Heather O'Neill 0:09
Hello, everyone, you are listening to the tech thinking aloud podcast. Each episode we bring tech articles to life by reading them aloud and discussing their importance to the tech community and the world. We're your hosts, Heather and Jim O'Neill.

Jim O'Neill 0:27
Today's article is titled, gender bias turned out to be a wonderful indicator of weworks in competence. It's written by Sarah Green Carmichael. The article is featured at latimes.com, and you can find the link in the show notes. Now, here's the article.

Exactly zero people should be surprised by the recent filing of a pregnancy discrimination lawsuit against we work. Bad management and gender bias tend to go together like poison ivy and a rash. Medina barty, former chief of staff to Adam Newman, the former chief executive of WeCo WeWork's parent, filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, alleging that we demoted her twice, once after each of her pregnancies. A spokesperson for we have said the company doesn't tolerate discrimination of any kind. As Barney tells it in her complaint, before becoming pregnant, she had been only one of five employees to receive an award for outstanding performance. But after her first pregnancy, Barney was told that instead of reporting directly to Newman, she'd have a new boss, who coincidentally would have her old title. Moreover, her new male boss would be offered $400,000 with a signing bonus of 175,000 she'd been paid $150,000. Her complaint documents not only how Newman and other executives began treating her with disdain after she announced her pregnancies, referring to her parental leave as a retirement of vacation and a problem, but also how they retaliated against her and other female employees when they pointed out company management problems. The overall impression isn't a particularly sexist company.

The sort of normal level sexist company with incompetent management. For instance, Barney claims she tried for months after returning from her second parental leave to get clarity on her new role by seeking meetings with her bosses and other leaders of the firm from her returned to work in early March through June of this year, these conversations went nowhere. On June 5, Newman referred to her as having come out of retirement this week, even though she returned two months earlier. Finally, in late June or early July, she complained to Chris Hill, the head of product and Newman's brother in law. Well, at least you're still getting a paycheck. She says he replied. Executives didn't seem bothered by an employee pulling a six figure salary while having no idea what she was supposed to be doing. Despite a lack of clarity about her role and responsibilities her complaint reads in August 2019, his body received positive marks across all categories in her performance assessment. Newman then allegedly asked for bodies help with ways initial public offering, telling a colleague he needed a woman's touch and bringing her After his house in the Hamptons for a meeting, where Barney reminded Newman she'd been ready since March to step up. A few weeks later, she was fired. Similarly, in a separate lawsuit, Lisa bridges, a former senior vice president at the company alleges gender discrimination, retaliation and a glaring gender pay gap, which chief legal officer Jennifer Barrett allegedly said was justified because men take risks and women don't. I'm not sure insufficient risk taking has been

always problem. But nonetheless, shortly after bridges raised these concerns she was put on leave and subsequently fired.

A third executive Ruby Anya has alleged she was sexually assaulted on two different occasions at company events and fired after reporting this assault to human resources. We has denied and is claims of assault, and said she was terminated because of poor performance. The overall picture of these lawsuits conjure shows not only frat house antics on company time, but also managerial ninja popery employees run around like headless chickens while bosses bury their heads in the sand. It's birdbrain there are no telltale signs of a well managed company employees with clear rules and goals. Teams aligned around agreed upon targets managers who regularly meet with employees. Sure, good management is rarer than it should be. But it exists and it's not rocket science. It also has an impact on the bottom line. Harvard Business School Professor rafail, Assa Dune and her colleagues have studied more than 12,000 companies and found that organizations that do the basic boring work of managing, documenting processes setting clear goals retaining employees tracking key performance indicators score significantly higher on productivity, profitability and growth and stick around longer. In related work, the researchers have estimated that dobut important management practices could account for about a quarter of productivity gaps between countries. startup founders like to say that they're moving too fast for this bureaucratic stuff that it would slow their growth. In fact, the opposite is true. startups that adopt formal management structures are the ones that end up scaling successfully. The ones that don't collapse under the weight of their own chaos. Because you know what they're really time consuming in competence, a team of people who don't know what they're supposed to be doing, led by managers who can't remember who's in the office isn't headed towards success. Rather than move fast and break things. How about moving methodically and not making so many dumb mistakes. Companies that are good at managing tend to be not only more profitable, but also good places for women to work, because companies that are good at managing tend to have fair hiring and promotion practices. So think of sexual harassment, pay gaps and Pregnancy Discrimination as your canaries in the coal mine. If these things can run rampant, then the company is probably missing essential management tools, like maybe a viable business model. This article was written by Sarah green Carmichael and editor with Bloomberg opinion, or work can be found at Bloomberg com. We were lucky enough to have Sarah on the show to talk about the article. So let's get into it.

Hey, everyone. Thanks for joining us to discuss the article that we just heard. I should say up front that you're hearing me talk right now, because Heather's that sick today. But she'll be back next time. And I am very fortunate to be here with Sarah green carmical who wrote this article. Sarah, welcome to the show. And thank you for being here.

Sarah Green Carmichael 6:16
Thank you so much for having me. Absolutely.

Jim O'Neill 6:19

Would you mind starting us off by telling us just a little bit about who you are as well as how this article came about?

Sarah Green Carmichael 6:25
Yes, sure. So I am an editor and a columnist at Bloomberg opinion. And before I joined Bloomberg earlier this year, I also have been an editor at barons and at Harvard Business Review for a long time. And how the article came to be, was just I was sort of like probably a lot of us watching the wework spectacle unfold. And then when the kind of allegations of different kinds of gender discrimination came out I thought, of course of course this company that's such a mess also has this problem. Yeah.

Jim O'Neill 6:59
Right on and just out of curiosity, how does this article kind of fit into the overall kind of work that you typically do?

Sarah Green Carmichael 7:07
Yeah, so I have spent much of my career focusing on good management. So when I was at Harvard Business Review, that's all that hvR covers is good management. And so I edited a lot of articles on that. And then I've always personally been interested in gender issues. From a very young age like I, I think I read the feminine mystique for the first time as sort of famous feminist classic when I was 11 years old. So I, for whatever reason, that interest of mine goes way back. And so then this article was kind of a chance to look both at good management and how important it is, and also at some of the gender issues that I've just followed for a long time.

Jim O'Neill 7:45
Yeah, absolutely. That totally makes sense. So we often discuss sort of essay type articles on this show, it's a little less common that we do sort of breaking news analysis. So that makes me kind of want to just try to catch us up to what's happened in the world with we work since you're onwas published. So let me see if I get this right after this kind of public meltdown, we shelled its plans for an IPO and CEO Adam Newman stepped down. But the company got another infusion of cash from its main financer and it seems to be barreling ahead. Do I have that about right?

Sarah Green Carmichael 8:18
Yeah, I think those are the broad strokes. And I think what's interesting to see now is, people seem more aware now that we is really just a real estate company that leases office space to people. There's no real kind of fancy technology aspects to it. It's actually a fairly traditional business. So it's interesting to me to see investors kind of looking at it with a more realistic lens now that that kind of, I don't know, glamour that had been sort of obscuring their vision has fallen away.

Jim O'Neill 8:49

Yeah. Have you kept following any of the threads from the article that you wrote and sort of do you foresee any meaningful changes for we work out after this in terms of the culture treating women,

Sarah Green Carmichael 9:02
I would hope so I mean, I think, you know, it's funny because while that article specifically uses we as a peg, this is a, an issue, you've probably seen it a lot of other companies, and will, unfortunately probably keep seeing other companies. You know, I think back to a few hours ago, Uber was in the news for sexual harassment allegations and gender discrimination allegations. And Uber is also a company that had a lot of kind of other problems that they were dealing with, and you ended up seeing their CEO leave and a new co written. So I think that kind of my point, when I say gender bias can be a canary in the coal mine is if you have a gender problem, no matter what country or sorry, what company you are, you probably have other problems too.

Jim O'Neill 9:45
Yeah, absolutely. One thing I wanted to quickly circle back to just in terms of how I asked that question. When we talk about gender bias, we often do frame it in terms of men and women with a sort of default assumption of cisgenderedness. So just to sort of push on that, how do you think that we, in general can kind of reframe these discussions of gender discrimination? So that we make sure that we're including binary and non binary trans people? Um, you know, everybody who is facing this kind of discrimination?

Sarah Green Carmichael 10:14
That's a really good question. And I think one of the things that's important about this topic is, this is a business issue. It's not an issue of women versus men. Or it, you know, an issue of sort of pitting one side against the other side, when you tackle gender discrimination of any kind, any kind of gender based discrimination, regardless of you know, who is the target of it, you what you're really saying is we need to get better at managing period. Because if you're a good manager who sets fair targets and gives people fair feedback, that is going to affect every single person you manage, regardless of how they identify. So I think bite sort of acknowledging that this is really a management and a business challenge, and not about kind of women versus men, I think that companies can do a lot to advance the problem and also have it an inclusive solution to the problem that doesn't just focus on say, like cisgendered straight women.

Jim O'Neill 11:11
Yeah, that makes a lot of sense. And, you know, as you pointed out in the article article, that it's, like, the good management practices, part of this is not exactly the most, you know, like, rocket science part of things. It's not, you know, one of the sort of things it's going to catch everybody's attention. It's just one of those basics that you know, you have to sort of go back to that, this is one of the things that is going to signal Are you know, is your company culture succeeding?

Sarah Green Carmichael 11:37

Exactly.

Jim O'Neill 11:39
So one other thing in terms of threads from the article you mentioned at one point you know, I'm not sure that insufficient risk taking has been used problem, which that was one of my favorite lines, especially I I sent that to Heather on slack and I was like zing. So I appreciated that. But that was specifically in regards to wees justification for paying men more because they take risks more than women. But, and obviously, I'm not going to be speaking to this from my own personal experience. But the the sort of the research bears out that taking risks as a woman tends to be pretty much always a catch 22. And in particular, at the like, when pitching the startup, there's data to show that women tend to be asked about how they will account for every type of risk, and they are actually their their startup is viewed through the lens of that potential risk, whereas men get asked about their potential, and the potential to grow and things like that. And, you know, so this reinforces from the get go, that women are expected to be cautious, whereas men, especially sis men, are encouraged to pursue that risk, you know, for the sake of fulfilling that potential. So I'm curious how have you seen that play out in your research into this article and we specifically but as well as other cases, yeah.

Sarah Green Carmichael 12:59
So this is a fascinating area of research and has been really heavily studied by different sociologists and psychologists and Business School professors. And one of there's sort of different and sometimes conflicting findings here. So some studies show that when you can keep the playing field level men and women will both take risks at roughly the same level. Other studies have shown maybe that don't have quite the same methodology that men do to tend to take more risks. But then those studies also suggest that sometimes men take dumber risks than women do. So there's a lot of kind of stuff to sort through here. But I think in the workplace, the best evidence that we have suggests that women do tend to be more cautious not because they're innately risk averse, but because they are penalized more heavily for making mistakes. And I think you see that if you sort of look around tech startup land, for example, I have a hard time believing that if Elon Musk were a woman that he would still be running his company like, men get to be bold and crazy and weird and make mistakes and women founders, you know, really don't I think we saw this more recently, the CEO of away who was a female, Steph Curry, has just announced that she's going to be stepping down from her job after relatively small kind of infractions. And I think if she were a man, I think it's very unlikely that she would have been booted out at this at this stage. So I think we can see that that men and women are tend to be treated differently there. And that explains, I think some of women's risk aversion in the workplace is women are expected to be more meticulous, not make so many mistakes and are penalized more harshly when they do make mistakes.

Jim O'Neill 14:46
Yeah, absolutely. And you know that those consequences are real, you know, like the the idea of not getting to run your company anymore. That certainly is going to put a damper on your ability or your desire to take risks.

Sarah Green Carmichael 14:59

Totally. And I think to your earlier question. I think when you look at the studies, they've been really fascinating studies on how venture capitalists talk to male founders versus female founders. And the female founders do get asked a ton more questions about Have you accounted for this? Have you accounted for that? how you handle it if this goes wrong, or if that goes around, and men get a lot more questions about upside? So I think it's one of those things where when you look at real not just lab experiments, but real people in real work settings, you can really see that difference play out.

Jim O'Neill 15:32

Yeah, totally. One of the things that you said a minute ago that I was curious about is, you know, that that some of the studies or just sort of real life anecdotes have shown that when when there's a living sorry, when there's a level playing field, that you know, men and women tend to be able to take the same degree of risk or you know, tend to to act on that degree of risk. Obviously, a level playing field is hard or you know, possibly in possible to find, you know, in reality, but I'm curious what that might look like or if there's, you know, sort of evidence to show that that is something that people are succeeding in providing?

Sarah Green Carmichael 16:11

Yeah, that's a good question. I mean, I think, well, there's a couple of things I'd like to say about that. First is that that comment came from what is sometimes called the gender similarities hypothesis, which shows that across like, you know, decades of studies into gender differences, men and women are almost exactly the same. So the differences that we're talking about in behavior are really small differences, and can mostly be explained by the fact that men and women tend to be treated differently by other people, right? So when you have a level playing field, and you should see men and women acting, you know, pretty similarly. And so I think some companies have recognized that maybe what they need isn't like another women's networking lunch, but in fact, a different systems that account for things like how can we make our promotion or hiring process more fair, so that everyone is sort of being seen for who they really are and for the talent they possess, and that it will actually allow them to hire better people, people more suited for those roles. So I think that's sort of the next frontier to me is is looking at how we interview, you know, potential job candidates, how we select people for promotion, how we give credit in the office for, you know, different projects, who gets stuck doing the kind of boring projects that don't bring in revenue and who gets the sort of glory work that that does lead to promotions. There's a ton of fascinating research into all of those. And I think the upshot of it is that you can design an organization that is more fair to everyone in the company, and the result is that you end up hiring the best people for each job.

Jim O'Neill 17:54

Totally. Yeah, no, that makes that makes a lot of sense. Are there sort of bright spots in this realm that you're aware of that, you know, people are companies that we should be looking at for examples.

Sarah Green Carmichael 18:06
Well, one example that's just top of mind right now, as we've been seeing more discussion about paid leave paid family leave in the US. One example is just that there are some companies who are offering paid leave to both parents. So it, many companies offer no paid leave at all. But there are some companies that are not only offering paid maternity leave, but are saying, hey, it's parental leave. And regardless of whether you are gay or straight, or the birth parent or an adoptive parent, if you have any baby, this is the amount of time that you get. And I think something like that goes a long way towards establishing that. You know, we can make room in our companies for policies that help everyone equally and they're not sort of about providing special treatment to one category of person. So that's an example where I think a lot of companies have really moved forward in a pretty short amount of time.

Jim O'Neill 19:02
Yeah, right on. I mean, you know, the kind of stuff that feels like it should be the basics. But, you know, sometimes that's not sometimes it takes a while.

Sarah Green Carmichael 19:11
Yeah, exactly. And just to give you another example, I think a couple of years ago, you know, Google, for example, used to say, if you want to get a promotion at Google, you have to put yourself forward. Well, it turns out men were putting themselves forward a lot more than women were. So instead of saying, Oh, well, the women just need to change their behavior. They actually thought, well, maybe we should provide like training sessions on like, what's promotable, and like, give more information on like, what it means to put yourself forward and what the criteria are. So that's a kind of another attempt to say, let's actually just rethink this process that's having a differential impact, as opposed to, oh, maybe the women can just try a little harder.

Jim O'Neill 19:54
Yeah, no, that's, that's a good example. And that's actually a pretty good segue into the thing that I wanted to talk about next. So we, we certainly we would like to see more of that kind of behavior where it's like we're looking at the data, and then we're changing the way that we do things to better accommodate what we think is reality. At the the other end of that spectrum, of course, is this idea, the sort of, you know, philosophy in Silicon Valley of move fast and break things that is sort of a parody of itself at this point. But, you know, the, it seems like there's been a lot of pushback lately. Pretty well deserved on that whole idea and that philosophy, and you even mentioned in your article, how, you know, how about moving methodically and not making so many dumb mistakes, which we loved because you know, this is not a, this is not a philosophy that we particularly adore. We would love to see companies doing more of the methodical, slow moving, work. So I'm curious what would you look for in a company that is in fact, you know, avoiding the break things, philosophy and slowing down and doing the more methodical work.

Sarah Green Carmichael 21:02
Yeah, I would look for, for example, things like how, like our managers checking in regularly with the people who work for them. Do those people have a clearly defined set of goals? Like do they know what success looks like? Do they know who to go to if there's a problem? How quickly are those problems handled? I think when you have just like some of these really basic management things, like here's a really basic, boring example, checklists, and checklists are not sexy. No one gets up in the morning thinking like yeah, checklist. But they've been shown to really help reduce errors in hospitals. And these are like doctors like us. They're not dumb people. You know, they're really smart people, but they're having complex procedures and having a tool like a checklist really helps them. So there's some of these kind of just like unsexy management basics that when companies take time to do them, what actually happens is you end up moving faster, because you're not having to like, stop and go back and redo work that you've already done?

Jim O'Neill 22:07
Yeah, that makes total sense, you know, the sort of day to day practical level of thing that you can implement. And that sounds like it feeds into, you know, if you if you're in a situation where your company culture is this sort of harmful or toxic, you know, let's move fast and break things. Let's, you know, just sort of go for it and pick up the pieces later. You know, it sounds like there are some concrete things that you can start to recommend or, you know, look for the company to know to try and change that culture.

Sarah Green Carmichael 22:43
Right. I mean, I have a friend who works in a tech company and I don't want to identify too many details because I don't want her to get in trouble. But, you know, when she complained to me about work, it's stuff like, you know, I have another new boss, you know, my second new boss this year. Or, you know, my third new boss in the last 18 months, my every project I'm working on is totally changed again, you know, and it takes time to figure out how to handle a new boss or how to handle a new project. And by the time she's sort of figuring it out, it's like, oh, we're pivoting again. And I think the company thinks of it as being kind of adaptive and pivoting and, you know, experimenting. And to her, it just feels like chaos. And I have to say, you know, the sort of lack of ability to fix a point in the distance and move methodically towards that point, seems to result in a lot of wasted effort. So I think to the to the extent that you can make a strategic decision and say, This is what we're going to work on, these are the milestones of how we'll get there and keep moving forward. You will get there much faster than if you're kind of running around in circles in a frenzy.

Jim O'Neill 23:51
Yeah, absolutely. And as, as consultants who are sort of in the digital product space, a lot of the time there's definitely something that we've certainly observed on our end with some of the folks that we've worked with. There's another interesting side to this coin, when it comes to sort of the company culture and philosophy, in particular with people management, which is that anti discrimination efforts and efforts to include more people and diversify to, you know, to build

better teams. These things have a big role, potentially, in affecting the company culture. So I'm curious, on your perspective, your perspective on how those kinds of efforts, you know, counteracting gender and racial biases, things like that can factor into shifting a company's mindset and culture in a positive way.

Sarah Green Carmichael 24:45
This is a tough one, because the evidence I've seen so far on things like bias training programs has been really mixed. And I wish that those programs had shown better results, but they show really mixed results and it seems to be highly dependent on what type of program it is and what your workforce is already, like, how well that works, I would say, from my own experience, and from just the research I've read and the articles I've edited, written by experts in this area, I would say the best efforts are the ones that redesign organizational systems, not the ones that involve trying to change people's minds, because I think it's really hard to police people's thoughts. People have a lot of unconscious thoughts they're not aware of, like making those thoughts more conscious doesn't always seem to result in changing behavior. We also all think things that we don't necessarily act on, right, rather than sort of changing what's in the head of different employees. I'd rather focus on designing a system that treats people equitably, as opposed to saying, oh, we're going to have a training or like you know, launching new affiliation groups so that women can get together and talk to each other and hope that that helps. Because I think, you know, we've spent decades having these women's affinity groups or other affinity groups in, in offices. And I don't see a lot of progress there. I think part of it is, you know, women don't need to talk to each other about this problem. Like, we know, like, we know what the problem is, what we need is executives, many of whom are older men to admit that, you know, oh, if we write in our job description, that what we need is a coding ninja who's going to come in and kick ass that like that job description is not going to going to necessarily apply to diverse candidates. It's going to apply to a specific type of probably young male candidate.

Jim O'Neill 26:46
Yep.

Sarah Green Carmichael 26:47
Um, so I think you know, that to me, that's if I were running a company, I would put my money on changing the systems based on the robust evidence that's out there, that simple changes can really affect your workforce in a profound way. And the result is that you end up with better employees in each job. As opposed to like, oh, let's have a women's initiative where, you know, there's like mentoring, like, I don't think women need more mentoring other women at this point.

Jim O'Neill 27:18
Fair enough? No, that's that. I think that's great. I think that really dovetails with some of that, like, what popped into my head when you were talking about that was the idea of like, it's really hard to change people's behavior, which is exactly what you said that like, you know, if the if, if the mindset of somebody who's like, you know, got some habits that they want to change, or whatever it is, you know, we use the metaphor of the like the rider on the elephant or whatever.

It's hard to, you know, drive the elephant in a different direction. But if you change the path, so that the way that that elephant moves down, the road is structured better and more the direction that you want, then you're going to get better results. So it's not as much about the change of people's behaviors consciously. It's the structuring and shaping of the organization so that people sort of naturally fall into the behaviors that you want.

Sarah Green Carmichael 28:08
Yeah. And I think if you know if there's someone in your office who is like acting in a way that is sexist or racist, or whatever bias in some way I deal with their behavior and, like, intervene when you see that and intervene, like help the people that they seem to be harming the just as you would address any management problem. If you saw someone like stealing office supplies or something, maybe you'd be like, Hey, don't take all the folders. You know, if someone makes a racist joke, say like, Hey, don't make a racist joke. But don't don't necessarily make everyone sit through an unconscious bias training and expect suddenly, you're going to have like 50% women at the top of your firm.

Jim O'Neill 28:50
Yeah. Now that's a great call. And you know, it has to be it seems like it has to be addressed at multiple levels. You have to deal with individual problematic behavior but also sort of organizational culture and the systemic structural issues that are in place. So I would love to bring us back a little bit towards we work, you know, in the context of this article, obviously, you know, one of the sort of conclusions from this is, you know, like you said, the, the gender discrimination, and all of those issues are the canary in the coal mine, and that there's a whole host of sort of managerial and competence and bad practices going on under the hood. So I'm curious what kind of advice I mean, we've talked about we've covered some of this stuff, but, you know, do you have any other advice that you would particularly like, sorry, do you have any other advice that you would particularly call out to give to companies that are sort of scaling up, but who want to avoid the kind of mistakes that we work is making and you know, create a company that scales and succeeds?

Sarah Green Carmichael 29:54
That's a really interesting question. I think. It sounds to me like a lot of the chaos We, and so many other companies in this position could have been avoided with more methodical, sort of, I hate to call it slower growth, but essentially I'm saying slower growth. And that's why I think the whole venture capital approach of saying, we're going to invest in a bunch of companies, most of them will fail, one or two will be super profitable and IPO and make us millionaires or billionaires. But those companies have to grow really, really fast. I have struggles with that approach, because I think that startups that I see being successful are generally the ones that do a little bit more bootstrapping, and maybe they've got investors, but those investors are in it for the long haul. They're not looking to make an exit necessarily. So I think, you know, I think my advice is a little bit maybe more on like how you think about your business model from the very beginning and how you're going to be profitable and how you're going to grow sustainably. It's not just about growth and prop thinking about profits later. It's not about growing like 500%.

And, you know, capturing all the market share, especially if you're a company that basically is just leasing office space, you know, so I think, for me, it's something where, you know, you want to probably grow a little bit more slowly so that you can hire people at a sustainable pace hire managers to manage them, so that you're not collapsing under the weight of your own growth expectations.

Jim O'Neill 31:31
Yeah, no, absolutely. I it feels like, there is sort of a groundswell lately of kind of healthy skepticism about venture capital and the ways that we fund companies and the ways that we expect them to just grow at lightning speed and, you know, offer 10 x 30 x, whatever x returns. And that so I think that this really fits into that kind of narrative where the context that you're in when you you know, Look for funding or look for how your, your company is going to scale up. It really matters. And it's you know that the, the formula that's going to work for some companies does not work for everybody.

Sarah Green Carmichael 32:10
Totally. I mean, I think if you're a company where network effects are going to make a big difference to your business, then maybe you do want that kind of caffeine rush of VC money pouring in so that you can get big fast. But most companies aren't like that most, most companies are looking for something that is a little bit more modest and might last a little longer. So I think it's really a question of what business are you in? And what makes sense for you?

Jim O'Neill 32:36
Yeah, absolutely. Well, Sarah, this has been a fantastic conversation, and I really appreciate it. Can you talk to you? Before we wrap up, I would love to just ask, you know, what's a project that you're working on these days that you would like to shout out or send people to?

Sarah Green Carmichael 32:50
Oh, thank you for asking that. Um, I would say I mean, I'm writing on Bloomberg opinion all the time. I have a new piece out. Now on debacle at the way and their luggage companies yield departing. So if people are interested in management and issues of gender at work or people at work, I hope they will check out my Bloomberg opinion columns. Thank you.

Jim O'Neill 33:13
Fantastic. Yeah. I would definitely send people there. Ya know, be like I said, Heather wish that she could be here to have this conversation as well. But I really appreciate it good to talk to you. And thank you so much for coming on our show.

Sarah Green Carmichael 33:27
Thanks for having me.

Heather O'Neill 33:32

A big thanks to this week's author for sharing the article. And thank you also to our producer Melanie Scroggins. To get details about anything we referenced in this episode, or to recommend an article for future episodes, visit tech thinking aloud.com we'll see you in the next episode.