

University of Louisville

## ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

---

5-2022

### Divided we fall: gender-based occupational segregation in Kentucky's executive branch 2012-2020.

Hillary McGoodwin Abbott  
*University of Louisville*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>



Part of the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Organization Development Commons](#), [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), [Politics and Social Change Commons](#), [Public Administration Commons](#), [Public Affairs Commons](#), and the [Social Justice Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Abbott, Hillary McGoodwin, "Divided we fall: gender-based occupational segregation in Kentucky's executive branch 2012-2020." (2022). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3868.  
Retrieved from <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd/3868>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact [thinkir@louisville.edu](mailto:thinkir@louisville.edu).

DIVIDED WE FALL: GENDER-BASED OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION IN  
KENTUCKY'S EXECUTIVE BRANCH 2012-2020

By

Hillary McGoodwin Abbott  
B.A., University of Kentucky, 2015

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Faculty of the  
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

Master of Public Administration

Department of Urban and Public Affairs  
University of Louisville  
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2022

Copyright 2022 by Hillary McGoodwin Abbott

All rights reserved



DIVIDED WE FALL: GENDER-BASED OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION IN  
KENTUCKY'S EXECUTIVE BRANCH 2012-2020

By

Hillary McGoodwin Abbott  
B.A., University of Kentucky, 2015

A Thesis Approved on

April 12 2022

by the following Thesis Committee:

---

Thesis Director  
Dr. Janet Kelly

---

Dr. Aaron Rollins

---

Dr. Patrick Exmeyer

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my tenacious and brilliant niece

QUINN MCGOODWIN

Who will hopefully face a future where the concepts discussed in this paper seem foreign due to the sacrifices and triumphs of the persevering women who have preceded her.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Dr. Janet Kelly for her encouragement, direction, and willingness to see me through this adventure. My admiration for your scholarship knows no bounds. Secondly, thank you to Dr. Aaron Rollins, who changed my life when he called me with the news that I had been accepted to the MPA program. I'm honored to be your student. I would also like to thank Dr. Patrick Exmeyer for bringing his exuberance, infectious enthusiasm, and outstanding support to my committee in addition to the whole of the MPA program.

In August 2019, I joined the Health, Welfare, and Family Services Committee at the Legislative Research Commission. After my nearly two years as a Legislative Assistant, the move to the committee system was both welcome as it was illuminating. My supervisor, DeeAnn Wenk, greeted my plan to pursue my Master's with sincere encouragement and has been a role model to me. Without her understanding and accommodations, I would not have been able to be both a full-time employee and student. I am humbled by her attention to my work and her belief in me.

Getting through an original research project of this magnitude requires sustenance unconditionally provided to me by my parents, Rob and Susan McGoodwin. I am thankful for their unconditional support that, when distilled down, is pure love.

Louisville's MPA program has provided me with the greatest gift, golden friendships with Colleen Jones, Amy Brooks, and John Schwartzlose. Thank you all for your unfiltered support. This journey would have been hellish without you. Thank you to

my lifelong family and friends: Tom McGoodwin, Anne, Ray, and Andrea Sabbatine, Kirk McCain, Bob Bose, Joe and Donna Terry, Dr. Gretchen Starr-LeBeau, Erica Brady, Cooper and Nicole McGoodwin, and Katie Wheeler for your unrivaled love, support, and friendship. How did I get so lucky with you lot?

Lastly, for much of my life, completing a graduate degree was a non-starter, but here I am, on the precipices of graduating. I would not be here if it were not for my husband's unfettered belief, support, and love. Brian encouraged me to apply for this program. He countered my fears of cost, whether I could even do both work and school, and helped me realize my own potential. He applauded my perseverance by ensuring I knew I was always supported and by becoming himself, a feminist. He helped me believe in myself in a way that I never have before. His love has carried me through many nights of self-doubt, of immense stress, and as a result, I can present this product of blood, sweat, and tears. You were right; we made it work. What a great team we are! Thank you, I love you.



## ABSTRACT

### DIVIDED WE FALL: GENDER-BASED OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION IN KENTUCKY'S EXECUTIVE BRANCH 2012-2020

Hillary McGoodwin Abbott

April 12, 2022

Fifty-eight years have passed since the Title VII of the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 was signed into law, yet discrimination in employment still occurs; the Kentucky Executive Branch is no exception. This paper will use Theodore Lowi's agency typology and EEOC categorical data from the 2012 and 2020 Kentucky Office of Diversity and Employment Training Semi-Annual Report on Female and Minority Employment (SAR) to identify gendered occupational segregation in three distinct Executive Branch agencies, address potential contributing factors and areas of change (Alkadry & Tower, 2006; Lowi, 1985; Newman, 1994; Escriche, 2007). Addressing any underlying discriminatory practices that may be systemic in the Kentucky Executive Branch is crucial to achieving an end to occupational segregation, bringing Kentucky closer to the goal of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. First, an acknowledgment that there is a problem must be made. Kentucky has a problem.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	ix
INTRODUCTION AND METHODS.....	10
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS.....	27
DISCUSSION SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	29
REFERENCES.....	38
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	43

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Distributive Agency: Transportation Jan-June 2012/July-December 2020.....	25
2. Redistributive Agency: Cabinet for Health and Family Services Jan-June 2012/July-December 2020.....	26
3. Regulatory Agency: Energy and Environment Cabinet Jan-June 2012/July-December 2020.....	27
4. Descriptive Statistics of Females in EEO Categories 2012.....	28
5. Descriptive Statistics of Females in EEO Categories 2020.....	29

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

ILLUSTRATIONS	PAGE
1. Example Image from the 2020 SAR Percentage of Executive Branch Employment Representation Data.....	21
2. Example Image from the 2020 SAR of Data Used for the Quantitative Analysis Section.....	22

## INTRODUCTION AND METHODS

In 2013, President Barack Obama commemorated the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the passing of the Equal Pay Act and extension of Title VII of the Civil Rights Bill of 1964. President Obama's administration created a task force that looked at the progress made in those fifty years and the work that had to be done (EEOC, 2013). Several states followed suit and commemorated this anniversary with equal pay initiatives; some states even passed strict equal pay and anti-discrimination legislation (Maatz, 2013). In November of 2013, Kentucky Governor Steven Beshear issued an executive order that amended Kentucky's Affirmative Action plan of 1996 to create the Office of Diversity, Equality, and Training (ODET). This executive order created Kentucky Revised Statute 18A.138(4), which directs the Personnel Cabinet, through the newly formed ODET to produce a Semi-Annual Report on Female & Minority Employment which would provide state officials with a place-in-time progress assessment of the Commonwealth's Affirmative Action Plan. Commonwealth's Affirmative Action Plan requires that a minimum number of females and minorities are employed through each Executive Branch agency and details the percentage of minorities and females in the eight Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEO) employment categories. ODET would oversee the baseline employment and report semi-annually on female and minority hiring status in the executive branch. The data compiled in these reports are broken down by cabinet, a specific job, and grade, and gives an overall number of employed with the percentage of females and minorities. Ideally, this information and data collected in these

reports would be used to support interventions by the Executive Branch for any underperforming cabinets and agencies. However, it does not appear that is always, if ever, the case.

This paper will follow the example of a West Virginia study of gender-based occupational segregation and wage disparity in the executive branch (Alkadry & Tower, n.d., 2006, 2013). This paper will examine evidence for occupational segregation (but not wage disparity) in Kentucky's executive branch.

The reports produced by ODET are public records and were procured through an open records request. The ODET reports data in aggregate and does not designate the education or experience of the employees they capture in the data. The variables accounted for are the type of job, place in the organizational hierarchy, gender, and race. This paper will omit the minority/race variable to focus solely on the female variable, type of job, and organizational hierarchy. "Gender," "women," and "female" will be used synonymously for the purposes and scope of this paper and do not reflect any gender identity bias, ignorance, or slight to the LGBTQ+ community. Using the aggregated data from the first Semi-Annual Report in 2012 and then from the most recent Semi-Annual Report from 2020, descriptive statistics and t-tests will be employed to test whether occupational segregation is evident in three of the four Theodore Lowi agency typologies: regulatory, distributive, and redistributive agencies.

## LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORY

In 1963-1964, President John F. Kennedy introduced the first equal pay legislation in the United States. Over fifty-eight years later, the fight for equal pay is still intense, gender discrimination in the workplace is still a problem, and the battle for equity in the labor market is omnipresent. Equal pay cannot exist if gender-based disparities in employment are prevalent. Stereotypical views on women's work in male-exclusive domains are ever-present, breeds discrimination, and fuels implicit biases. Due to the perennial nature of this fight, scholarly literature is rich with economists, public administrators, sociologists, and psychologists attempting to figure out why the glass ceiling still exists across both the private and public sectors as well as the glass wall, which refers to the areas that women are walled into through occupational segregation. For over 30 years, scholars have approached the gender pay equity quandary with new ways to inquire about the source of inequity. One of these new ways to look at gender pay and employment inequity is to begin looking at where women are employed, where they are "walled" in (Newman, 1994; Bishu & Headley, 2020), what is the financial makeup of the fields, and agencies they are employed in (Lowi, 1985) and what are the resources available to them in those fields (Bowling et al., 2006). By comparing the placement of employed women with men in similar fields or with equivalent education and experiential background, problems that comprise the "glass wall" are evident. Data gathered in EEO reports can be deceptive, and the SAR reports used in this article are no different. For instance, the statistic of the total number of women employed can be used

as a straw man; giving the appearance of equity, but when closer attention is paid to what jobs females are employed in and what opportunities those jobs have for career advancement, and where those jobs reside in the organizational hierarchy of an agency, an altogether different picture emerges. If 89% of an agency's female employees are in clerical positions, not much has changed in 50 years. Filling a quota is not indicative of change, especially if that quota is filled by a protected class in a terminal role.

However, if the percentage of total female employees in an agency is dispersed throughout the ranks, then progress may be happening. Escriche (2007) highlighted the importance of eliminating occupational segregation as central to fighting wage inequity; getting women into jobs that have the same "investment" opportunities by the employer as their male counterparts ensures the opportunity for career advancement. The more women in dead-end or terminal jobs, the fewer women there will be in the upper ranks of agencies and businesses. Escriche also points out that it is equally crucial that men begin occupying historically and stereotypically female jobs, like clerical positions, for total occupational equity; one demographic cannot monopolize one sphere for there to be equity (2007). Experience is often a determinant for acquiring jobs with more authority and higher pay; how can women get the experience needed to qualify for jobs in the upper ranks if they are segregated in positions that do not offer training outside of the task they are currently assigned. Occupational segregation is often present in regions where traditional gender roles are valued. Alkadry and Tower (2013) observed that occupational segregation might function as individual choice, but social norms and



expectations influence the choice; women are socialized into caring and sensible jobs while men are socialized into leadership positions that are more consistent with masculinity (Stivers, 1993). Gender-typing and socialization could be significant determinants of the choices made by women, which brings into question the extent to which option is being freely exercised in the shadow of influential gender roles. Even when women successfully break into traditionally male jobs, they are less liked and more often personally derogated than their male, leading them not to stay there long or feel valued to matriculate upwards in that agency (Heilman et al., 2004).

Economists in the 1980s and 1990s conducted equal pay research, assuming that motherhood, work experience, and education were the principal reasons women were not reaching the high-paying, high-human capital investment jobs in public administration. Gender-based assumptions on motherhood and a woman's ability to dedicate themselves to their work and family comprise a vast majority of implicit biases held by hiring managers, especially in the resistant to change bureaucracies of the public sector. Institutional knowledge is essential to the workflow of an agency. However, when institutional knowledge is also relied upon for hiring, institutional knowledge can be a barrier to the advancement of women who have not always occupied multiple spheres of the public sector. New data has revealed that wage and occupation inequities exist even when education and experience are equivalents between male and female employees. Blau & Kahn (2017) found a substantial narrowing of the gender work experience gap. By 2011, the gap had fallen markedly to only 1.4 years, with the fastest increase in

women's relative experience occurring during the 1980s (2017). Thus, on these two primary measures of human capital—schooling and actual labor market experience—women made essential gains during the 1981-2011 period, reversing the education gap and significantly reducing the experience gap but are still behind men in high-paying and leadership positions (2017). Representative bureaucracy and female parity across all levels of public organizations are attainable yet unrealized by most organizations (Newman 1994). When investigating the barriers to career advancement based on gender, Newman offers a clue to unlock why, despite advancement in education and experience, women are not advancing in their careers:

“...women continue to be underrepresented at the top of the organizational hierarchy. Segmented equality views representation at various levels within the organization. Upper-level management positions in state governments are one such level or segment. Although block equality has been achieved, segmented equality remains elusive. Women continue to be compressed into the lower levels of public agencies and concentrated into traditionally defined “female-type” occupations; in other words, under glass ceilings, and within glass walls.” (p. 227)

Theodore Lowi's framework of administrative structure is based on four models, the regulatory agency model, the distributive agency model, the redistributive agency model, and the constituent agency model (1994). Each model develops its characteristic political structure, political process, elites, and group relations (Lowi, 1985; Newman,

1994). Organizations are not created equal; the work environment of each of Lowi's agency types is distinctive and predicts leadership styles and patterns of career advancement (1994). In the comprehensive study of West Virginia's public administration and gender-based occupational segregation, Alkadry and Tower (2006) found that using Lowi's agency typology and the EEO categories can become evident where occupational segregation occurs.

State-level public administration agency-based segregation is prevalent, and once broken down into Lowi's agency typology, gender-based occupational segregation and position segregation become hard to miss (2006). Position segregation refers to women being primarily located and unable to advance out of lower levels of organizations (Alkadry & Tower, 2013). Women tend to be found in lower levels of organizations, such as administrative support and clerical positions (Hsieh & Winslow, 2006; Meier & Wilkins, 2002). Women tend to be underrepresented in regulatory agencies, agencies whose focus is to implement regulatory policies (e.g., environmental agencies, law enforcement agencies, or taxing authorities), and distributive agencies, whose focus is to serve the general population (e.g., transportation, parks, and recreation agencies) (Alkadry & Tower, 2013). Women tend to be overrepresented in redistributive agencies, or agencies that reallocate money and provide services to a particular subset of the population, such as health, welfare, or education (Alkadry, Nolf & Condo, 2002). Departments with primarily female-dominated occupations tend to pay lower wages than agencies with predominantly male-dominated positions (Orazem & Mattila, 1998).

Distributive and regulatory agencies tend to pay higher salaries than redistributive agencies (Miller et al., 1999; Orazem & Mattila, 1998; Riccucci, 2009). Importantly, even when women enter male-dominated agencies, they may be in lower-paid or less prestigious agency segments, unable to move up or compete for other positions (Riccucci, 2009; Alkadry & Tower, 2013).

Kerr, B., Miller, W., & Reid, M. (2002) conducted a sweeping research survey of sex segregation among state bureaucracies from 1987-97. Their findings suggest that most women work in redistributive and regulatory agencies, discovering that discrimination in the hiring and promotion of women is most severe in distributive agencies (Newman 1994). Mutually reinforcing relationships between agencies and their clientele make distributive processes resistant to change, making it more difficult for women to enter these occupational areas (Newman, 1994; Lowi, 1985). Distributive agencies are characterized by a reliance on professional and occupational norms, promotion of specialists (i.e., engineers, biologists) rather than generalists, limited due process requirements, relatively wide fields of discretion, and limited sensitivity to discriminatory practices (Long et al., 1967; Lowi 1985; Lewis & Emmert, 1984; Newman 1994).

## A CASE AGAINST KENTUCKY

Distributive agencies in Kentucky include Transportation, Agriculture, Fish and Wildlife (Lowi, 1985) and “can operate in their political environment almost as though they had unlimited resources” (Lowi, 1985; Newman, 1994). Lowi states that there are virtually no losers in distributive agencies due to the mutually dependent nature of the relationship between the controller or agency representative and the client. Newman suggests that agencies with solidified and mutually dependent power and results structure are inherently resistant to change (1994). Colloquially referred to as a “good-old-boys club,” distributive agencies are hard to penetrate for women, especially in regions like Kentucky where gender roles evolve slowly, if at all. Resistance to change would then inhibit women from upward mobility in this field (Newman 1994, p. 278).

Redistributive Agencies in Kentucky are Health and Family Services, Education, Labor, and Finance & Administration. Redistributive agencies whose job is to maintain and manipulate human lives have distinct winners and losers; this leads to high visibility and high conflict (Newman, 1994 p. 279). The widely publicized COVID-19 induced unemployment system failing by the labor cabinet in Kentucky is an excellent example of a redistributive agency's high-visibility and high-cost nature (Martinez, 2021).

Redistributive agencies also fall under historically female spheres because of the stereotype of women as the caregivers; it is no surprise that the majority of all redistributive agencies in the United States are staffed and run by women.


Regulatory agencies implement, uphold, and provide protection according to federal and state regulations. In Kentucky, regulatory agencies include Justice and Public Safety, Energy and Environment, Economic Development. In Lowi's agency typology, regulatory agencies have a strict organizational structure limiting mobility upward and encouraging lateral career movement and advancement from the outside agency for specialists (Lowi, 1985; Newman 1994, p. 278). The authority given to these agencies has the potential to create a power bubble that reinforces gender-based authority stereotypes that exclude women, even if those women are specialists like lawyers or judges; glass walls. Perception of female leadership and authority from generational stereotyping excludes women from penetrating fields and agencies where power and authority are controlled by men (Alkadry & Tower, 2011; Mölders et al., 2017). Regional societal gender roles reinforce the power dynamic and public perception of "good" authority, which results in women's clerical or administrative roles within these organizations. These roles are "dead-end" and stereotypically female.

When reviewing state Executive Branch employment data, specifically when broken down by EEO category, consideration must be given to potential skew caused by gubernatorial-appointed positions within the Executive Branch. Historically, key power positions within the EEO "top" categories of agencies and cabinets have been filled with appointed personnel. Those are positions held until the Governor who appointed them leaves office or another appointment is made. These appointments often come from outside the agency to which they are appointed. Thus, their presence in the data for

females in those categories should not be considered reflective of the agency's positive progress nor representative of equitable hiring within the cabinet or agency. The ODET reports for Kentucky do not identify appointed positions; therefore, it is challenging to account for skew definitively, but many high-profile cabinet and agency appointments make the news and are announced through formal news releases; however, many are not high-profile enough to generate news.

## REPORT DATA

Illustrations 1.



*Note:* Image from the July-December 2020 SAR (page 13).



Illustrations 2.

**TRANSPORTATION CABINET**  
**July 1, 2020 – December 31, 2020 Semi-Annual Report on Female and Minority**  
**Employment by EEO Job Categories**

Job Category	Total EMPS	Min	%Min	Min Proj% Goal	Female Emps	% Female	Fem Proj% Goal
EEO GRP 1: OFFICIALS & ADMIN	43	4	9.30%	12.2	12	27.91%	50.8
EEO GRP 2: PROFESSIONAL	1,683	109	6.48%	12.2	629	37.37%	50.8
EEO GRP 3: TECHNICIANS	2,107	69	3.27%	12.2	83	3.94%	50.8
EEO GRP 4: PROTECT SERV WRKR	3	0	0%	12.2	1	33.33%	50.8
EEO GRP 5: PARA PROFESSIONAL	21	0	0%	12.2	7	33.33%	50.8
EEO GRP 6: OFFICE & CLERICAL	16	0	0%	12.2	13	81.25%	50.8
EEO GRP 7: SKILLED WORKER	228	9	3.95%	12.2	1	0.44%	50.8
EEO GRP 8: SERVICE MAINTENANCE	36	1	2.78%	12.2	6	16.67%	50.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,137</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>4.64%</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>752</b>	<b>18.18%</b>	<b>50.8</b>

\*Green- Utilization goal met

*Note:* Image from July-December 2020 SAR (page 25)

ODET has produced semi-annual reports on female and minority employment since 2014. The most recent of these reports available to the author as of June 2021 was the July-December 2020 report (2021). The data is extracted from that report and used as a point-in-time overview. ODET has a 50.8 percent goal for female employment across

all federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEO) Group categories in each executive branch agency. The eight Federal EEO group categories Kentucky used to distinguish job categories and place in the organizational hierarchy are the numbers 1-8. EEO Group 1 is the officials and administrative job category which carries the most authority and highest wages (i.e., chiefs, division heads, directors, superintendents). EEO Group 2 is the professional job category categorized by specialists (i.e., lawyers, engineers, doctors, and social workers). EEO Group 3 is the technician category, and it is where technical specialists (i.e., computer programmers, surveyors, highway technicians, police, and fire sergeants) are housed. EEO Group 4 is the protective service workers category (i.e., police patrol officers, firefighters, correctional officers, and park rangers) are housed. EEO Group 5 is where paraprofessionals are categorized (i.e., research assistants, child support workers, library assistants, ambulance drivers, and home health aides). EEO Group 6 is where Administrative Support is categorized (i.e., secretaries, clerical aides, couriers, bookkeepers, payroll clerks, telephone operators, and sales workers). EEO Group 7 is classified as skilled craft workers (i.e., electricians, heavy equipment operators, carpenters, power plant operators). Lastly, EEO Group 8 is the service-maintenance group and is comprised of (i.e., custodians, truck drivers, construction laborers, farm laborers, and apprentices). The agency analysis below will identify the EEO categories by their group number (i.e., EEO Group 6), corresponding with the jobs identified above representing that EEO group classification.

Kentucky's executive branch is comprised of the following cabinets and agencies: Economic Development (ECO), Education and Workforce (EDW), Energy and Environment (EEC), Finance and Administration (FA), General Government (GG), Health and Family Services (HFS), Justice and Public Safety (JPS), Labor (LAB), Personnel (PERS), Public Protection (PPC), Tourism, Arts, and Heritage (TAH), and Transportation (TRAN). For the scope of this paper, the focus will be on one agency from Lowi's administrative model, excluding Lowi's constituent agency.

The distributive agency summarized will be the Transportation (TRAN) cabinet. The redistributive agency from the report that will be summarized is the Cabinet for Health and Family Services (HFS). The regulatory agency from the report that will be summarized is the Energy and Environment Cabinet (EEC). The semi-annual report gives several data markers, but to avoid redundancy, the total number of employees in that agency or cabinet, the total number of females in that agency or cabinet, and the percentage of females in all 8 of the EEO Groups will be discussed (2021).

Table 1.

*Distributive Agency: Transportation  
Jan-June 2012/July-December 2020*

EEO Category	2012 Female %	2020 Female %
Group 1 (Administrators and Officials):	18.82	27.91
Group 2 (Professionals)	36.95	37.37
Group 3 (Technicians):	20.34	3.94
Group 4 (Protective Service Workers)	25.00	33.33
Group 5 (Paraprofessionals)	18.45	33.33
Group 6 (Clerical)	35.66	81.25
Group 7 (Skilled Workers)	2.71	.44
Group 8 (Service-Maintenance)	9.02	16.67

The total number of employees in TRAN is in 2012 was 4,782 and 4,137 in 2020. 906 were female in 2012, 18.95 percent. In 2020, 752 percent were female, 18.18 percent, well under the ODET female utilization goal. Females appear to be segregated in EEO Group 6-Clerical, making up 81.25 percent. Clerical or secretarial roles tend to be terminal roles or roles that have little to no career advancement opportunity into another higher-paying EEO group.

Table 2.

*Redistributive Agency: Cabinet for Health and Family Services  
Jan-June 2012/July-December 2020*

EEO Category	2012 Female %	2020 Female %
Group 1 (Administrators and Officials):	65.02	77.97
Group 2 (Professionals)	80.82	82.73
Group 3 (Technicians):	58.13	74.29
Group 4 (Protective Service Workers)	41.43	31.48
Group 5 (Paraprofessionals)	85.20	85.01
Group 6 (Clerical)	95.96	93.57
Group 7 (Skilled Workers)	17.54	4
Group 8 (Service-Maintenance)	68.60	68.83

The total number of employees in HFS in 2012 was 7,565, of which 6,069 were female employees, 80.22 percent. In 2020, the total number of employees was 6,678. 5,506 were female, with the total percentage of female employees 82.45 percent. HFS is consistently exceeding ODET's female utilization goal. Females are well-dispersed across all EEO groups except for Group 7, Skilled Workers, which only utilizes four percent of females. Unsurprisingly, HFS is overwhelmingly female as HFS, like most redistributive agencies, oversees the care for humans; caring is viewed as a uniquely female character trait.

Table 3.

*Regulatory Agency: Energy and Environment Cabinet  
Jan-June 2012/July-December 2020*

EEO Category	2012 Female %	2020 Female %
Group 1 (Administrators and Officials):	32.02	42.42
Group 2 (Professionals)	38.62	39.41
Group 3 (Technicians):	10.34	34.55
Group 4 (Protective Service Workers)	0	0
Group 5 (Paraprofessionals)	83.33	100
Group 6 (Clerical)	90.00	100
Group 7 (Skilled Workers)	31.25	0
Group 8 (Service-Maintenance)	0	16.67

The total number of employees in the EEC in 2012 was 1,663; 594 were female, totaling 35.72 percent. In 2020 the total number of employees in the EEC was 1,331; 527 were female, making the percentage of EEC female employees 39.59 percent; consistently under the executive branch female employment goal of 50.8 percent. Two EEO groups exceed the goal with 100 percent female staffing: Group 5-Paraprofessionals and Group 6-Clerical. The remaining six EEO groups in the EEC fall well under ODET's

female utilization goal. Females in EEC appear to be falling into the terminal and the stereotypically female job of clerical or paraprofessional. Females are not well dispersed throughout the agency and are underrepresented in positions of authority (i.e., groups 1, 2, & 3).

## QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Table 4.

*Descriptive Statistics of Females in EEO Categories*

Cabinet (year)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min # of Women	Max # of Women
Transportation (2012)	113.25	204.71	1.00	616.00
Energy and Environment (2012)	74.25	162.11	0.00	470.00
Health and Family Services (2012)	758.63	1227.83	10.00	3599.00

*Note:* Variables used from EEO Categories 1-6.

Table 5.

*Descriptive Statistics of Females in EEO Categories*

Cabinet (year)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min # of Women	Max. # of Women
Transportation (2020)	65.88	169.90	0.00	486.00
Energy and Environment (2020)	92.38	214.06	1.00	618.00
Health and Family Services (2020)	702.75	1369.23	1.00	3961.00

*Note:* Variables used from EEO Categories 1-6.



In 2012, the distributive Transportation Cabinet employed significantly fewer females across all six EEO employment categories ( $M = 113.24$ ,  $SD = 169.90$ ,  $t(14) = -1.47$ ,  $p = 0.16$ ) when compared to redistributive Health and Family Services Cabinet ( $M = 758.63$ ,  $SD = 1227.83$ ).

In 2020, distributive Transportation further lowered the number of females employed ( $M = 65.88$ ,  $SD = 169.90$ ,  $t(14) = -1.246$ ,  $p = 0.233$ ) when compared to redistributive Health and Family Services Cabinet ( $M = 702.75$ ,  $SD = 1369.23$ ).

These results show that the distributive agency, Transportation Cabinet, follows the prescription of employing significantly fewer women than the redistributive agency, Health and Family Services Cabinet. While the available aggregated data does not let us break down the data beyond the EEO categories, the data nonetheless shows occupational segregation in agency and position segregation. Few women are employed throughout the Transportation cabinet compared to a predominantly female Health and Family Services cabinet.

## DISCUSSION, SUMMARY, AND CONCLUSIONS

These findings (they are not peripheral) suggest that, like in West Virginia (Alkadry & Tower, 2013) gender-based occupational segregation in Kentucky follows Lowi's agency typology with the high-money, the high-power distributive agency tested, employing few women and the stereotypical female caring agency tested, with little money but the most state-wide reach and state-wide dependency, employing the most women across all categories.

Revealing that despite the mandatory minimum threshold of female employment not being met in 2012, the first year of reporting, the Transportation Cabinet has the appearance of improving the gender employment disparity for the years the state was monitoring progress, as illustrated by the 2020 data because the total number of employees decreased throughout those years. To penetrate a gender-exclusive environment, more accountability measures are required, more training opportunities, punishment for underperforming cabinets are needed, and hiring campaigns that are not hollow public relations exercises.

As Escriche (2007) describes, the way to break segregation and public perception that leads people to hire homogenous groups is to increase male employment in female-dominated fields, like the redistributive agencies, and have women visibly comprising the regulatory & distributive male agencies. In the July-December 2013 SAR report (2014), the ODET acknowledged this perception in Kentucky in female employment:

“The greatest deficiency in female employment is found in the Transportation Cabinet. Certain cabinets will have more difficulty reaching goals due to limited qualifying availability within the labor pool of *targeted populations* for traditionally race or gender dominated positions.” (pg. 7.)

By the ODET’s admission, *targeted populations* are segregated by gender. This admission and the data from these three agencies illuminate what Alkadry & Tower (2013) and Newman (1994) and Escriche (2007) suggest could happen if attention is not paid to what types of jobs women are employed. More proactive steps would need to be undertaken in training and retention measures if agency-embedded, implicitly biased gender-view overhauls were to happen.

Many factors contribute to organizational segregation, and opportunities for change lie within understanding those factors. Addressing sexual harassment, avoiding tokenism, and recognizing as well as working to educate managers on implicit biases, are ways contributing factors to organizational segregation can be used to change the culture creating the problem. First, an organization must recognize there is a problem to fix and invest accordingly in the remedy. The overarching story of gendered rights is one of the moderate gains, although made in such a way as to promote sporadic, narrowly focused advances. Guy and Fenley (2014) describe the process this way. Legislative protections are considered adequate until a suit is brought forth, forcing courts to interpret one aspect of the legislation. Subsequent legislation is formulated to address that specific gap while ignoring or not acknowledging other lingering loopholes that will surface (2014).

Because of this process, women have been directly involved in forcing institutional change through these slow legislative and judicial processes (Eidmann, 2008). Legislated protections follow the windsock of public opinion, which gradually changes to a large degree.

In addition to the overt problems addressed by legislation and case law, cultural barriers limit the ability to see beyond a binary definition of gender as male or female (2014). Functioning as blinders, these barriers obscure the fact that institutions have been established in such a way that “male” has come to be equated with “normal” and “neutral,” leaving “female” as the non-normal and different (Stivers, 2010). Therefore, efforts to increase gender equity need to shift from our current conceptualization of gender in dichotomous terms, which serves to maintain the normal/other divide (2014). )

Expectation confirmation plays a role in social interaction (Magee & Frasier, 2014). Success in organizations depends ultimately on an individual's competence and social approval, seeming to be a good fit for a job (Heilman et al., 2004; Schachter, 2016). The degree to which expectations affect leadership opportunities for women depends on many factors. These include the gender make-up of the organization and whether a particular task's characteristics seem more or less congenial to what our culture labels congruent with female nature (Yoder, 2001). Empirical studies have shown some evidence that men and women do approach leadership differently but not necessarily less effectively (Schachter, 2016).

Managers impart implicit bias on their hiring decisions in many ways. If those managers are in a system based in a culturally misogynistic or male-power-centered culture like Kentucky, gender-specific biases often pervade through. Assumptions such as women as caring, not tough, and feminine, not masculine could lead a manager not to want to hire them for a powerful position or fill a role in a systemically male agency. This is precisely what the ODET admitted in their SAR note about the results for underperforming cabinets when the jobs that comprise that cabinet are historically male, not feminine, and come with a lot of power and visibility. Women who do not conform to culturally expected gender behaviors and appear more masculine and tough run the risk of being discriminated against for being challenging to work with, too harsh, brash, or bossy (Newman, 1994). Since the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed, women's access and participation in higher education have skyrocketed; however, job segregation continues, leading directly to pay disparity. Unlike the Civil Rights anthem of *equal pay for equal work*, job segregation makes that moot, as there is no equal work to generate equal pay in 2020.

The effects on job segregation follow women as they move up the ladder (Guy & Newman, 2004), entering into a male-dominated sphere where expectations of failure and challenges to their leadership will be greater. With one of the root causes of occupational segregation being cultural views towards women, including misconceptions of leadership ability, then more women that visibly occupy higher-paying, powerful positions, the more significant opportunity there is for those misconceptions to be quelled. However, suppose

there are "token" women in these roles who are sent to fill a quota and not taken seriously. In that case, job segregation is still occurring despite the position being one of higher power and visibility. The adage "it takes a village" applies to help women sustain success in leadership roles. Tokenism is a genuine concern for states like Kentucky that create expectations of minimum female employment, as seen in affirmative action cases, instead of hiring people who are qualified and managers wanting those people to be hired in the first place when people are hired to fill a quota they are doomed from the outset—leading to resentment of their colleagues and unfair and often unattainable expectations placed on their shoulders. The perception of not "working your way up" or "coming by the job honestly" are common themes of colleagues who feel passed over by affirmative action hires or token hires. If women are trying to penetrate an already hostile towards women organizational culture, then giving them the opportunities that their male colleagues have, not just filling quotas with no investment, is the best way to proceed. Avoiding any situation that reinforces the implicit bias of those making decisions is crucial to women's chance to penetrate the glass ceiling.

Many issues relating to discrimination based on gender are at the forefront of today's society, as seen in the #metoo movement, like sexual harassment. Women are still concentrated in less lucrative and less powerful positions, and this workplace segregation contributes to more significant numbers of sexual harassment cases filed by women (Guy & Fenley, 2014). Often, human resource-led sexual harassment policies create a culture of fear and silence for the victim instead of addressing the root of the harassing behavior

since they are designed to protect the agency's interests (Pate, 2017). Most victims who experience workplace sexual harassment either do not attempt to move up within their workplace after the event or leave their job altogether (Keyton et al., 2001), directly impacting their career trajectory. If sexual harassment is pervasive, which it is, especially in a culture like Kentucky's culture that demeans the ability and equality of women, and it is not far-fetched to imagine sexual harassment being a contributing factor to organizational segregation and suggest why more women are not in higher, more powerful organizational roles. Fear and hostility are often traits that accompany sexual harassment and gender discrimination which are not conducive to an environment that a woman would be able to prosper (Guy & Fenly, 2014).

As Alkadry and Tower (2006) discovered in West Virginia, gender-based occupational segregation correlates with gender pay inequity (Guy & Fenley, 2014), adding that an employee's human capital (the competencies, skills, and knowledge one holds) appear to be an objective factor utilized to set fair and appropriate pay but also variables managers use to place an employee in a particular job. Gender discrimination impacts these variables, affecting the pay and opportunity gap between men and women (Alkadry & Tower, 2006). Traits such as education or years of service are easily quantifiable; other variables such as leadership ability or social competencies are subjectively gauged are prone to be valued thus compensated differently (2014). While pay data was not included as a variable in the ODET SAR, pay disparity can be inferred

by where in the EEO categories women are placed and referring back to Lowi's agency typology: the more money an agency has = the greater the gender disparity.

There is hope, however. Research surrounding implicit bias has seen an uptick in recent years, often regarding race and cultural competency issues. Regardless of the type of implicit bias, psychologists and sociologists alike have been able to study how to change those implicit biases. One method that has been shown to impact bias, cultural and personal, is through visibility (Gino & Kauffman, 2021). Proponents of descriptive representation frequently argue that by challenging both the reality and norm that politics is a male occupation, the presence of female politicians transforms beliefs about the appropriateness of politics for women and thus increases interest in political activity among women, especially young women (Campbell & Wolbrecht, 2006). The same can be valid for making women visible in agencies where they are invisible, and the culture is not conducive to having females in the visible spheres. It will not be easy for the initial women who begin to occupy a visual space in those distributive and regulatory agencies.

Socialization throughout our lives is often how gender-based expectations and standards are developed, and socialization can be used to evolve ingrained norms. An expectation could be that the more men interact with women as colleagues, operating the same space and occupational functions with women, the more their inherent belief systems will be challenged and may evolve. The change will need to happen with the perception of an agency from within and the perception of an agency from the outside for actual change to occur; visibility is one step in the equation. Suppose more women knew



that working for the Transportation Cabinet in more than a clerical position was possible. In that case, more women may add that possibility to their aspirations because they have seen others like them make it their reality. If people see something often enough, their implicit bias becomes overridden with a new bias or association that incorporates the previously marginalized group because the exposure has now normalized in their minds (Vetter, 2020; ICMA, 2017). It should be noted that concerning visibility when a person seeks the reports used in this paper from the Personnel Cabinet's website, they are not visible nor available for online access, unlike most other Executive Branch reports, which is problematic.

The Personnel Cabinet's Office of Diversity, Equality, and Training opened every SAR with guidelines and notes on intention and action. Not one report from the dozen that were combed through for this paper mentioned action or intervention that would be taken against the underperforming cabinets. The underperformance reported should have triggered an investigation, but it does not appear that any occurred as the underperforming cabinets statically underperformed from the first report in 2012 to the 2020 report. Behavior seldom changes without inducement and reinforcement (positive or negative). What incentive is there for the Transportation Cabinet to alter its sustained culture if it continues underperforming and shows systemic discrimination patterns in the Personnel's cabinet's data? Lowi's (1985) agency typology implies that an agency's policy-making and power-oriented structures make up the identity of that agency. That would mean significant, sweeping, and forceful change would have to occur to root out

the systemic cultural patterns of occupational segregation and gender discrimination inherent in Lowi's typology.

Kentucky cannot be written off as a lost cause until it has exhausted all investment options like training and education, also to consider punitive measures for underperformance on gender ratios if other positive incentives do not work. The legislature should consider passing a law that carries a penalty for breaking the law, such as underperformance; that way, the oversight shifts from the Executive Branch administrations in office to the legislature that comes with the power of law's checks and balances. It should be noted that three different Governors from both political parties oversaw the Office of Diversity, Equality, and Training during the reporting years chronicled. Lack of action for occupational segregation and chronic agency underperformance has been under bipartisan oversight. Substantial changes must be made to move Kentucky in the right direction, which is forward. An acknowledgment of a systemic problem is an ideal place to start, and then an assessment of all the factors that contribute to occupational segregation must follow. Kentucky will stagnate if it merely collects data and does not address the cause of systemic inequity, further fortifying the glass walls, reinforcing the glass ceiling, leaving us no choice but to live up to our state motto of *divided we fall*.

## REFERENCES

- Alkadry, M. G., & Tower, L. E. (2006). Unequal Pay: The Role of Gender. *Public Administration Review*, 66(6), 888–898. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00656.x>
- Alkadry, M. G., & Tower, L. E. (2011). Covert Pay Discrimination: How Authority Predicts Pay Differences between Women and Men. *Public Administration Review*, 71(5), 740–750. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02413.x>
- Alkadry, M. G., & Tower, L. E. (2013). Slowly but can we say "surely" Pay Equity & Segregation A Decade Later in West Virginia State Government. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 37(2), 210–239. <https://doi.org/www.jstor.org/stable/24372008>
- Arth, D. (2020). Women's Approaches to Negotiation: The Role of Negotiation in the Gender Pay Gap. <https://doi.org/10.31237/osf.io/prvb7>
- Bishu, S. G., & Headley, A. M. (2020). Equal Employment Opportunity: Women Bureaucrats in Male-Dominated Professions. *Public Administration Review*, 80(6), 1063–1074. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13178>
- Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2017). The Gender Wage Gap: Extent, Trends, and Explanations. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 55(3), 789–865. <https://doi.org/http://www.jstor.org/stable/26303306>
- Bowling, C. J., Kelleher, C. A., Jones, J., & Wright, D. S. (2006). Cracked Ceilings, Firmer Floors, and Weakening Walls: Trends and Patterns in Gender Representation among Executives Leading American State Agencies, 1970?200 0. *Public Administration Review*, 66(6), 823–836. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00651.x>
- Breaking barriers: Unconscious gender bias in the workplace*. International Labour Organization. (2017, August). Retrieved February 16, 2022, from [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_dialogue/---act\\_emp/documents/publication/wcms\\_601276.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_dialogue/---act_emp/documents/publication/wcms_601276.pdf)
- Campbell, D. E., & Wolbrecht, C. (2006). See Jane Run: Women politicians as role models for adolescents. *The Journal of Politics*, 68(2), 233–247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00402>

- Commonwealth of Kentucky Personnel Cabinet, Office of Diversity, Equality, and Training, *Semi-Annual Report on Female and Minority Employment, January- June 2012* (2013). Frankfort, Kentucky; Commonwealth of Kentucky.
- Commonwealth of Kentucky Personnel Cabinet, Office of Diversity, Equality, and Training, *Semi-Annual Report on Female and Minority Employment, July-December 2013* (2014). Frankfort, Kentucky; Commonwealth of Kentucky.
- Commonwealth of Kentucky Personnel Cabinet, Office of Diversity, Equality, and Training, *Semi-Annual Report on Female and Minority Employment, July-December 2020* (2021). Frankfort, Kentucky; Commonwealth of Kentucky.
- Cooky, C., Council, L. D., Mears, M. A., & Messner, M. A. (2021). One and Done: The Long Eclipse of Women's Televised Sports, 1989–2019. *Communication & Sport*, 9(3), 347–371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21674795211003524>
- DeHart-Davis, L., Hatmaker, D., Nelson, K., Pandey, S., Pandey, S., Smith, A., & Kazouh, A. (2020, February). Near The Top: Understanding Gender Imbalance In Local Government Management. Public Management: *Local Government Review Special Report*, 6–19. Retrieved July 20, 2021, from <https://icma.org/documents/lgr-local-government-review-february-2020>.
- Dolan, J. (2004). Gender Equity: Illusion or Reality for Women in the Federal Executive Service? *Public Administration Review*, 64(3), 299–308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00374.x>
- Eidmann, K. A. (2008). Ledbetter in Congress: The limits of a narrow legislative override. *The Yale Law Journal*, 117(5), 971. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20455815>
- Escriche, L. (2007). Persistence of Occupational Segregation: The Role of the Intergenerational Transmission of Preferences. *The Economic Journal*, 117(520), 837–857. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2007.02052.x>
- Gino, F., & Kauffman, K. (2021, August 30). *Unconscious bias training that works*. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved February 16, 2022, from <https://hbr.org/2021/09/unconscious-bias-training-that-works>
- Guy, M. E., & Fenley, V. M. (2013). Inch by inch. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 34(1), 40–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371x13510379>

- Guy, M. E., & Newman, M. A. (2004). Women's Jobs, Men's Jobs: Sex Segregation and Emotional Labor. *Public Administration Review*, 64(3), 289–298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00373.x>
- Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 416–427. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.416>
- Hsieh, C.-wei, & Winslow, E. (2006). Gender representation in the federal workforce. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 26(3), 276–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371x05281785>
- Keyton, J., Ferguson, P., & Rhodes, S. C. (2001). Cultural indicators of sexual harassment. *Southern Communication Journal*, 67(1), 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10417940109373217>
- Lee, J. (2018). Passive leadership and sexual harassment. *Personnel Review*, 47(3), 594–612. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-07-2016-0169>
- Lewis, G. B., & Emmert, M. A. (1984). Who pays for veterans' preference? *Administration & Society*, 16(3), 328–345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009539978401600304>
- Long, N., Jennings, E. E., Corson, J. J., & Paul, R. S. (1967). Turbulence at the top. *Public Administration Review*, 27(5), 471. <https://doi.org/10.2307/973404>
- Lowi, T. J. (1985). 3. The State in Politics. *Regulatory Policy and the Social Sciences*, 67–110. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520313651-005>
- Maatz, L. (2013, June 27). Equal Pay Act Anniversary Renews Push for Law's Promise. *La Prensa San Diego*. <https://laprensa-sandiego.org/equal-pay-act-anniversary-renews-push-for-laws-promise/>.
- Magee, J. C., & Frasier, C. W. (2014). Status and power: The principal inputs to influence for public managers. *Public Administration Review*, 74(3), 307–317. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12203>
- Martinez, N. (2021, April 21). Damning report of Kentucky's unemployment debacle released. *WAVE-3 News*. <https://www.wave3.com/2021/04/21/damning-report-kentuckys-unemployment-debacle-released/>.

- Meier, K. J., & Wilkins, V. M. (2002). Gender differences in agency head salaries: The case of public education. *Public Administration Review*, 62(4), 405–411. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00194>
- Miller, W., Kerr, B., & Reid, M. (1999). A National Study of Gender-Based Occupational Segregation in Municipal Bureaucracies: Persistence of Glass Walls? *Public Administration Review*, 59(3), 218–226. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3109950>
- Mölders, S., Brosi, P., Bekk, M., Spörrle, M., & Welppe, I. M. (2017). Support for quotas for women in leadership: The influence of gender stereotypes. *Human Resource Management*, 57(4), 869–882. <https://doi.org/https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.echo.louisville.edu/doi/full/10.1002/hrm.21882?sid=worldcat.org>
- Newman, M. A. (1994). Gender and Lowi's Thesis: Implications for Career Advancement. *Public Administration Review*, 54(3), 277. <https://doi.org/10.2307/976732>
- Orazem, P. F., & Mattila, J. P. (1998). Male-female supply to state government jobs and comparable worth. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16(1), 95–121. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209883>
- Okahana, H., Zhou, E., & Gao, J. (2020). (rep.). *Council on Graduate Schools Enrollment Data 2009-2019*. Council on Graduate Schools. Retrieved from [https://cgsnet.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/CGS\\_GED19\\_Report\\_final2.pdf](https://cgsnet.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/CGS_GED19_Report_final2.pdf)
- Pate, R. L. (2017). The equal opportunity harasser, sexual harassment, gender-neutral words, and Ludwig Wittgenstein. *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law*, 17(3), 180–194. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1358229117722269>
- Personnel Cabinet (Ed.). (2021). *Commonwealth of Kentucky's Executive Branch Affirmative Action Plan*. Kentucky Personnel Cabinet: The Office of Diversity & Equality: Affirmative Action . Retrieved July 20, 2021, from <https://personnel.ky.gov/Pages/AffirmativeAction.aspx>
- Riccucci, N. M. (2019). Equality: Norma M. Riccucci. *Public Integrity*, 21(6), 632–634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2019.1651127>
- Schachter, H. L. (2016). Women in public administration. *Administration & Society*, 49(1), 143–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399715611173>

- Stivers, C. (1993). Rationality and romanticism in constitutional argument. *Public Administration Review*, 53(3), 254. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3110132>
- Stivers, C. (2010). Class. *Administration & Society*, 42(1), 119–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399710362655>
- Task Force on women in the Profession Final Report 2014. *International City/County Management Association*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 16, 2022, from [https://icma.org/sites/default/files/306859\\_Task%20Force%20on%20Women%20in%20the%20Profession%20Final%20Report%202014.pdf](https://icma.org/sites/default/files/306859_Task%20Force%20on%20Women%20in%20the%20Profession%20Final%20Report%202014.pdf)
- Vetter, N. (2020, January). Women in leadership: Run the world: Women in leadership. *Public Management*. Retrieved February 16, 2022, from <https://icma.org/articles/pm-magazine/women-leadership-run-world-women-leadership>
- The White House, *Fifty years after the Equal Pay Act* (2013). Washington, D.C.
- Yoder, S. D. (2001). Is sexism the issue? *American Journal of Bioethics*, 1(1), 14–15. <https://doi.org/10.1162/152651601750078880>

## CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: Hillary McGoodwin Abbott

ADDRESS: 550 Darby Creek Road  
Unit 19  
Lexington, KY 40509

DOB: Lexington, Kentucky – July 26, 1988

### EDUCATION & TRAINING:

B.A., History  
University of Kentucky  
2012-2015

### AWARDS:

Departmental Honors in History  
University of Kentucky  
2015

### PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES:

American Society for Public Administration  
International City/County Management Association

### PUBLICATIONS:

### NATIONAL MEETING PRESENTATIONS:

### REFERRED JOURNALS:

### BOOKS AND SYMPOSIA:

### INVITED PRESENTATIONS: