

VIEW to the U transcribed
Season 2, Women in Academia, Episode #3
Professor Sonia Kang, Department of Management –
Institute for Management and Innovation (IMI) at U of T Mississauga and
Organizational Behaviour and HR Management Area at Rotman School of Management, U of T

Sonia Kang (SK): I think that the most important message that I want people to take away from my work is that it shouldn't be the responsibility of minorities or women or anyone else to try to figure out how to navigate the system in order to avoid discrimination. The only way that we can solve the problem is if we change the structure of the system itself. And so the work that I'm doing now is pretty much all aimed at that goal to try to figure out what small tweaks we can make to the way that information is presented or the way that decisions are made or the way that people are evaluated in order to make progress towards diversity and inclusion.

Carla DeMarco (CD): Diversity and inclusion are two big themes for today's guest on VIEW the U. On this edition of the podcast, Professor Sonia Kang charts her research path in the Department of Management within the Institute for Management and Innovation at University of Toronto Mississauga. She discusses her broad program of research that touches on several areas including managing multiple identities, résumé whitening, the psychological foundations of discrimination, and the effects of stigma and stereotyping and their connection to age, race, gender, and also a new line of inquiry, looking at the stigma associated with mental health.

With this second season of the podcast focused on women in academia, Sonia also imparts some advice for anyone with their sights set on a scholarly career, but that could be of use for most women who are trying to find balance in any occupation.

Hello, and welcome to VIEW to the U, an eye on UTM research. I'm Carla DeMarco at U of T Mississauga. VIEW to the U is a monthly podcast that will feature UTM faculty members from a range of disciplines who will illuminate some of the inner workings of the science labs, and enlighten the social sciences and humanities hubs at UTM.

Sonia Kang is an Assistant Professor of Organizational Behaviour and Human Resource Management in the Department of Management at the University of Toronto Mississauga, and she holds a cross appointment in the Organizational Behaviour and HR Management area at Rotman School of Management at U of T. Her research examines methods for optimizing diversity and the barriers associated with trying to achieve this aim. She is particularly interested in the experience and effects of prejudice and discrimination, and examines these phenomena across the lifespan from childhood to old age.

I understand that your research spans across several areas including identity and race, optimizing diversity, and inclusion and organization stigma and discrimination stereotyping and its effects on how people perform cognitively, so I was wondering if you could give me a bit more detail about your research.

SK:

Sure. So, as you mentioned, my research is aimed at understanding development, experience, and reduction of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination, all sort of with the goal of helping to increase diversity and inclusion. So, broadly speaking, my work fits into three sort of overarching themes: experiencing and coping with stigma, psychological foundations of stigma and discrimination, and then managing multiple identities.

Within the experiencing and coping with stigma line, I've looked at the effects of stigma and stereotypes related to age, to race, and gender, and I have some new work looking at stigma based on mental health now. Within the second line, psychological foundations, I've examined how children process information about stigma at different ages, how the brain responds to stigma-related information, and how perceptions of the intentionality of discrimination impact the kinds of interventions that we can use to improve race relations.

And then finally in the third line – managing multiple identities – I look at the experience and perception of multiple identities. So, each of us identifies with multiple different groups simultaneously. So, this can be things like our gender group or our racial group, our age group, as well as groups that are related to things like our occupation or hobbies or interests, any other social roles. So, for example, for me I could say I'm a woman, I'm an Indian, I'm Canadian, I'm a professor, a mother, a sister, I like skiing, I'm an Albertan. And all of these different identities have the potential to affect how others see me and also how I experience my life. And all of my research in that line has really focused in on how those multiple identities are perceived and how we can manage them and really how we can use them to our advantage.

CD:

Very interesting. And so I was wondering then if you could give me a couple of examples of current projects that you're working on.

SK:

Sure. So, one example is a project that I'm working on with my PhD student, Joyce He . And we're looking at the effects of sexism on a variety of different outcomes that are really important to professional life. So, in one study we collected a large sample of real job applications. We asked people to send in the applications that they'd used when applying for jobs. And we looked at how women used language to manage their gender cues when they're applying for jobs in female- or male-dominated fields.

So, you'll probably have heard of research showing that men and women can differ in the way that they use language. So, women are socialized in such a way that they tend to be more emotionally expressive. They use more adjectives, more references to emotion, but also more non-assertive. So, they use

negations like “but” and hedges in their speech. Whereas men tend to be more egocentric, so they use more first person pronouns when they're talking, so saying things like, “I,” more action based in their speech. So, in a job application, that might come across as a woman saying something like, “I was a member of a team that developed X product,” whereas a man might take more personal ownership and agency over that and say, “I developed the first prototype of X.” A woman might say something like, “I think that I'm well suited for this position,” whereas a man would say, “I am well suited for this position.”

In our work, we've been interested in seeing how women might use this language strategically in an attempt to actually avoid being discriminated against when they're applying specifically for male-dominated jobs specifically by downplaying feminine cues in their job applications, so, using less communal language, being more assertive. And that's what we've found so far. When we examine the types of language people use in their cover letters when they're applying for different types of jobs, women tend to use fewer feminine cues. They do things like use less communal language, less qualifiers when they're writing more direct speech. Men, on the other hand, don't differ in the way that they are presenting themselves, which makes sense. They're not really expecting to be discriminated against.

The unfortunate thing about this, what we find is that the attempts that women make in order to avoid discrimination might actually backfire. So, when they do things like use less communal language in their job applications, they're actually less likely to get the job, no matter what kind of job it is, because people have these expectations about how women should act, how they should use language. So, the next step in this work is to figure out how to make this effect go away.

So, what we're really trying to do is do this in a structural way. So we don't want sort of a “fix the women” intervention where we try to teach women to be more assertive or more direct, because that's not necessarily better. The point that we're trying to make here with our studies is that when we're thinking about inclusion really we have to make these systemic structural changes so that everyone who has the knowledge and the skills and abilities can succeed, not just make it so that everyone acts sort of in a regimented way. So, in another study we're trying to test an intervention to change the way that leadership is framed, and we're focusing on leadership, of course, because it's traditionally been dominated by men. So, what we're trying to do in that work is really leave women alone, so not try to change anything about how women are presenting themselves, or leaning in or leaning out, or whatever, and instead really focus on whether we can reframe the concept of leadership itself. So, can we sort of reduce the dissonance between perceptions of women and perceptions of leaders so that we can actually increase the proportion of women who apply for leadership positions and can see themselves succeeding there. And that work is funded, in part, by the Institute for Gender in the Economy at Rotman.

And then I have another project that I can tell you about, which is looking at the effects of stigma as it's related to mental health, especially for people who have been diagnosed with depression and anxiety.

So, I've been working on that project mainly with Arunima Kapoor, who's a UofT alumna, and we look at a couple of different projects there that compare stigma based on mental versus physical illness. So, in work that we did together for her undergraduate honour's thesis, we found that people who have gaps in their employment after taking off time to deal with mental illness like depression are penalized more severely than people who take off the same amount of time to deal with a physical illness. So, if someone says on their cover letter, "I have this gap of six months on my résumé because I was diagnosed with diabetes, I was figuring out how to deal with that," people have no problem hiring them. They're like, "That's great. Come and work for us." If someone says that they took off six months to deal with depression, all of a sudden we saw that the likelihood that the person with the same credentials would be hired goes way down.

So, in the next step, we even compared depression to a physical illness that manifests with symptoms that are similar to depression. So, we presented raters with a job candidate that had to take off time to deal with hypothyroidism, which has symptoms that are very similar to that of depression, so things like fatigue, depressed mood, inability to focus. And again, we found that only the person with the mental illness was discriminated against. So, it's definitely not about the symptoms, but it's about the stigma, and that's a huge problem, again, because we have to figure out what structural changes can be made to include people who are living with mental illnesses like depression and anxiety. That's a huge group of people who we're missing out on, including hiring into companies. And it's not that hard really to accommodate them. So, we're currently working on a project that takes her thesis sort of out of the lab and into the real workforce, and we're starting with a series of studies that examines the challenges that are actually faced by people with depression and anxiety as they're sort of navigating that return to work after having taken off time to deal with their illness. And that work is happening right now, and it's actually funded by a grant from the Connaught Foundation [UofT fund]. So we're working on that as we speak.

CD: And getting back to the other study though that you mentioned with regards to the applications and the different language that women use. I'm just curious, okay, so you're mainly focusing on the application stage. Do you go a step further for when people are at the interview stage, or you haven't gone there yet?

SK: We haven't gone there yet, but that's definitely something that we're interested in. And really we want to go even further and look at ... that's what the inclusion side is really about is looking at what happens when you can actually get people hired. So a lot of the work in the diversity spaces sort of focus on those initial

stages, so, how are people recruited, how are people selected, how are they interviewed. But really, once they're in the company, it's like a free for all, and we don't know really what to do with people to make sure that we're including them and creating spaces for people to succeed in. So we're definitely interested in doing work on that side as well.

So, one example of that is related to another project that I'm doing with the Engendering Success in STEM work. And in that one we're looking at different kinds of inclusion programs that we can use in order to create a better, inclusive network space within companies. And so we've actually just started that work right now, trying to design what that intervention might look like.

CD: Oh, you know, I'll just say it, too, for people who don't know what STEM stands for, it's Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and some people are adding an extra 'M' for Medicine, I think. So then that was also a follow up question, I just wanted to ask you a little bit more about the research partnership that you're involved with that's part of this Engendering Success in STEM collaboration. Because as I understand, it's a very large-scale group.

SK: Right. Yeah. That project, so it's Engendering Success in STEM, it's a research partnership that's funded by SSHRC [Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada]; it's a team grant. So our PI on that project is Toni Schmader from UBC, but the team includes 12 other professors from UBC, UofT, Waterloo, SFU, and OSU, as well as probably a couple dozen really awesome graduate and undergraduate students. And the point of the research consortium is to bring together scholars who study gender, social psychology, developmental psychology, organizational psychology with STEM experts from engineering, computer science, and other math and science disciplines. And we're also partnered with a lot of different corporate partners including, for example, GM, Tech is one, PCL Construction. And the purpose of the project is to test out a number of different interventions aimed at creating more inclusive cultures for men and women, for boys and girls as well, in the STEM fields.

So we have four different projects. There's Project Climb, which is focused on using role models to change STEM biases and self beliefs, and that's with elementary-school students. We have the next project, Prism, which is looking at changing boys' and girls' perceived fit into STEM in high school. And then the two projects that I'm involved in, Sync and Rise. And Sync looks at integrating men and women to collaborate effectively and sort of promote each other at the university stage. And then Rise looks at creating these identity-safe interactions inclusive spaces to really foster a sense of being included among early career STEM professionals.

CD: And so the other thing I wanted to ask you about was that I know you had a lot of pickup on one of your articles about résumé whitening. And so I was wondering you could speak a little bit more about that topic.

SK:

So the article that you mentioned is one that I published with my co-authors, Katherine DeCelles, Andras Tilcsik, and Sora Jun, and our research looked at a phenomenon called "résumé whitening," which is when racial minorities conceal or downplay racial cues in job applications really with an attempt to avoid anticipated discrimination in labor markets. So we had started to hear about whitening anecdotally from students. We see it on campus all the time. You know, they mention that this is something that they were doing, their friends were doing, and sometimes even being told to do by a career counsellor. So, a Chinese student named Ming, for example, might choose to go by May, because it's easier for people to say and more recognizable.

At the same time, there was an article in the *New York Times* about whitening, a couple of books, but no one had really done any research to look at whitening in a really controlled scientific way. So, we wanted to know whether whitening was actually something that was happening among minority job seekers, why they were doing it, and also how employers were responding to it.

So we used three different methods in the paper: interviews, an experiment, and a résumé audit study. And our interviews were conducted with black and Asian university students. And we really just wanted to ask them about whether they or anyone that they knew had engaged in whitening and sort of what their motivations were for doing so if they had. In our interviews, we found that roughly a third of participants in the sample said that this was something that they had personally done, and two-thirds in the sample said that they knew someone who had. So, of course, the real number's somewhere in between those. And the main areas that we saw people whitening were in their name, so, like the example that I mentioned, or in the description of their experiences. So they might remove foreign experience or take off a racial qualifier as part of a group or team or something like that.

So, of course when telling us about why they were whitening, it wasn't that surprising. People said that they were whitening in order to tone down their race to avoid discrimination. So, they mentioned that this was something that was really motivated by recognizing that discrimination is out there. And this was an advance in this literature because prior to this people had really focused only on the employer side. So, in terms of labour-market discrimination, there's a lot of interest in sort of what companies are doing to either create discrimination or to try to combat it, but not a lot about what applicants are actually doing to avoid it. They'd been sort of treated as these passive recipients of discrimination, and we knew that's not the case. Obviously people live in the world, they understand what's going on, and they're going to react in some way. So, we really wanted to know that side of the story.

One really important thing that we learned from the interviews was that people mentioned to us that they would whiten *less* or sometimes not at all when they're applying for jobs with employers who explicitly stated that they valued diversity. So, when you go to a website and an employer has a message up there

like, "We're an equal opportunity employer. We encourage people from different backgrounds to apply," people in our study were saying that, "I take that at face value and I won't whiten my résumé when I apply for a job at a company like that."

So, in our next study, in our experiment, we wanted to see is it true, will minorities whiten less when job ads explicitly mention valuing diversity. So, we tested that by creating job ads that did or did not mention diversity, and we asked half of the participants to craft résumés to apply for a pro-diversity job, and then half of them to create résumés to apply for the jobs that didn't mention diversity. And so we could compare the résumés that participants created during the experiment with the full résumés that we asked them to submit to us beforehand. And we found that, as participants told us in the interviews, in the experiment they were half as likely to whiten in response to job ads that mentioned diversity. So, we know that it has an effect on people in this kind of controlled setting.

So, the next thing we wanted to do is find out how organizations themselves respond to these kind of whitened and unwhitened résumés. So, we created résumés for black and Asian applicants, and we varied the extent to which racial information was apparent on them, either it was very obvious that the applicants were black and Asian, or very hard to tell. And we sent out those résumés to 1,600 different jobs, half of them mentioned valuing diversity, half of them didn't. And we created email accounts, phone numbers for the applicants, and just kind of sat back and saw how many call backs that they got. And our main finding across both black and Asian résumés was that the whitened résumés, where it's hard to tell if not impossible to tell that the applicant is black or Asian, was two to two and a half times more likely to get a call back than the unwhitened résumés. And the most important thing was that the gap between the whitened and unwhitened résumés was no smaller for the pro-diversity employers than the employers who didn't mention diversity at all.

CD: And do you ... in that instance though, too, do you look at gender at all?

SK: So, in our applications, we just held gender constant. So we just had male applicants. It would be really interesting to do this and see sort of the intersectional effects. We didn't test it here though.

CD: I don't know if it's surprise ... it's just sad to me. Because even for the ones that say that they're pro-diversity ...

SK: Yeah. So, I think the worst part of the study is that I think that companies that have these kind of pro-diversity statements, I don't think that they're just putting them up for show. They actually want to increase diversity and they've thought hard about it. And I think that they think, "If I have this message up on my website, it's like problem solved, that's it." But, one of the really important implications of our study is that these pro-diversity statements encourage job

applicants to sort of let their guard down and disclose aspects of their identity, like these racial cues in their names or memberships in teams or groups that they normally wouldn't, they would normally hide those aspects of their identity. And so putting up those kinds of statements and not ensuring that there's follow through can actually do more harm than good. Because if those diversity statements encourage applicants to reveal racial cues to an organization that's going to discriminate against them anyway, then it can actually open up minorities to more discrimination. So, for some people, they might have the exact opposite of the intended effect.

CD: And then the other follow-up question I had though was what are your thoughts on either anonymized résumés or blind hiring?

SK: When I talk about this research, people ask this a lot, why does this happen and what can we do? Why do companies bother writing these diversity statements and then not making sure that they're kind of following through?

I think that there's definitely companies out there that are kind of scared of lawsuits and just doing it for show, but I think most of these statements and related policies that people have, diversity training programs, for example, are put into place with good intentions, but they just don't get us very far. And I think that there's a lot of factors to consider, but one of the most important things is related to your question about blind recruitment, is that there's just so much information in these situations.

So, under a situation where we're looking at résumés, first of all, people are looking at maybe 100 or 1,000 résumés for one job, here's time pressure, there's resource pressure. You might be the only person who's been tasked with doing that. There's social conformity pressure, you have to kind of agree with people. But really the big thing is that there's just so much information, and when we have information overload like that, we're likely to sort of fall back on our unconscious or implicit or unintentional biases.

So, I think to the extent that anonymized recruitment can hide information that might activate those biases, then I think it's worth trying out in sort of a systematic rigorous way when there's a demonstrated under-representation of some group. But it's not the only thing that we can do, so I'd also like to see more research looking at things like skills based assessments, so hiring people based on a skills test relevant to what they're actually going to do rather than only on their credentials. Or, like the work that I told you about earlier, so changing job advertisements or descriptions to actually increase the proportion of under-represented groups in the application pool. In any case, all of those things are kind of just for one step, the hiring step, but they won't necessarily help on the inclusion side, so we have to think about that as well.

CD: I'm just thinking, too, this can be extended so many different areas, right? Because it's not just about the hiring. I'm thinking about say, the Canada

research chair program, as an example has made it their statement that they will be trying to have more appointments for women. But if they make this mission that they want to have more female representation, you have to know who the females are, right?

SK: Yeah, absolutely. And also, these are kinds of changes where eventually ... they only go so far. Because eventually, you're going to show up for an interview and people are going to realize what race you are, what gender you are, and that you might have been able to hide up until that point. And so I think it can help, especially in places where we have really demonstrated under-representation of a particular group, I think it can help sort of bring up numbers to a more acceptable baseline level. But, in a lot of situations we might not have that room for movement. So for example, the government of Canada just did their blind recruitment trial. And they reported that there's no evidence that it works, but it's actually not a very good test because they're already kind of over-represented. So, their baseline I think was 47% visible minorities are hired in those positions, which is an over-representation because the visible minority population of Canada is only like 20%. So they're already beyond this hypothetical ceiling so there's not a lot of room for movement there.

So, yeah, I think that these kinds of interventions will have the most effect where we have the worse case scenario going on. But, in most settings, we need more work I think on the inclusion side than on necessarily on this hiring piece.

CD: And so I was also wondering how did you get into this particular field of study in the first place?

SK: So, I think I've been really interested in these types of social issues for really as long as I can remember. I'm really motivated by this problem, so it's kind of kept me going. I really hate seeing smart, capable people sort of held down by the system. I have a problem with authority, so that's part of it. And I think in terms of where I am right now, I think I'm really lucky because I got awesome training as an undergraduate and grad student in psychology on really sort of basic scientific design. So, how to run and design a reliable valid experiment, how to analyze, interpret results. And now I'm in a position that allows me to take all of that into a really applied space and hopefully have a positive impact on people's lives. So I think I was really interested in the initial problem, and then through a number of awesome, lucky coincidences I kind of ended up in a place where I can apply all of that training to hopefully try and help that problem.

CD: And so then that leads into my next question: what do you feel is the biggest impact of your work?

SK: So, I'm going to tell you what I want to be the impact of my work. So, I think that the most important message that I want people to take away from my work is that it shouldn't be the responsibility of minorities or women or anyone else to try to figure out how to navigate the system in order to avoid discrimination.

The only way that we can solve the problem is if we change the structure of the system itself. And so, the work that I'm doing now is pretty much all aimed at that goal, to try to figure out what small tweaks we can make to the way that information is presented or the way that decisions are made or the way that people are evaluated in order to make progress towards diversity and inclusion.

CD:

[Interlude music]

Coming up, women in academia. Sonia offers words of encouragement and advice for women looking to embark on a career in academia with a focus on finding balance in a challenging environment.

This season of VIEW to the U is a focus on women in academia, and there's been a lot of discussion lately of promoting and supporting women in all careers. And so I'm just asking my interviewees this season if you've ever personally come across any challenges in the course of your career, or also if you haven't, because sometimes people are very fortunate to not have that, if you have any words of encouragement or tips for young women who are looking to pursue a career in academia, or either in your discipline or otherwise.

SK:

Okay. So many challenges. So, academia is so many challenging things *all* at the same time. So, it's difficult to get into, it's difficult to succeed in. It's competitive. It's isolating. There's rejection, there's failure. There's demands on your time, and they're constant demands on your time. And, from what I can tell, they just grow and grow as you advance in your career. You have to work really, really hard to maintain balance otherwise you just end up working all the time. And then there's a lot of social challenges. So, academia can be a really cliquey, like any other job there's a lot of nepotism, there's insecurities, there's big egos. And then there's the stuff that you might be interested in that I think are challenges that are unique to women, like there's increased expectations of emotional labour, service work. There's biases in peer and student evaluation. There's sort of a constant battle to prove yourself as an expert. Definitely a lot of challenges.

And, I think, that in terms of the second part of your question, which is kind of like tips, I think for me the most important thing is having a really great support network. So, I'm really lucky because my husband is also an academic, so we can provide really great support for each other because we kind of get the challenges and the demands and provide advice that actually makes sense. We met in grad school, actually, so definitely the friends that you make in grad school are really important.

And then the other part of your academic support network that's so critical are your mentors. So, you need people that you can look to for advice and guidance and knowledge, and people who are willing to open doors for you, and make things happen. And you really have to seek that out. And also I think you have to make yourself *mentorable*. There's a give and take there, so that means being

accountable and doing good work and meeting your deadlines and taking things seriously. So, I think that part is really important.

Other things I think are ... Like I said about sort of the competitiveness, I think it's really easy in academia to get caught up in social comparisons. So, it's easy to start feeling bad about yourself if you compare yourself to others. So I think it's really important to focus on doing your own work and making your own work as good as you can and not focus too much on everyone else's kind of like highlight reel, they're achievements. And then just practical things, being organized is so important. So I am a major scheduler. I should show you my calendar. You have to use a schedule, you have to stick to it. You really have to schedule things like break and exercise into it otherwise you never do those things, which I really find more and more again as you advance in your career. Schedule things like self care, set goals and deadlines, and really be efficient with your work time.

So, it's so easy in academia, I find, to get sucked into long work hours because you can work whenever. But, what you really need to do, I think, is be working smart with the time that you *do* have.

So this is a tip which I haven't learned myself, so if people learn how to do it, they can tell me, but I think when we hear about 60-, 70-, 80-hour work weeks, I think a lot of that is a myth and people are not really using that time efficiently. Like, just because you're sitting at your desk doesn't mean that you're working. So I think you need to be more efficient in the time that you do have. That said, there's definitely times when you do have to work on evenings and weekends, but try not to make that the norm because it's a really hard habit to get out of when you have to get out of it. So, for example, I have a child now, so I can't really just work all the time in the evenings and weekends. And if you're relying on that time and then you lose it, it's really hard. So you have to learn how to be efficient in small amounts of time.

I think that's it. I mean, the last thing I guess is just to be realistic about your possibilities and know that it's going to be a hard road. Don't expect it to be easy.

CD: You mentioned mentors because I know that is a huge thing, and most of us have benefited from having some great mentor. Do you have someone that was kind of a mentor?

SK: Yeah, absolutely. So my PhD advisor is Alison Chasteen. She's amazing. She's a professor in the Psychology Department.

CD: Is she at U of T?

SK: Yeah, at U of T. And so, a lot of the things that I do now that I think make me effective are things that I either learned from her, kind of reinforced in my own

behaviour. So she's again super organized, super diplomatic. So when I'm thinking about how to respond to a frustrating situation, I'll often think about how she might respond to that, which has been really helpful. I think a lot of my own mentoring style with my students now is kind of taken from that model because I found it worked really well for me.

And then also just peer mentors, I think. So now my colleague here, Soo Min Toh [IMI at UTM], is someone that I consider a mentor. I really look up to her as someone who, again, diplomacy's there. She gets a lot done. And then Sarah Kaplan [Rotman at UofT] is another person whom I'm working with now who I really look to as a mentor and a sponsor and someone who is a great model of how I would like to develop in my own career.

CD: And you also raised a point about I think women in leadership, and also that's something that's been coming up a lot more. I went to go to a Women in Leadership panel, and there were some interesting insights that came out of that because it was all women who they're either the director of all these sort of creative, cultural centers, but the point that was brought up was just about women not being as good to ask for things. And so I'm thinking about when you've got a mentor, again it takes a certain amount of self confidence or just that ability to ask someone for help or that sort of guidance.

SK: Yeah, absolutely. I think there's work on this that women are sort of less likely to self nominate for a promotion or less likely to put themselves forward for opportunities, and that's kind of just the way that we're socialized, it's not an essential quality of women. Not all women are like this, it's just kind of a product of the way that we're socialized. And I think that having a really strong mentor is really important, and particularly for women to see other women in those positions. And I think it's really hard in fields where women are under-represented, and there's just simply not that many women to choose from as a mentor. But hopefully that will also improve as we kind of improve things at the bottom, hopefully those women will continue and then be able to rise up to positions of power where they can then mentor people in the future as well.

CD: Those are all the questions I have.

SK: Okay. Awesome.

CD: So, thank you so much for coming in, Sonia.

SK: Thank you.

CD: I would like to thank everyone for listening to today's show.

I would especially like to thank my guest, Sonia Kang, for coming in to speak about her work in the Department of Management and ME at UTM. Thank you

to the Office of the Vice-Principal, Research at UTM for their support, and for everyone who has expressed their interest in this podcast.

Please feel free to get in touch with me. My contact information is on our SoundCloud page if you have feedback, or if there's someone from UTM that you'd like to see featured on VIEW to the U.

Last, and as always, thank you to Tim Lane for his tunes and support.

Thank you.