

Organizational Culture, Social Equity, and Diversity: Teaching Public Administration Education in the Postmodern Era

Author(s): Mitchell F. Rice

Source: *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, Apr., 2004, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Apr., 2004), pp. 143-154

Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40215647>

#### REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[https://www.jstor.org/stable/40215647?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/40215647?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Public Affairs Education*

JSTOR

# Organizational Culture, Social Equity, and Diversity: Teaching Public Administration Education in the Postmodern Era

*Mitchell F. Rice*  
*Texas A&M University*

---

## ABSTRACT

An important issue closely related to social equity in public service delivery is the teaching of diversity/diversity management in public administration education. This essay addresses this observation in two ways. First, it provides an overview of the traditional cultural environment of public organizations and offers a view of a social equity subculture. Second, the essay presents a perspective on teaching diversity in public administration education as a way of enhancing a social equity focus in the classroom. The premise of this essay is that social equity can best be achieved if public administrators, public managers, and public service delivery personnel have a clear understanding and appreciation of diversity and diversity management that is built into the organization's culture. If social equity is seen as having a connection to diversity within a public organization, it may affect how well the organization advances social equity in the public service delivery process. A concluding thought of the essay is that the teaching of social equity and diversity must be included in public administration education coursework and curricula and that a concerted effort should be made to diversify—racially and ethnically—public administration faculty.

*J-PAE 10 (2004):2:143-154*

Public administration operates in a postmodern period. This is a period, as viewed by Cunningham and Weschler (2002), where traditional methods, processes, and teachings are not compatible with the constructs and realities of the time. The orthodox—bureaucratic—public administration in both theory and practice must give way to a new model for teaching public administration education in the postmodern era (Fox and Miller, 1995). A major feature of the postmodern era in the United States is diverse population groups led by rapidly increasing numbers of Hispanics and Latinos (any race), Asian Americans, African Americans, and other racial groups (see U.S. Census, 2000). Some communities, especially in the South (for example, Georgia and the Carolinas) and Midwest (for example, Iowa) are experiencing tremendous population growths of Hispanics and Latinos, where there were very few some fifteen or twenty years ago (U.S. Census, 2000). Because of this increasing multiculturalism of American society, teaching public administration education in postmodern times demands the inclusion of important topics such as social equity and diversity in the curricula. These topics can facilitate students' knowledge and learning and increase their overall competency, better preparing them to both manage and work in public organizations in a contemporary multicultural society.<sup>1</sup>

Why is the inclusion of these topics important in the education and development of future public administrators, managers, and public service delivery personnel? If social equity involves fairness and equal treatment in public service delivery and public policy implementation, then a more basic focus in public administration education curricula and courses has to examine who works in public organizations, how well are they managed, and who receives public services in a multicultural society. Further, is there a connection between a public organization's interest or lack of interest in social equity in service delivery and its ability to promote and manage diversity among its workforce?

*Journal of Public Affairs Education 143*

Although the concept of social equity does denote fairness and equal treatment, this view does not clearly and fully address the concept within the practice of public administration (see Svava and Brunet, 2004). For public administrators, social equity can also be a value commitment that may involve implementing targeted programs as a way of bringing about equality of results (outcomes) as opposed to input equality—that is, treating every resident, consumer, or client the same. Social equity also involves procedures or process, access, and quality in public service delivery (Svava and Brunet, 2004). Because the meaning of social equity is not clearly understood, and equity measures or standards have yet to be fully developed and accepted, the concept has been slow to find its way into extensive debate and discussion in the contemporary public administration literature and in the profession. With these shortcomings in mind, the National Academy of Public Administration's Standing Panel on Social Equity (2000, 2-3) offers the following definition of social equity:

The fair, just and equitable management of all institutions serving the public directly or by contract, and the fair, just and equitable distribution of public services, and the implementation of public policy, and the commitment to promote fairness, justice and equity in the formation of public policy.

The connection between social equity and diversity takes into account the fact that public organizations and public administrators, managers, and public service delivery personnel can profoundly affect how well they manage and deliver services to all groups in society. If a public organization has a socially diverse workforce that is well managed and has proactive diversity strategies in place, will this contribute to a public organization's consideration of social equity in public service delivery? An operating assumption behind diversity in public organizations is that having different types of employees increases productivity and organizational effectiveness, because individuals with different characteris-

tics have different work styles and cultural knowledge that makes them valuable assets to public organizations in a multicultural society (see Edelman, Fuller, and Mara-Drita, 2001, 1618). Miller and Katz (1995) note that diversity gives an organization a greater range of creativity, problem-solving and decision-making skills, and a potential for seeing 360 degrees of the landscape. The point here is that a proactive organizational diversity strategy can be a vital social equity asset in public service delivery.

Therefore, it would seem that an important issue, closely related to social equity in public service delivery, is the teaching of diversity and diversity management in public administration education. This essay addresses this observation in two ways. First, the essay provides an overview of the traditional cultural environment of public organizations and offers a view of a social equity subculture. Second, the essay presents a perspective on teaching diversity in public administration education as a way of enhancing a social equity focus in the classroom. The premise of this essay is that social equity can best be achieved if public administrators, public managers, and public service delivery personnel have a clear understanding and appreciation of diversity and diversity management that is built into the organization's culture. If social equity is seen as having a connection to diversity within a public organization, it may have an impact on how well the organization advances social equity in the public service delivery process. A concluding thought of the essay is that the teaching of social equity and diversity must be included in public administration education coursework and curricula along with a concerted effort to diversify—racially and ethnically—public administration faculty. It is expected that the discussion that follows may generate considerable debate in the teaching of public administration education among both public administration scholars and public professionals.

#### THE CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT OF PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS: AN OVERVIEW

Traditionally, the cultural environment of public organizations has not been positively associated with

social equity or diversity. Promoting social equity in public service delivery involves citizen input and participation, neither of which a public organization has a strong interest in pursuing or operationalizing (see King et al., 1998; Peters, 1999). Perhaps one explanation is that the bureaucratic culture of an organization reflects those who run and control it. Generally, public organizations in the United States are controlled by individuals of western European descent who have adopted a specific process for the way things are done. The literature has identified this specific process as a culture of conformity (Feldman, 1985), a culture of technical rationality (Adams and Ingersoll, 1990), a culture of process (Deal and Kennedy, 1982), or a culture of control (Ban, 1995). According to Claver et al. (1999, 456), "it is possible to analyze how to improve working habits and the results" of a public organization by examining its culture.

Culture is "a set of values, symbols and rituals shared by members of an organization," describing the way duties and responsibilities are carried out internally and how the organization relates to its customers or clients and the environment (Claver et al., 1999, 456). These values, symbols, and rituals are both formal and informal or written and unwritten. Culture in public organizations takes into account how employees are treated and how the public service delivery process is rationalized. In other words, the culture of a public organization determines its public service orientation. Traditional bureaucratic culture is internally centered and oriented and has the following features (Claver et al., 1999, 459):

- The management style is authoritarian, and there is a high degree of control.
- There is little communication, and the management is usually univocal and top-down.
- Individuals search for stability, have limited scope for initiative, and are oriented toward obeying orders.
- The decision-making process is repetitive and centralized.
- There is reluctance to start innovative processes.
- There are high degrees of conformity.

A citizen-oriented culture in a public organization is more externally focused and has the following orientation (Stewart and Clarke, 1987, 163-164):

- The tasks and activities that are carried out are solely aimed at usefully serving the citizens.
- The organization will be judged according to the quality of the service given with the resources available.
- The service offered will be a shared value provided that is shared by all members of the organization.
- A high-quality service is sought.
- Quality in service requires a real approach to the citizen.

Claver et al. (1999, 459) add to these features:

- The citizens have a primary role in the scale of shared values.
- There is frequent contact with the citizens.
- The problems that arise in public service delivery are thoroughly analyzed.
- All members of a section or department of public administration seek prompt service.

Combining the latter features with those of a citizen-oriented culture would seem to add some elements of a social equity perspective to public service delivery in comparison to the features of a public organization with a traditional bureaucratic culture where internal processes, proper hierarchical protocol, verticality, and formality are emphasized. Further, a citizen orientation perspective in a public organization would require the organization to have responsibility to all clients or customers, not just majoritarian preferences (Vigoda, 2002). Arguably, a responsive public organization "must be reactive, sympathetic, sensitive and capable of feeling" its clients' needs and opinions (Vigoda, 2002, 529). Responsiveness also denotes fairness, accuracy, and speed in service delivery (Vigoda, 2002). Traditional public administration has not fully stressed the external responsibility of public organizations in providing public services to clients or customers with differing needs. This is especially the case in the teaching of public administration.

TRADITIONAL PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION EDUCATION

Coursework in public administration education consists of most of the following subjects: public personnel management/human resources management; public management; public budgeting and finance; organizational management theory and behavior; research methods/quantitative analysis; policy analysis; and ethics. The National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA, 2003, 11) classifies these subject matters into three “common curriculum components”: “The Management of Public Service Organizations,” “The Application of Quantitative and Qualitative Techniques of Analysis,” and “Understanding of the Public Policy and Organizational Environment.” The overall objective of this coursework is to cover a broad range of topics such as the origin and development of public administration as a field of study and academic inquiry; political and legal institutions affecting public management; economic and social institutions and processes; how to prepare a budget; decentralization, devolution, and bureaucracy; the public policy process; personnel/human resources functions; distinction between public administration and business administration; and the principles of public management—efficiency, effectiveness, and economy in the public sector. When a program presents itself for accreditation review, NASPAA determines if the program’s course offerings and contents, as well as other factors, meet its criteria for delivering “a basic level of educational quality” (Breux et al., 2003, 259-260).

NASPAA’s common curriculum components do not identify social equity and diversity as required course content areas. The closest topics that can be associated with social equity and diversity are the issues of representative bureaucracy and affirmative action. The public administration literature covers these subjects quite extensively. Yet, recognizing contemporary demographic developments and changes, NASPAA does seem to be indirectly supportive of the teaching of social equity and/or diversity by permitting public administration programs the flexibility to use “additional curriculum components” to help develop students’ general competen-

cies “that are consistent with the program mission” (NASPAA, 2003, 12). Although this is commendable, the topics of social equity and diversity, if included in a program’s coursework, would seem to be secondary to, or less important than, the common curriculum competency areas. Perhaps the topics of social equity and diversity should be included as part of the common curriculum components, to make them part of NASPAA’s minimal required academic standards for public administration education.

Traditional coursework in public administration sees the influence of cultural differences in organizations as something that is invisible, illegitimate, and negative (Adler, 1991) and inconsistent with the values of efficiency, effectiveness, economy, and good management, and the practices of control, standardization, neutrality, and impersonality. If these values and practices continue to receive primary consideration in the classroom, with little attention to social equity and diversity, are we as teachers of public administration teaching courses and topics that are necessary and relevant? Are we preparing aspiring students for public service work in a multicultural and diverse society? If we continue to teach the Weberian model of bureaucracy and all of the characteristics that have come to be associated with it, are we continuing to promote a bureaucratic culture that is rigid and does not emphasize innovation and change? If so, we are teaching that those who work in a bureaucratic culture have routines and habits that lead to safety and conformity, and that any modification of these routines and habits will create a anxiety and discomfort for the public organization’s executives, managers, and service delivery personnel. Golembiewski and Vigoda (2000) maintain that public bureaucracies have a vertical flow of orders and reports, accountability to highly ranked officers, fear of sanctions and restrictions, and sometimes even a lack of sufficient accountability dynamics. Thus, it would seem that traditional curricula and coursework in public administration is well suited to transmitting well-defined facts and theories, particularly to academically inclined, well-schooled audiences. But this kind of teaching and coursework may not be particularly suited to educating a broader and

more racially and ethnically diverse group of future public administration decision-makers and service delivery personnel.

Instead, as teachers, we should provide students with the perspective that a public organization can be transformed into one with a culture of responsibility, a culture of innovation, and a culture of cost awareness. In other words, public organizations should move from a culture of conformity and status quo, emphasizing procedures and continuity, to embrace a culture of performance (Kest, 1992) advancing a social equity subculture. A social equity subculture stresses responsibility to clients who need public services more, innovative public service delivery strategies and techniques, and greater focus on cost awareness in programs and services as opposed to a focus on budgeted costs. As future public administrators, public managers, and public service delivery personnel, students must be taught that a traditional bureaucratic culture can be modified or changed to reflect a citizen-oriented or social equity-oriented service delivery culture. Claver et al. (1999) offer a cultural diagnosis methodology consisting of the following process:

1. Making a diagnosis of the present culture;
2. Explaining the need for modifications;
3. Defining the values desired;
4. Involving management;
5. Making collaborators aware of this new need;
6. Changing the symbols;
7. Changing training programs to incorporate the new values; and
8. Periodically revising the values.

This methodological approach, better known as a cultural audit, examines the organization's core assumptions and their manifestations as a way of describing its current state and the reasons for it (Thomas, 1999).

In a related way, Denhardt (2001, 507) raises the question: "Do we seek to educate our students with respect to theory or to practice?" The question begs discussion, because pre-service students and in-service students bring a different mindset to the classroom—one shaped by their educational, professional, and/or life experiences. The mindset of stu-

dents from different cultures, ethnicities, and races may also be different. Students from these backgrounds, in many instances, may be seeking a public administration education to sincerely carry out the adage "to make a difference in the quality of life" for individuals within their specific cultures, ethnicities, and races. Yet teachers of public administration prepare and teach from their own frame of reference. Although we would like to not think so, teaching is not a neutral activity. Students are influenced by our answers to their questions, what we tell them in lectures, and the textbooks, articles, and readings we assign to them.

At the risk of raising the ire of many of my colleagues, the teaching of social equity and diversity may be problematic if a teacher's culture, background, race, and social and life experiences are very different from those of the students they are teaching. This is not to say that white faculty cannot teach African American students, or vice versa. It is to say that diversity in the public administration faculty would logically accentuate and convey the importance of diversity to our students and would perhaps increase the likelihood that coursework taught by a racially and ethnically diverse faculty would include a social equity and/or diversity component. Very few people of color are on the faculties of public administration education programs (excluding programs at historically black colleges and universities), and even fewer are teaching in nationally recognized programs. This may be one explanation behind why public administration education coursework continues with a strong theoretical and functional orientation and with little or no focus on social equity and diversity issues. As Cunningham and Weschler (2002, 106) and Faerman (2000) note, we teach theories and practices that maintain and perpetuate stable organization systems. Of course, we teach what we were taught in our own academic preparation, which for many of us did not include the issues of social equity and diversity. From this perspective, professors seldom teach, nor do they firmly grasp, how a focus on social equity and diversity may induce organizational instability and uncertainty. In traditional public administration education, social equity and diversity have not been emphasized in

coursework focusing on organizational operating procedures and missions. While coursework in organizational theory and organizational development may focus on organizational instability, uncertainty, and the impact of the environment on the organization, how would such coursework handle social equity and diversity issues and change in organizations?

Further, regardless of whether we are teaching public administration students to be staff practitioners or line-manager practitioners, the issues of social equity and diversity/diversity management are important to the areas of responsibility of both types of public practitioners. On one hand, Cunningham and Weschler (2002, 105) note that staffers' responsibilities revolve around "1) planning and implementing research projects; 2) carrying out statistical analysis; 3) formulating policy options; and 4) creating and refining financial, personnel and information systems." Staffers work in a multicultural environment and must possess social equity and diversity knowledge and understanding. Staffers can also incorporate social equity analysis and diversity observations into research projects and statistical analyses. In this way, their work can be passed on to superiors.

On the other hand, line-manager practitioners' responsibilities include "1) deciding among policy options; 2) implementing policy; 3) negotiating with stakeholders; 4) motivating subordinates; and 5) anticipating impending changes in the organization's environment" (Cunningham and Weschler, 2002, 105). Line managers are more directly related to the public organization's service delivery process, and their responsibilities involve leadership of subordinates and peers and leadership with stakeholders. Line-manager practitioners must handle social relationships, deal with emotionally challenged situations, supervise multicultural personnel, and seek win-win solutions to complex problems. Therefore, line-manager practitioners' understanding of diversity may affect their subordinates' views of social equity and diversity in the service delivery process. In consideration of this line of thought, the teaching of social equity and diversity would seem to be a

necessary competency for students to gain from a public administration education. Below, I describe how I teach diversity as a way of enhancing my students' understanding of social equity.

#### TEACHING DIVERSITY AS A WAY OF ENHANCING A SOCIAL EQUITY FOCUS

In teaching a course on diversity and public organizations, we must first identify the primary objectives of the course. In my graduate course, "Diversity, Public Policy and Public Administration," the primary objectives are to prepare students who have career aspirations to be employed in the public sector to meet the diversity and multicultural social challenges they will face as future public administrators, public managers, and public service delivery personnel; to enhance students' knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of cultural diversity; to provide cultural competencies needed to interact successfully in a rapidly demographically changing society; and to emphasize that diversity is not a four-letter word in public administration (see Auman and Myers, 1996). The course emphasizes that public administration/public management is a dynamic process involving the provision, allocation, management, and distribution of public services to diverse constituencies representing different races, ethnicities, backgrounds, and genders. The course gives considerable attention to distinguishing between affirmative action, multiculturalism, and diversity management, and uses readings, discussions, and experiential activities on managing diversity and valuing diversity paradigms, monoculturalism, and organizational culture.

My students are also required to complete two field assignments. One assignment requires an interview—from a set of questions I provide—to obtain the views of a public administration executive or administrator (such as a city manager, police chief, fire chief, personnel administrator) on how diversity is affecting the work environment and service delivery (see Table 1). This assignment gives students the opportunity to meet and talk directly with a public administrator, public executive, or department head. An indirect outcome of this interview assignment is that students are sometimes asked to submit a job

application to the organization. The other assignment consists of attending a policy-making body's public meeting to observe first-hand interactions between policymakers and public administrators, the extent of the diversity of policymakers and public administrators, and whether and how this diversity plays out in an interactive policy-making process. Both of these field assignments provide students with a closer connection to their public administration education. Further, many students have never met or spoken with a public administrator, public executive, or department head or have never attended a public body's policy-making meeting. These assignments fill this void.

The course maintains that affirmative action, multiculturalism, and diversity have different meanings and that operationalizing them leads to different quantitative, qualitative, and behavioral outcomes. The different outcomes result from different imple-

mentation strategies and approaches. Tables 2 and 3 define key diversity terms and show the differences between affirmative action, multiculturalism, and managing diversity; unlike affirmative action and multiculturalism, managing diversity is a pragmatic, synergistic strategy driving productivity, service delivery, organizational competitiveness, and social equity (see Rice, 2001). The course also discusses the differences between monocultural, affirmative action, and multicultural organizations (see Table 4).

Among the important understandings conveyed in the course are that (1) hiring diverse personnel is simply not an end in itself, and neither is a diversity edict from top leadership; (2) implementing public policy initiatives requires an understanding of the diverse constituencies served by the organization; (3) public organizations are synergistic organizations (Adler, 1991) that seek to maximize the advantages of diversity while minimizing its disadvantages;

Table 1. Interview Questions for Public Administrators

<p>You are required to interview a high-level public administrator in a city, county, or state agency to carry out this assignment.</p> <p>This assignment must be prepared in a question/answer format. The ten required questions must be presented in numerical order with the answers. You are required to ask at least two additional questions not listed here with answers. These additional questions and answers must be indicated with an asterisk (*). The individual that you will interview <i>must</i> be approved in advance by the instructor.</p> <p>Is diversity in society impacting your organization or agency? If so, how? If not, why not?</p> <p>In your opinion, what does the term diversity mean for your organization or agency?</p> <p>Do you see employee diversity being a plus in carrying out the objectives and mission of your organization or agency? Explain.</p> <p>How is your organization demonstrating its commitment to diversity?</p> <p>Does your organization use diversity training? Why? Why not?</p> <p>How do your employees respond to diversity training?</p> <p>Do you see diversity as a major issue in your organization? Explain.</p> <p>Have you noticed differences in leadership communications and leadership interactions among persons of different racial and ethnic backgrounds in your organization or agency? Explain.</p> <p>How has diversity impacted your ability to carry out your job? Explain.</p> <p>Has your organization or agency ever conducted an employee survey on diversity issues? Why? Or why not?</p>
--



Table 2. Diversity Glossary

*Cultural Audit*—examines the values, symbols, rules, and routines that maintain a public organization's purpose and existence to uncover counterproductive activities and barriers that may adversely affect the organization's public service mission and service delivery process.

*Diversity*—refers to a broad range of differences among employees, including race, gender, age, ethnicity, physical abilities, sexual orientation, education, and so on.

*Diversity Audit*—allows the employer to uncover how selected groups of employees are experiencing the organization and to uncover hidden perceptions or confirm perceived biases before an incident of harassment or discrimination.

*Diversity Climate*—refers to employee behaviors and attitudes that are grounded in perceptions of the organizational context related to women and minorities.

*Diversity Recruitment Quotient*—a process in which an organization's materials and environment are analyzed from a minority perspective to determine why the organization does not receive employment applications from diverse applicants.

*Managing Diversity*—refers to the effective utilization of the diversity of the workforce to accomplish organizational goals.

*Monoculturalism*—refers to the values, customs, and dominance of one culture over another.

*Multiculturalism/Valuing Diversity*—refers to “the process of recognizing, understanding and appreciating cultures other than one's own,” and to a change in perspective on the diversity of individual workers in an organization; the change is from regarding differences as a disadvantage to seeing them as important assets in an organization.

(4) diversity strategies are preceded by cultural audits and/or diversity audits and what they consist of to provide a comparative analysis for measuring diversity progress; and (5) several types of diversity training methodologies are available to draw on based on findings from cultural audits and/or diversity audits (Rice, 2002). These are two separate and distinct audits seeking different information. A cultural audit attempts to examine the values, symbols, rules, and routines that maintain the public organization's purpose and existence to uncover counterproductive activities and barriers that may adversely affect the organization's public service mission and service delivery process. A diversity audit seeks to uncover how selected groups of employees are

experiencing the organization and the prevailing diversity climate in the organization (Rice, 2002).

A second issue in teaching diversity in public administration education is what texts are available for student use. This is also the case for teaching social equity. Only a few textbooks discuss social equity and diversity in a public sector context. Svara and Brunet (2004) argue that social equity is a blind spot in the seven most widely used texts in the field. They conducted a content analysis of these works and found that only one text defined social equity and only two texts gave attention to the historical aspects of social equity in the field. A majority of the texts provided coverage on the issues of due process, discrimination, sexual harassment, equal

Table 3. Comparing Affirmative Action, Multiculturalism, and Managing Diversity

<i>Affirmative Action</i>	<i>Multiculturalism (Valuing Differences)</i>	<i>Managing Diversity</i>
<i>Focus.</i> Fairness and equality.	<i>Focus.</i> Learning and effectiveness of cultural differences.	<i>Focus.</i> Integrating diversity for organizational productivity and effectiveness.
<i>Quantitative.</i> Emphasis is on achieving equality of opportunity in the work environment through the changing of organizational demographics. Progress is monitored by statistical reports and analysis (descriptive data).	<i>Qualitative.</i> Emphasis is on the appreciating differences and creating an environment in which everyone feels valued and accepted. Progress is monitored by organizational surveys focused on attitudes and perceptions.	<i>Behavioral.</i> Emphasis is on building specific skills and creating policies that get the best from every employee. Efforts are monitored by progress toward achieving goals and objectives.
<i>Legally driven.</i> Written plans and statistical goals for specific groups are utilized. Reports are mandated by EEO laws and consent decrees. Demographic characteristics are most important.	<i>Ethically driven.</i> Moral and ethical imperatives drive this culture change.	<i>Strategically driven.</i> Behaviors and policies are seen as contributing to organizational goals and objectives, such as profit and productivity, and are tied to rewards and results.
<i>Remedial.</i> Specific target groups benefit as past wrongs are remedied. Previously excluded groups have an advantage.	<i>Idealistic.</i> Everyone benefits. Everyone feels valued and accepted in an inclusive environment.	<i>Pragmatic.</i> The organization benefits; morale, profits, and productivity increase.
<i>Assimilation model.</i> Model assumes that groups brought into the system will adapt to existing organizational norms. Employees' apparent differences do not count.	<i>Diversity model.</i> Model assumes that groups will retain their own characteristics and shape the organization as well as be shaped by it.	<i>Synergy model.</i> Model assumes that diverse groups will create new ways of working together effectively in a pluralistic environment.
<i>Opens doors.</i> Efforts affect hiring and promotion decisions in the organization.	<i>Opens attitudes, minds, and the culture.</i> Efforts affect attitudes of employees.	<i>Opens the system.</i> Efforts affect managerial practices and policies.
<i>Resistance.</i> Resistance is due to perceived limits to autonomy in decision-making and perceived fears of reverse discrimination.	<i>Resistance.</i> Resistance is due to a fear of change, discomfort with differences, and a desire to return to the "good old days."	<i>Resistance.</i> Resistance is due to denial of demographic realities, of the need for alternative approaches, and of the benefits of change. It also arises from the difficulty of learning new skills, altering existing systems, and finding the time to work toward synergetic solutions.

Source: Derived from Rice (2001) and Ricucci (2002).

Table 4. Contemporary Organizational Cultures

<p><i>The Monocultural Organization</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Domination of one group over another.</li><li>• Seeks to establish and maintain superiority.</li><li>• Exclusionary hiring and membership practices.</li></ul> <p><i>The Affirmative Action Organization</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Committed to actively recruiting and hiring underrepresented or formerly discriminated individuals.</li><li>• All individuals in the organization are encouraged to behave in a nonoppressive way.</li><li>• All members of the organization still conform to norms and practices of the dominant group.</li><li>• Targets change at the individual level.</li><li>• Focus on hiring numbers and assimilation.</li></ul> <p><i>The Multicultural Organization</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reflects the contributions and interests of diverse cultural and social groups in mission, operations, etc.</li><li>• Diverse cultural and social groups play an influential role in all levels of the organization.</li><li>• Supports efforts to expand diversity and multiculturalism.</li></ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Source: Derived from Miller and Katz (1995).</i></p>
--

employment opportunity/affirmative action, and representativeness. None of the texts covered cultural competencies, equity measures, and ethics. The literature on diversity in public administration, although more abundant and more developed, has only a few available texts. I edited a volume in 1996 titled *Diversity and Public Organizations: Theory, Issues, and Perspectives*, which is now under revision. More recent works are those by Mathews (1998), Broadnax (2000), Riccucci (2001), and Naff (2001). Scholarly articles and other publications focusing on diversity and diversity management are more plentiful, and may be assigned as complementary reading materials. Examples of complementary reading materials are Thomas (1999), Soni (2000), U.S. Office of Personnel Management (2000), and Naff and Kellough (2001).

#### CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

In the postmodern era, it would seem that, in order for social equity in service delivery to be a primary concern in public administration education and in public organizations, both must first get their own houses in order. The teaching of social equity and diversity must be included in curricula and

coursework in public administration education, and a concerted effort must be made to provide students with a racially and ethnically diverse faculty. These efforts may contribute to the culture of public organizations incorporating diversity within their missions and their management practices. A strong focus on diversity inside a public organization may posture it to move from a bureaucratic culture toward a citizen-oriented/social equity culture. This movement requires a shift and adjustment to three new cultures: a culture of responsibility; a culture of innovation; and a culture of cost awareness (Claver, 1999). Adopting this typology of culture leads to what Claver (1999) calls a culture of performance with a social equity subculture. In this cultural environment, decision-making takes on a certain degree of innovation, improvisation, and risk (Keston, 1992). Surely, social equity considerations on the part of public organizations would best occur in this kind of cultural environment.

One way to ascertain whether this type of culture exists in a public organization is to conduct a culture diagnosis, the purpose of which is to identify not only the particular culture that is present and its

operating values but also the extent to which it is shared by members. The cultural diagnosis can determine whether a negative bureaucratic culture exists and inhibits effective public service delivery and considerations of social equity. In addition, a diversity audit can be administered to uncover hidden perceptions or confirmed biases about certain groups of individuals.

Public administration education needs to incorporate into its curricula and courses, in a very substantive way, the topics of social equity and diversity in order to be more relevant to contemporary students. Perhaps one way to achieve this is for public administration education to structure—or restructure—its learning developmental sequence to include not only cognitive development and linguistics or interactive development but also a strong focus on psychosocial development (Denhardt, 2001). The knowledge attained in the psychosocial development sequence focuses on action skills of intrapersonal improvement, which would seem to lend itself to the promotion and consideration of social equity in public service delivery. Denhardt argues (2001, 530) that “one’s intrapersonal skills are those capabilities that provide psychological and moral grounding for our actions.” As a result, with the psychosocial development sequence, future public administrators should be more adept at acting morally, responsibly, effectively, independently, and equitably. Imparting these skills in public administration education may require that NASPAA elevate the topics of social equity and diversity to the level of common curriculum components.

#### NOTES

1. Versions of this paper were presented at the Special Symposium on The Social Equity Component of Public Affairs Education at the National Academy of Public Administration, Washington, D.C., February 14, 2003, and at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, October 16-19, 2003, Pittsburgh, PA. The author wishes to thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments and critiques on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

#### REFERENCES

- Adams, Guy B., and Virginia M. Ingersoll. 1990. “Culture, Technical Rationality, and Organizational Culture.” *American Review of Public Administration*, 20(4):285-303.
- Adler, Nancy J. 1991. *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*. Boston: PSW-Kent Publishing Co.
- Auman, Rick, and Gina Myers. 1996. “Why is Diversity Becoming a Four-Letter Word?” In Mitchell F. Rice, ed., *Diversity and Public Organizations*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt Publishing Co.
- Ban, Carolyn. 1995. *How Do Public Managers Manage? Bureaucratic Constraints, Organizational Culture, and the Potential for Reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Breaux, David A., Edward J. Clynych, and John C. Morris. 2003. “The Core Curriculum Content of NASPAA—Accredited Programs: Fundamentally Alike or Different?” *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 9(4):259-273.
- Broadnax, Walter D. 2000. *Diversity and Affirmative Action in Public Service*. Boulder, Col.: Westview Press.
- Claver, Enrique, et al. 1999. “Public Administration: From Bureaucratic Culture to Citizen-Oriented Culture.” *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 12(6):445-464.
- Cunningham, Robert, and Louis Weschler. 2002. “Theory and Public Administration Student/Practitioner.” *Public Administration Review*, 62(1):103-111.
- Deal, Terrence E., and Allan A. Kennedy. 1982. *Corporate Cultures*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Denhardt, Robert B. 2001. “The Big Questions of Public Administration Education.” *Public Administration Review*, 61(5):526-534.
- Faerman, Sue. 2000. “Using Service Learning to Prepare Professionals for the Early 21st Century.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Schools of Public Administration and Affairs (October).
- Feldman, S. P. 1985. “Culture and Conformity: An Essay on Individual Adaptation in Centralized Bureaucracy.” *Human Relations*, 38(4):341-356.
- Fox, Charles J., and Hugh T. Miller. 1995. *Postmodern Public Administration: Toward Discourse*. Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage Publications.
- Golembiewski, Robert T., and Eran Vigoda. 2000. “Organizational Innovation and Science of Craft of Management.” In M. A. Rahim, R. T. Golembiewski, and K. D. Mackenzie, eds., *Current Topics in Management*. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Keston, J. B. 1992. “Dimensions of Excellence: Changing Organizational Culture.” *The Public Manager*, 23(3):17-20.
- King, Cheryl, Kathryn M. Feltey, and Bridget O. Susel. 1998. “The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration.” *Public Administration Review*, 58(4):317-326.
- Mathews, Audrey L. 1999. *The Sum of the Differences: Diversity and Public Organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Miller, Frederick A., and Judith H. Katz. 1995. “Cultural Diversity as a Developmental Process: The Path from a Monocultural Club to Inclusive Organization.” *The 1995 Annual Volume 2, Consulting*. San Diego: Pfeiffer and Co., 267-281.
- Naff, Katherine C. 2001. *To Look Like America: Dismantling Barriers for Women and Minorities in Government*. Boulder, Col.: Westview Press.
- Naff, Katherine C., and J. Edward Kellough. 2001. *A Changing Workforce: Diversity Programs in the Federal Government*. Washington, D.C.: Price Waterhouse Coopers.
- National Academy of Public Administration. 2000. *Standing Panel on Social Equity Issue Paper and Work Plan*. October.
- National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration. 2003. *General Instructions for the Self-Study Report*. Washington, D.C.: NASPAA.

## *Organizational Culture, Social Equity, and Diversity*

- Peters, B. Guy. 1999. *American Public Policy: Promise and Performance*. New York: Seven Bridges.
- Riccucci, Norma M. 2002. *Managing Diversity in Public Sector Workforces*. Boulder, Col: Westview Press.
- Rice, Mitchell F. 2001. "The Need for Teaching Diversity and Representativeness in University Public Administration Education and Professional Public Service Training Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa." In *Managing Diversity in the Civil Service*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: IOS Press: 99-110.
- Rice, Mitchell F., ed. 1996. *Diversity and Public Organizations: Theory, Issues and Perspectives*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt Publishing Co.
- Rice, Mitchell F. 2002. "Diversity Initiatives and Best Practices in Organizations: Developments, Approaches and Issues." Paper presented at the International Conference of the Academy of Business Administration, Warsaw, Poland (August).
- Soni, Vidu. 2000. "A Twenty-First Century for Diversity in the Public Sector." *Public Administration Review*, 60(5):395-408.
- Stewart, J., and Clarke, M. 1987. "The Public Service Orientation: Issues and Dilemmas." *Public Administration Review*, 65(3):161-177.
- Svara, James, and James Brunet. 2004. "Filling in the Skeletal Pillar: Addressing Social Equity in Introductory Courses in Public Administration." *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 10(2):XXXX.
- Thomas, R. Roosevelt, Jr. 1999. "Diversity Management: Some Measurement Criteria." *Employment Relations Today*, Winter:49-62.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management. 2000. *Building and Maintaining a Diverse, High-Quality Workforce: A Guide for Federal Agencies*. Washington, DC.: USOPM, Employment Service Diversity Office.

Mitchell F. Rice is the director of the Race and Ethnic Studies Institute at Texas A&M University and is a professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service. He is a Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration. He has written and lectured extensively on such topics as MWBE set-aside programs, cultural diversity, affirmative action and EEO diversity, and Public Policy and African-American Health Issues. His published books include *Diversity and Public Organizations* (Kendall Hunt 1996).