although heightening sensitivity for sexism was sufficient to reduce women's sexist beliefs (an effect that was still present in a one-week follow up measure), men needed to increase their empathy for the target of sexism to change their endorsement of modern and neosexist beliefs, though their endorsement of benevolent sexist beliefs remained unaffected. In a further study designed to reduce endorsement of benevolent sexist beliefs, Becker and Swim (2012) provided participants with information about the harm and prevalence of benevolent sexism. They illustrated that information about harm reduced women's and men's endorsement of benevolent sexist beliefs, while information about both harm and prevalence was necessary to change endorsement of modern sexist beliefs.

Together, as these papers illustrate, successful interventions to reduce sexism are possible. Therefore, the aim of this special issue is to bring together and promote novel theoretical approaches as well as empirically tested methods that identify key antecedents and consequences of diverse ways of confronting and reducing sexism. Moreover, this issue aims at presenting interventions that have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing sexist beliefs.

Overall, a goal of this issue is to provide readers with the knowledge of effective and reliable methods to confront and reduce sexism. If the programs and interventions in this issue are to inform policy and be used in organizational settings they must be evaluated. As a result, many contributions rely on experimental methodology to test the efficacy of certain ways of confrontation or interventions to reduce sexism.

Overview of Contributions to this Issue

All articles in this issue explore ways to confront and reduce sexism. The articles are organized according to two major themes: the first section deals with predictors, moderators, and strategies of confronting sexism; the second section is comprised of articles on predictors, moderators, and strategies of interventions to reduce sexism.

Confronting Sexism

In the first paper, Ashburn-Nardo, Blanchar, Petersson, Morris and Goodwin (2014) point to the role of an important moderating situational variable, namely the perpetrator's power in confronting sexism. Results of two experiments illustrate

that perpetrator power inhibits direct confrontation intentions. Because the costs of confronting a high power perpetrator are perceived to be high, others in the situation feel less responsible and indecisive about what to do.

The second paper, written by Drury and Kaiser (2014), focuses on the role of bystanders (allies) in confronting sexism. In their review, they highlight that although men are less likely to confront sexism compared to women (with an analysis of the barriers to men's confronting), when men do confront, they are perceived as more legitimate than women who confront. The reasons as to why men's confronting is seen as more legitimate are then discussed, including that men are not seen as direct beneficiaries to the sexism reduction that comes with confronting and that men are not stereotyped as hypersensitive and thus their confrontation is seen as reflecting objective reality more so than women's. Finally, the policy implications of men's confronting is discussed, both in terms of encouraging men to become allies, and how women's confronting can gain insights from the legitimacy that is often ascribed to men's confrontations.

In the third paper, Gervais and Hillard (2014) report the results of a study that tested perceptions of leaders who confront prejudice. They manipulated the message of confronting (direct vs. indirect), the source (male leader vs. female leader), and the context (public vs. private). Results show that in line with gender role prescriptions, participants evaluated a male leader more favorably when he confronted indirectly and publically, and evaluated a female leader more favorably when she confronted indirectly and privately. Moreover, participants perceived the statement as more sexist when it was confronted publically than privately. The authors discuss the potential costs to women of confronting sexism privately.

Next, Becker and Barreto (2014) examine different ways of confronting sexism. They investigated how a female target is perceived by women and men depending on whether she confronts a sexist perpetrator nonaggressively, confronts aggressively, or chooses not to respond to the sexist incident. Results show that perceivers evaluated the nonaggressive confrontation most favorably and supported it more than the aggressive way and the nonresponse. In particular, women weakly identified and men highly identified with their gender felt more hostility towards and had a less positive impression of the aggressive confronter (compared to the nonaggressive confronter).

In the last paper of this section, Buchanan, Settles, Hall, and O'Connor (2014) review system-level interventions designed to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment in the workplace, and organizational responses to those who confront or report sexual harassment. They first describe why sexual harassment occurs, namely that certain workplaces create a permissive climate or espouse hyper-masculine values. Next, they discuss how this insight into the reason why sexual harassment occurs informs ways to reduce harassment. They then highlight effective strategies for reducing harassment. Finally, using the U.S. military as a case study, they detail the consequences to individuals who confronted

and reported sexism, especially women, concluding with a discussion of how organizations can reduce sexual harassment by removing or reducing the barriers that accompany reporting on sexual harassment.

Interventions for Reducing Sexism

Cundiff, Zawadzki, Danube, and Shields (2014) report two intervention studies that examine how reactance and self-efficacy elicited during an intervention influence the recognition of sexism as harmful and the intention to engage in behaviors to address subtle sexism. They compare experiential learning, in the form of the WAGES-Academic, either to a condition in which information is provided without experiential learning or to a group activity control condition. Results indicate that WAGES, compared to providing only information, increased the recognition of everyday sexism as harmful, and promoted behavioral intentions to seek information about gender equity and discuss it with others. The different outcomes obtained by WAGES compared to information only were due to WAGES evoking less reactance and promoting self-efficacy. Results are then discussed in terms of how policy regarding diversity training could be shaped to increase its utility and effectiveness.

Case, Hensley, and Anderson (2014) report two intervention studies aimed to raise awareness of heterosexual and male privilege among college students. They test different elements of learning in both studies compared to a control condition, namely the effectiveness of reading a list of privileges of being heterosexual or male combined with reflective writing, or the effectiveness of watching a video after which volunteers discuss ways that heterosexual and male privileges brings advantages to their lives combined with reflective writing. Both studies were successful in that the interventions increased awareness of heterosexual privilege and increased internal motivations to respond without prejudice (Study 1), and reduced endorsement of modern sexism (Study 2).

De Lemus, Navarro, Megías, Velásquez, and Ryan (2014) report three intervention studies to reduce hostile and benevolent sexism in Argentina, Spain, and El Salvador. They developed a 20-hour gender-training program for women and men based on Pratto and Walker's (2004) power and gender model, including information about gender as a social construction, recourses, and social obligations and ideologies. Following the intervention, they measured participants' hostile and benevolent sexism and intention to engage in collective action. All three studies were successful in reducing participants' sexist beliefs.

Calogero and Tylka (2014) discuss a particular manifestation of sexism, the sexual objectification of women's bodies, and the consequences that sexual objectification has for women. They note the prevalence and seeming normativity of objectification, and describe these factors as a large part of why it is so difficult to reduce sexual objectification. Drawing from system justification theory and

objectification theory, they propose that the key targets to disrupting the system of sexual objectification include adjustments to both a self and societal perspective on women's bodies.

Finally, Glick (2014) comments on this issue by highlighting that this issue brings about increased efforts to develop theory-inspired and research-tested interventions for confronting and reducing sexism.

Conclusion

Sexism continues to be pervasive in society despite years of policy and research aimed at reducing sexism. Thus, a multipronged approach is needed to understand when and how sexism can be confronted, and endorsement of sexist attitudes can be reduced. Moreover, good intentions to prevent sexism are not enough as individuals may hold, and act on, sexist beliefs that are implicit. The articles presented in this issue represent important starting points for how to approach sexism with the aims of addressing and eliminating it. Optimistically the presented work demonstrates that sexism is neither permanent nor inevitable. Yet, it also suggests that much more work needs to be done as sexist actions continue to be performed, and people, women and men alike, continue to hold sexist attitudes. For progress, it is vital to recognize that sexism harms everybody, men as well as women, either directly or indirectly, and therefore efforts to create lasting change must come from all individuals.

References

- Ashburn-Nardo, L., Blanchar, J. C., Petersson, J., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2014). Do you say something when it's your boss? The role of perpetrator power in prejudice confrontation. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 615–636.
- Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2008). The confronting prejudiced responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*, 332–342. doi: 10.5465/AMLE.2008.34251671.
- Ayres, M. M., Friedman, C. K., & Leaper, C. (2009). Individual and situational factors related to young women's likelihood of confronting sexism in their everyday lives. *Sex Roles, 61*, 449–460. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9635-3.
- Barreto, M., Ryan, M. K., & Schmitt, M. (2009). *The glass ceiling in the 21st century: Understanding barriers to gender equality*. Washington, DC: APA. doi:10.1037/11863-000.
- Becker, J. C., & Barreto, M. (2014). Ways to go: Men's and women's support for aggressive and non-aggressive confrontation of sexism as a function of gender identification. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 668–686.
- Becker, J. C., Glick, P., Ilic, M., & Bohner, G. (2011). Damned if she does, damned if she doesn't? Social consequences of accepting versus rejecting benevolent sexist offers for the target and perpetrator. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 761–773. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.823.
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the unseen: Attention to daily encounters with sexism as a way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*, 227–242. doi: 10.1177/0361684310397509.

- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2012). Reducing endorsement of benevolent and modern sexist beliefs: Differential effects of addressing harm versus pervasiveness of benevolent sexism. *Social Psychology, 43*(3), 127–137. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000091.
- Blanchard, F. A., Crandall, C. S., Brigham, J. C., & Vaughn, L. A. (1994). Condemning and condoning racism: A social context approach to interracial settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 993–997. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.993.
- Brinkman, B. G., & Rickard, K. M. (2009). College students' descriptions of everyday gender prejudice. *Sex Roles, 61*, 461–475. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9643-3.
- Buchanan, N. T., Settles, I. H., Hall, A. T., & O'Connor, R. C. (2014). A review of organizational strategies for reducing sexual harassment: Insights from the U.S. military. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 687–702.
- Calogero, R. M., & Tylka, T. L. (2014). Sanctioning resistance to sexual objectification: An integrative system justification perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 763–778.
- Case, K. A., Hensley, R., & Anderson, A. (2014). Reflecting on heterosexual and male privilege: Interventions to raise awareness. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 722–740.
- Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist, 64*, 170–180. doi: 10.1037/a0014564.
- Cundiff, J. L., Zawadzki, M. J., Danube, C. L., & Shields, S. A. (2014). Using experiential learning to increase the recognition of everyday sexism as harmful: The WAGES intervention. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 703–721.
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 532–544. doi: 10.1177/0146167202250923.
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 784–803. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784.
- de Lemus, S., Navarro, L., Megías, J. L., Velásquez, M., & Ryan, E. (2014). From sex to gender: A university intervention to reduce sexism in Argentina, Spain, and El Salvador. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 741–762.
- Dodd, E. H., Giuliano, T. A., Boutell, J. M., & Moran, B. E. (2001). Respected or rejected: Perceptions of women who confront sexist remarks. *Sex Roles, 45*, 567–577. doi: 10.1023/A:1014866915741.
- Drury, B. J., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Allies against sexism: The role of men in confronting sexism. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 637–652.
- Feagin, J. R., & Sikes, M. P. (1994). *Living with racism: The black middle-class experience*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society* (pp. 173–196). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gervais, S. J., & Hillard, A. L. (2014). Confronting sexism as persuasion: Effects of a confrontation's source, message, and context. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 653–667.
- Gervais, S. J., Hillard, A. L., & Vescio, T. K. (2010). Confronting sexism: The role of relationship orientation and gender. *Sex Roles, 63*, 463–474. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9838-7.
- Glick, P. (2014). Commentary: Encouraging confrontation. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 779–791.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491–512. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23*, 519–536. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00379.x.
- Hyers, L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to anti-Black racism, anti-semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles, 56*, 1–12. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9142-8.
- Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 254–263. doi: 10.1177/0146167201272010.
- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2003). Derogating the victim: The interpersonal consequences of blaming events on discrimination. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 227–237. doi: 10.1177/13684302030063001.
- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2004). A stress and coping perspective on confronting sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28, 168–178. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00133.x.
- Lee, E. A., Soto, J. A., Swim, J. K., & Bernstein, M. J. (2012). Bitter reproach or sweet revenge: Cultural differences in response to racism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(7), 920–932. doi: 10.1177/0146167212440292.
- Major, B., Quinton, W., & McCoy, S. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of attributions to discrimination: Theoretical and empirical advances. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 34, pp. 251–330). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Mallett, R. K., & Wagner, D. E., (2011). The unexpectedly positive consequences of confronting sexism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 215–220. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.001.
- Miller, C. T., & Kaiser, C. R. (2001). A theoretical perspective on coping with stigma. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 73–92. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00202.
- Pratto, F., & Walker, A. (2004). The bases of gendered power. In A. H. Eagly, A. E. Beall, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender* (2nd ed., pp. 242–268). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751–783. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751.
- Rasinski, H. M., & Czopp, A. M. (2010). The effect of target status on witnesses' reactions to confrontations of bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32, 8–16. doi: 10.1080/01973530903539754.
- Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on cultural beliefs in social relations. *Gender & Society* 18, 510–531. doi: 10.1177/0891243204265269.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2008). *The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., Salvatore, J., & Hill, D. M. (2006). Silence is not golden: Intrapersonal consequences of not confronting prejudice. In S. Levin & C. Van Laar (Eds.), *Social stigma and group inequality: Social psychological perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shields, S. A. (2008). Intersectionality of social identities: A gender perspective. *Sex Roles*, 59, 301–311. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9501-8.
- Shields, S. A., Zawadzki, M. J., & Johnson, R. N. (2011). The impact of the “Workshop Activity for Gender Equity Simulation in the Academy” (WAGES-Academic) in demonstrating cumulative effects of gender bias. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4, 120–129. doi: 10.1037/a0022953.
- Stangor, C., Swim, J. K., Sechrist, G. B., DeCoster, J., VanAllen, K. L., & Ottenbreit, A. (2003). Ask, answer and announce: Three stages in perceiving and responding to discrimination. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 277–311). Hove, UK: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis.
- Swim, J. K., Eysseil, K. M., Murdoch, E. Q., & Ferguson M. J. (2010). Self-silencing to sexism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66, 493–507. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01658.x.
- Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me—what did you just say?: Women's public and private responses to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, 68–88. doi:10.1006/jesp.1998.1370.
- Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (2009). Sexism. In: T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 407–430). New York: Psychology Press.
- Swim, J. K., & Thomas, M. A. (2005). Responding to everyday discrimination: A synthesis of research on goal-directed, self-regulatory coping behaviors. In S. Levin, & C. Van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality* (pp. 105–128). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Zawadzki, M. J., Danube, C. L., & Shields, S. A. (2012). How to talk about gender inequity in the workplace: Using WAGES as an experiential learning tool to reduce reactance and promote self-efficacy. *Sex Roles*, 67, 605–616. doi: 10.1007/s11199-012-0181-z.
- Zawadzki, M. J., Shields, S. A., Danube, C. L., & Swim, J. K. (2013). Using WAGES to raise awareness of and reduce endorsement of sexism via experiential learning. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38, 75–92. doi: 10.1177/0361684313498573.

JULIA C. BECKER received her PhD in social psychology from the University of Marburg in 2008 and is a professor of social psychology at the University of Osnabrueck (Germany). Her main research interests focus on ways to explain why disadvantaged group members tolerate societal systems that produce social and economic inequality and how legitimizing ideologies (such as sexism) help to maintain unequal status relations. Building on this, she is interested in people's motivation in activism for social change and in the consequences of collective action participation.

MATTHEW J. ZAWADZKI received his PhD in social psychology and women's studies from The Pennsylvania State University in 2012. He is currently a professor in Psychological Sciences at the University of California, Merced. His research investigates how sexist attitudes can be reduced, emphasizing the mechanisms by which sexism reduction interventions prove successful or not. He is also interested in examining how psychological processes affect health, including how stress gets "under the skin" and can cause disease. His long term goals involve applying social psychological research to health-related domains with a focus on creating, testing, and implementing interventions to improve health.

STEPHANIE A. SHIELDS is a professor of psychology and women's studies at The Pennsylvania State University where she coordinates the dual-title PhD in women's studies and psychology. Her research is at the intersection of human emotion, gender, and feminist psychology. In addition to further development and testing of WAGES, her current work focuses on the micropolitics of emotion in everyday life, perception of emotion regulation in others, and theoretical and methodological issues relevant to integrating an intersectionality of social identities perspective into psychological research.