Table A. Initial List of Everyday Gender Discrimination

#	**Colleagues or clients…**
1	make negative assumptions about your personality based on gender stereotypes
2	treat you as if you were not competent because of your gender
3	ignore your ideas or treat them as if they didn't matter because of your gender
4	exclude you from informal groups or work activities because of your gender
5	share inappropriate jokes or memes about your gender
6	give you unwanted sexual attention or make inappropriate sexual comments
7	call you a sexist name
8	mock, mimic, or pick on you because of your gender
9	threaten you with harm (physical or otherwise) because of your gender

Table B. Robustness Checks with Three Alternative Samples

Variables	Model 1 (Completely Similar Tasks)	Model 2 (Someone Else Determines Work Location)	Model 3 (50% or Less Time Spent On-Site)
Remote Location	-0.08**	-0.14***	-0.07***
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Gender of Interaction Partners			
Slightly more women than men	0.03	0.17*	-0.00
	(0.09)	(0.07)	(0.06)
Men and women equally	-0.04	0.13	-0.03
	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.07)
Slightly more men	0.11	0.42***	0.13
	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.08)
Only or mostly men	-0.07	0.26	0.36***
	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.11)
High Monitoring	-0.01	0.04	0.00
	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.04)
Frequent Informal Interactions	0.05	0.01	0.03
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Frequent Formal Interactions	0.04	0.05	0.08*
	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Constant	0.19*	0.11	0.17*
	(0.09)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	638	852	1144

Notes. The reference group for remote location is on-site; the reference group for the gender of interaction partners is "only or mostly women." Because all models include individual fixed effects, they account for location-invariant characteristics, including *age under 30, motherhood, manager, % time spent on-site, white, married, university education, organization > 1000 employees,* and *part-time worker. *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05.*

Appendix A. Recruitment Strategy for Hybrid Worker Survey

We adopted two sampling approaches to recruit female, professional workers with hybrid arrangements.

SAMPLING APPROACH 1

We invited participants who met the following criteria on Prolific:

1. Affirmed in a standard Prolific prescreening question that "I sometimes work from a central place of work and sometimes remotely."
2. Identified as women between ages 18-75 located in the United States.
3. Indicated that they were currently employed in professional roles, including upper management, middle management, junior management, trained professional, consultant, researcher, self-employed/partner, support staff, or administrative staff.

SAMPLING APPROACH 2

Our second approach accounts for the fact that hybrid work arrangements can change quickly. Some women who did not have hybrid arrangements when they completed the standard Prolific prescreening question about hybrid work (item 1 above) might have since transitioned to a hybrid arrangement without updating their profile. To ensure that women with more recent hybrid arrangements were also represented, we ran an additional survey to identify professional women who met sampling criteria (2) and (3) above, but did not affirm that they had a hybrid arrangement in the Prolific prescreening question (item 1). In that short survey, we asked:

Please consider whether you worked **remotely** (for example, from home or a coffee shop), **on-site** (for example, an office or other central site), or **in both locations** in the past month. If you have more than one job, consider only your main job.

Which of the following best describes your **most recent month at work**?

- I worked **entirely REMOTELY** and did not work from an office or central site.
- I worked **entirely ON-SITE** and did not work from a remote location.
- I worked **both REMOTELY and ON-SITE.** I spent some of my time working from a remote location and some of my time at an office or central site.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

We invited those who indicated that they worked both remotely and on-site to participate. Respondents from both sampling approaches took the same survey. Our decision to invite respondents via the second

approach was theoretically motivated. We recognized that many workers were undergoing post-pandemic changes in work arrangements around the time of our May 2023 survey; we wanted to ensure that we did not systematically exclude workers whose hybrid arrangements emerged more recently. As an additional assurance that respondents were currently engaged in hybrid work, we had all survey participants confirm at the outset that they had a hybrid arrangement in the past month.

The majority (82%) of respondents came from the first sampling approach. Comparing respondents recruited via approaches 1 and 2, we find non-significant differences on key characteristics. Respondents from both approaches do not differ significantly in their likelihood of experiencing everyday gender discrimination in the past month (t = -0.58, p = .56). We also re-ran Model 1, Table 3 and included an interaction term for *remote work X sampling approach*. We found a non-significant coefficient (β = -0.01, p = .677), suggesting a non-significant difference between participants from each sampling approach and their difference in likelihood of discrimination between locations. Further, results of two-sided t-tests confirm non-significant differences between respondents from each sampling approach on age (t = 0.05, p = .96), gender composition of the interaction set (t = 1.67, p = .10), and percentage of time spent on-site (t = 0.92, p = .36). These results suggest that respondents recruited via the two approaches do not differ in ways that would meaningfully affect our overall findings.

Appendix B. Exploring Differences in Everyday Gender Discrimination Experiences by Location

In a series of exploratory analyses, we investigated whether different types of women (younger versus older; those whose interaction partner sets reflect different gender compositions) reported different types of everyday gender discrimination by location. We began by considering differences between younger and older women. We found that being underestimated was the most commonly reported type of discrimination for both age groups and in both locations. However, the second most common type of on-site discrimination differs by age group. When working on-site, women under 30 reported personality-related discrimination as the second most common form, whereas women over 30 reported being asked to perform tasks unrelated to their jobs. Thus, when working on-site, younger and older women have somewhat different discrimination experiences. Otherwise, younger and older women experience similar types of everyday gender discrimination in both locations.

Next, we examined the types of everyday gender discrimination experienced by women with primarily male versus primarily female interaction partners.[1] We found that the most frequent types of discrimination—being underestimated and personality-related discrimination—are consistent across locations regardless of the predominant gender of women's interaction partners. However, one type of discrimination differed between groups: being excluded from informal groups or work activities. Women interacting mainly with other women rarely reported being excluded (1% on-site and 1% remotely). However, among women with primarily male interaction partners, 11% reported being excluded on-site and 4% remotely. It appears that women with primarily male interaction partners are more likely to be excluded, particularly when working on-site. This finding echoes research demonstrating that female professionals are often excluded from male-dominated social engagements and informal professional gatherings, which often take place in-person (e.g., Morgan and Martin 2006). But despite this difference,

[1] Women with primarily male interaction partners work with *only or mostly men* or *slightly more men than women.* Women with primarily female interaction partners work with *only or mostly women* or *slightly more women than men.*

women's experiences of everyday gender discrimination were quite consistent across gender composition groups and remote versus on-site locations.

Appendix C. Supplemental Survey C: Work Preferences

In September 2023, we invited all Prolific participants who completed our main survey to take a "short survey about work preferences." We were able to resample 55.9% of the original survey participants, yielding a total of 610 respondents for our supplemental survey. Using a 7-point scale, participants rated the extent to which they preferred remote versus on-site work (7 = strongly prefer working on-site, 4 = equally prefer working remotely and working on-site, 1 = strongly prefer working remotely).

We took several steps to ensure that our measurement of everyday gender discrimination (captured in our main survey) did not bias, and was not biased by, our measurement of participants' general preferences for remote versus on-site work. First, we fielded the supplemental survey (focused on participants' general preference for on-site versus remote work) as a separate survey. This was advantageous because asking participants about both issues in the same survey and at the same time might have biased their responses. For example, asking numerous questions about gender discrimination and thus strongly focusing participants' attention on that issue might have led them to overstate their preference for the location in which they experienced less discrimination. Second, we obscured connections between the two surveys. Invitation to the main survey came from the first author, and invitations to the supplemental survey came from the second author. Third, to further obscure the purpose of the supplemental survey, we included our question of interest next to two filler questions, focused on preferences for routine versus creative tasks and preferences for frequent versus infrequent feedback at work.