Filling in the Skeletal Pillar: Addressing Social Equity in Introductory Courses in Public Administration

Author(s): James H. Svara and James R. Brunet

Filling in the Skeletal Pillar: Addressing Social Equity in Introductory Courses in Public Administration

James H. Svara and James R. Brunet
North Carolina State University

ABSTRACT

In this article, the authors investigate the coverage of social equity in introductory public administration textbooks. A framework for understanding and measuring social equity is first presented, followed by a detailed review of textbook content. Finding mixed attention to the issue, an "equity-across-the-survey-course" is suggested. The article concludes with specific recommendations for including social equity as a theme running throughout the course.

In an editorial that provided the basis for this issue of *J-PAE*, Ed Jennings expressed what is probably a common perception. A great deal of attention is given in public administration to public service values, including efficiency, effectiveness, democracy, responsiveness, and accountability. "Surely," Jennings argued, "in a democratic society, social equity should have the same degree of importance." In response to the charge to examine "how public affairs programs address social equity issues and what they communicate to their students about this central concern," attention should be given to how equity is handled in introductory courses in public administration. We examine this question by assessing the content of textbooks designed for these courses. We have not attempted to find out how instructors actually handle the topic in the classroom, but we provide an assessment of the text materials on which they can draw.

An assessment of textbooks as well as the larger issue of how social equity should be presented runs into an immediate problem. How do we know what we are looking for? One must have a framework for understanding equity before it is possible to determine the extent to which the elements in the framework are being covered. The first step in this paper is to consider how we think about social equity and the extent to which it has been given operational meaning in the field of public administration. Finding a lack of clarity, the second step is to propose a framework drawing on recent national discussions about measuring equity. The third step is to examine the content of major introductory textbooks. In view of the limited material we found in textbooks, our final step is to suggest ways to shore up the coverage of social equity in the public administration survey course.

THE MEANING OF SOCIAL EQUITY IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Social equity's place in the field of public administration is difficult to pin down. It would seem to be one of our most important normative

touchstones. It has been described as a third pillar of the field, along with efficiency and effectiveness.[1] Still, it is clear that equity is not as well developed as the other two pillars. The shortcomings in specification may arise from the confusion about the meaning of equity, both as a concept and as a value commitment for public administrators. Definitions can range from simple fairness and equal treatment to redistribution and reducing inequalities in society. The various definitions are not a problem *per se,* but there can be confusion if one administrator feels that the obligation to be equitable is met fully by providing the same garbage pickup schedule to all residents and another views targeted programs to help low-income children as the kind of approach that qualifies as equity. Thus, what actions are appropriate for public administrators to take in their presumed commitment to equity can also vary widely, and certain alternatives can raise the issue of administrator involvement in policy-making. Put together, these observations suggest that equity is a pillar in public administration, but a skeletal one lacking core and cover. Social equity is imposing from a distance, but when you get close to equity it is hollow. There is limited agreement about what equity means or what administrators should do about it except to be for equity in a general way.

The undeveloped condition of equity is further illustrated by the disparity between the measures available for it compared with the other two pillars of the field. Outfitted with scorecards, report cards, benchmarks, and customer satisfaction surveys, the modern administrator is well equipped to measure the efficiency and effectiveness of governmental operations. Politicians and administrators alike celebrate all manners of performance improvement, from declining crime rates to improving water quality. These popular measures, however, have little to say about our progress on issues of social equity. That is, they do not score agencies on their ability to treat all of citizens in a fair manner or to deliver public goods and services equally. Although some communities use measures that cross over into social equity domains—for example, benchmarks that track citizen complaints against police officers

(see Ammons, 2001)—comparative weakness in the development of such measures suggests that scholars and practitioners have not made equity central to the way they think about public administration and to how the performance of public agencies is measured.[2]

The scarcity of equity measures does not imply that social equity has been ignored *in toto* in the public administration literature. Sharp (1990) and Frederickson (1997) provide extended discussions of equity, and much work has been directed at issues of internal equity in governmental organizations—sexual harassment, diversity, and affirmative action (see Broadnax, 2000). Rather, the weak development of such measures suggests that the concept itself is not well understood.

A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING, MEASURING, AND ACTING ON SOCIAL EQUITY

It is a common perception that social equity is a relatively recent discovery in public administration, but the heritage of the field is ignored if we accept the view that equity is a post-'60s concern in public administration.[3] Part of establishing a modern, professional, democratic public administration in the United States and other countries has been promoting standards of fairness and due process and reducing favoritism and the arbitrary treatment of citizens. Furthermore, equality has been an ideal in the U.S. from its beginnings, although we have a long history of systemic and specific shortcomings in achieving it.[4] What is relatively recent is the realization that there are basic inequalities in society that will never be corrected by simply treating everyone equally and that existing government programs can perpetuate inequality. During the New Public Administration movement, public administration scholars began to consider the field's position on the redistribution of resources to reduce inequalities.

A panel of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) has been working to develop standards and measures of equity that can be used to better monitor the performance of government agencies and to guide efforts to elevate the attention to equity. As one of its first products, the panel

developed the following working 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 implementation of public policy, and the commitment to promote fairness, justice, and equity in the formation of public policy.[5]

This definition is helpful in defining the nature and scope of social equity concerns. Fairness, justice, and equitable distribution are viewed as normative cornerstones of equity. Important administrative functions and processes, such as policy formation, service delivery, implementation, and management, are also encompassed by the definition. Equity considerations extend to the work done and services delivered on behalf of government through contracts as well as the work of government agencies themselves. This definition clarified what is meant by equity, but the NAPA panel has faced the challenge of specifying more precisely what equity is and how it is possible to systematically examine when and how equity is being achieved. A panel committee has created a preliminary set of criteria that give operational meaning to equity and can be used in a variety of ways to measure equity.[6] The criteria are divided into four areas: procedural fairness, access, quality, and outcomes.

Procedural fairness involves the examination of problems or issues in procedural rights (due process), treatment in procedural sense (equal protection), and the application of eligibility criteria (equal rights) for existing policies and programs. This criterion includes an examination of fairness in management practices in areas such as hiring, promotion, and award of contracts. A commitment to procedural fairness is integral to administrative values: public administrators have an ethical and legal obligation to ensure that Constitutional rights are protected. Practices such as a failure to provide due process before relocating a family as part of an urban renewal project, using racial profiling to iden-

tify suspects, or unfairly denying benefits to a person who meets eligibility criteria all raise obvious equity issues.

Access—or distributional equity—involves a review of current policies, services, and practices to determine the level of access to services/benefits and an analysis of reasons for unequal access. Several alternative distributional principles may be used to promote equity: simple equality; differentiated equality; targeted intervention; redistribution; and commitment of resources to achieve equal results. Access concerns who receives benefits or services. Equity can be examined empirically—do all persons receive the same service and the same quality service?—as opposed to the procedural question of whether all are treated the same according to distributional standards in an existing program or policy. Or it can be examined normatively—should there be a policy commitment to providing the same level of service to all?

If there are gaps in equality, what approach should be taken, if any, to address inequality? If one does not pursue equal distribution, the other approaches are guided by a Rawlsian principle: unequal treatment should be intended to promote a fairer distribution of resources in society by benefiting those who are disadvantaged. A wide variety of programs offer a form of differentiated equality based on recipients meeting eligibility criteria that direct benefits to low income or minority persons. Targeted intervention is similar, with an emphasis on geographical areas in which low-income persons reside—for example, inner-city health clinics. Finally, certain programs have an explicit commitment to the redistribution of resources as a policy purpose, although it is not necessarily the only purpose. Temporary Assistance to Needy Families is redistributive, with the primary objective of moving the recipients of assistance into regular jobs. Medicaid offsets the disadvantage in access to health care for low-income persons.

Quality—or process equity—involves a review of the level of consistency in the quality of existing services delivered to groups and individuals. Process equity requires consistency in the nature of services

delivered to groups and individuals regardless of the distributional criterion that is used. For example, is garbage pickup the same in quality—the extent of spillage or missed cans—in all neighborhoods? Do children in inner-city schools have teachers with the same qualifications as those in suburban schools? Does healthcare under Medicaid match the prevailing standards of quality? Presumably, a commitment to equity entails a commitment to equal quality.

Outcomes involves an examination of whether policies and programs have the same impact for all groups and individuals served. Regardless of the approach to distribution and the consistency of quality, there is not necessarily a commitment to an equal level of accomplishment or outcomes. This approach represents a shift in focus from procedures and inputs to outputs. The results approach examines social and economic conditions and then asks why different outcomes occur—for example, achievement gaps in schools or differences in life expectancy based on income or race. Equal results equity might conceivably require that resources be allocated until the same results are achieved. This is the most demanding standard of equity and could involve an essentially open-ended commitment of resources. Part of the difficulty in achieving equal results is that government action is not the sole determinant of social outcomes. Social and economic conditions—for example, poverty—that are broader than the policy problem being examined may explain the differences in outcomes in education or health. Furthermore, individual behavior is often a critical element in explaining social outcomes. Still, a critical issue in consideration of equity at this level is how much inequality is acceptable and to what extent government can and should intervene to reduce the inequality in results.

One final aspect of creating a framework for understanding equity is its action implications. Equity cannot be a defining value of the field unless it is tied to a commitment to advance equity. Following from the definition and criteria, one may infer that public administrators have a responsibility to promote fairness, justice, and equitable distribution in policy formulation, implementation, and man-

agement and to critically examine the impact of government actions. Defining responsibility in this way assumes that administrators play an active role in policy-making and that their efforts to shape policy should include giving explicit attention to the implications of alternative approaches for equity. Thus, a broad commitment to equity presumes that administrators have a complementary relationship that includes helping to shape policy and preserving an agency's established policy goals (Svara, 2001; Svara and Brunet, 2003). It is not the expectation that public administrators within an agency will become policy campaigners offering gratuitous advice to elected officials about new programs that they favor to make society more equitable. What administrators should do is analyze unmet needs and recommend ways to improve existing policies and programs and/or create new policies or programs to advance equity.[7] Some of these changes may be accomplished by administrative action alone, particularly by removing procedural barriers to equity and improving access, quality, and outcomes within existing policies. Some will require elected officials to make policy changes.

It is important to note how this view of the responsibilities of administrators compares to the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) code of ethics. The code calls for efforts to change policies only if they are "counter-productive or obsolete," with no mention of changes to promote equity. The code obligates administrators to oppose or eliminate discrimination in Parts I-2 (along with supporting affirmative action) and II-3; to promote fairness in Part I-5; to promote equality, fairness, and due process in protecting citizens' rights in Part II-7; and to ensure due process for organizational members in IV-4. There is no explicit mention of the equitable distribution of public services. Thus, the expectations for administrator action are somewhat broader than those found in the ASPA code. This difference does not necessarily imply a conflict in value preferences, but it may be another indication that the generalized support for social equity has not been fully incorporated into the values or practices of public administration.[8]

THE SOCIAL EQUITY BLIND SPOT IN INTRODUCTORY TEXTS

In the past, public administration scholars have surveyed the contents of introductory textbooks to ascertain the field's pedagogical priorities (Waldo, 1955; Stillman, 1991; Cigler, 2000). In similar fashion, a content analysis of current textbooks in public administration was conducted to determine how the issue of social equity is covered. Two criteria were used for selecting textbooks to include in the analysis. First, we sought out textbooks that provided the most current overview of the field. We limited our selections to books published within the last three years, under the assumption that books of a more recent vintage had access to the latest social equity research and are more likely to be available for use in courses. Second, books that have gained a level of acceptance in the field, through publication in multiple editions, were selected over first-edition texts. Through this test, we hoped to get the books that had withstood the test of time and garnered a measure of support from instructors and students alike. In the end, we were left with the seven textbooks that are most often found in public administration classrooms.

Our search methods were both structured and inductive. We analyzed the presence of certain terms and topics—that is, reviewed the content against a predetermined checklist—and made an effort to discern how the issue was presented by the authors in ways that might not have been anticipated. From these two approaches, we identified a set of dimensions to summarize the equity content of the textbooks.

The dimensions parallel the criteria described above from the NAPA panel, with two additional dimensions pertaining to the coverage of changes in the focus on equity in the history of public administration and the discussion of ethical responsibilities pertaining to equity. Those dimensions and specific indicators are the following:

Use and Definition. We began at a macro level of analysis by noting how frequently the term "social equity" is used in the textbooks and how it is defined.

Historical Aspects. We were interested in learning whether the texts incorporated social equity into a general discussion of administrative history. To gauge whether social equity is presented as an important element in the historical development of the field, we looked to see if prominent milestones (equity in the founding of public administration or the Minnowbrook Conference) and movements connected to social equity (New Public Administration) were introduced. Historical presentations of important civil rights laws and judicial determinations are recorded in their specific social equity domains. For example, textbook coverage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 counted toward the discrimination category in the procedural fairness domain.

Procedural Fairness. Procedural Fairness included six areas.

- *Due Process.* Due process is an important constitutional principle that ensures that agency action is guided (constrained) by the rule of law. It promotes agency fairness in dealings with citizens by requiring certain procedural protections (for example, notice, hearings, appeals of agency decisions).
- *Discrimination.* Fairness in hiring and career advancement is another key element in social equity. The textbooks were reviewed for their coverage of various forms of discrimination in the workplace, including racial, gender, disability, and pregnancy.
- *Sexual Harassment.* Sexual harassment is a specific form of workplace discrimination that includes unwelcome sexual advances and conduct that creates a hostile work environment. The content of sexual harassment textbook discussions is explored.
- *Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action.* A leading concern in the early social equity movement was the need to open up government employment opportunities to underrepresented groups. We were particularly interested in seeing how the authors addressed this topic.
- *Representativeness.* An important consideration for social equity proponents is the racial, ethnic, and gender composition of the public workforce. In a sense, it is a check on the effectiveness of affirmative action programs.

The implication here is that a public service that closely matches the sociodemographic characteristics of the general population more accurately reflects the public interest. Textbook presentations comparing the demographic makeup of public servants to the general public and private sector workers are considered.

- *Cultural Competence.* This includes coverage of agency efforts to understand cultural differences in citizens in order to deliver services in a fair and consistent manner. Crosscultural communication is also relevant here.

Other Equity Measures

- *Access*—distributional equity. Discussion of criteria for distributing benefits or services, for example, distributive versus redistributive approaches.
- *Quality*—process equity. Performance measures concerning service quality.
- *Outcomes.* With the growing emphasis on accountability and performance in public programs, we searched for examples of social equity measures. We wanted to see if benchmarking presentations incorporated social equity goals alongside other outcome measures.

- *Ethics.* We explore whether social equity is included as a value principle in the discussion of administrative ethics or whether there is discussion of whether administrators have a responsibility to promote social equity.[9]

Table 1 summarizes the coverage of social equity concepts in introductory textbooks. The table clearly shows that the most attention is given to procedural social equity concerns, including due process, discrimination, and equal employment opportunity. Other aspects of social equity, including references to its historical significance, received less attention in the texts. For the sake of clarity, we removed from the table empty categories that did not record any coverage, including cultural competence, equity measures, and ethics. A more detailed discussion for each social equity domain is provided below.

Use and Definition

Students are not likely to find the phrase "social equity" in introductory public administration books. Two exceptions exist, however. Shafritz and Russell dedicate an entire chapter to the subject, and Berkley and Rouse mention social equity when discussing actions taken to diversify federal workplaces

Table 1: Social Equity Coverage in Public Administration Textbooks

	Definition	History	Due Process	Discrimination	Sexual Harassment	EEO/AA	Representativeness
Textbook							
Berkley/Rouse			X	X	X	X	X
Denhardt/Grubbs			X	X	X	X	
Milakovich/Gordon			X	X		X	
Henry		X		X	X	X	X
Rosenbloom/Kravchuk			X	X	X	X	X
Shafritz/Russell	X	X		X	X	X	
Starling			X	X	X	X	

Dimensions/indicators not covered in any texts: procedural fairness/cultural competence, other equity measures, and ethical aspects of equity.

(148). Other textbook authors prefer to discuss social equity issues such as discrimination, sexual harassment, and representativeness without reference to social equity.[10]

Several authors do introduce the related concept of "equity" in various contexts. Milakovich and Gordon discuss the Equity Pay Act of 1963, and Rosenbloom and Kravchuk identify equity as an important constitutional value for administrators. Shafritz and Russell provide the only formal definition: "social equity is fairness in the delivery of public services; it is egalitarianism in action—the principle that each citizen, regardless of economic resources or personal traits, deserves and has a right to be given equal treatment by the political system" (395). The first part of the definition hints at the distributional aspects of social equity; the second part leans toward procedural fairness.

Historical Aspects

Social equity is not typically cited in historical accounts of the field. Two exceptions are noteworthy. In his detailed history of public administration, Henry presents New Public Administration as a normative counterpoint to the behavioralist tendencies in political science and the value-neutral management science approach. He concludes that, while the New Public Administration movement "never lived up to its ambitions of revolutionizing the discipline," it "had a lasting impact on public administration in that [it] nudged public administrationists into reconsidering their traditional intellectual ties with both political science and management, and contemplating the prospects of academic autonomy" (2001, 45). Shafritz and Russell make the strongest connection between the value of social equity and the history of public administration. They trace the roots of social equity from Rousseau's Social Contract to the Minnowbrook gathering of activist scholars in 1968. For them, the legacy of the social equity movement has been a positive one "in that now the ethical and equitable treatment of citizens by administrators is at the forefront of concerns in public agencies" (397). They conclude with the following charge for administrators: "Social equity today does not have to be so

much fought for by young radicals as administered by managers of all ages" (397).

Due Process

A majority of the texts define and discuss the concept of procedural due process. Procedural due process "stands for the value of fundamental fairness...requiring procedures designed to protect individuals from malicious, arbitrary, erroneous, or capricious unconstitutional deprivation of life, liberty, or property at the hand of government" (Rosenbloom and Kravchuk, 2002, 35). This topic is often covered within a larger administrative law discussion about rulemaking and adjudication (Denhardt and Grubbs, 70; Milakovich and Gordon, 462-463; Starling, 147; Rosenbloom and Kravchuk, 537-539). Texts often mention specific procedural safeguards that are available to citizens when dealing with adverse agency actions, including adequate notice, right to representation, hearings, and the opportunity to appeal agency decisions.

Discrimination

The texts provide a basic introduction to discrimination, typically in a chapter on personnel administration. As such, the discrimination discussions are geared to illegal employment practices. Discrimination in its various forms (race, gender, age, pregnancy, disability) receives variable coverage, with the most attention directed at the first two items. Henry offers a unique overview of cultural bias in public employment testing (273). Shafritz and Russell actually begin their presentation by examining the heritage of slavery and racism in the United States. Frequently, reverse discrimination is also introduced.

Sexual Harassment

Six of the seven texts raise the issue of sexual harassment, usually offering a legal definition of sexual harassment and discussing relevant court cases that inform current policies. Denhardt and Grubbs offer practical advice on what agencies can do about sexual harassment (226). Another unique approach is to compare sexual harassment policies in the United States and Sweden (Berkley and Rouse, 148).

Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action

The texts provide uniformly solid coverage of the policies enacted to combat discrimination in employment practices. Many pages are given to the history of the Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and comparable worth, among other policies. The texts also dedicate space to the emerging backlash against these initiatives (Shafritz and Russell; Henry; and Milakovich and Gordon).

Representativeness

Several authors identify representativeness as an important public sector value (Milakovich and Gordon; Rosenbloom and Kravchuk). Attempts are made to compare the face of public administration to that of the general population. For example, Berkley and Rouse present two tables that track the number of women and minorities in various federal employment grades (139-140). Both tables indicate increasing numbers of women and minorities in higher grade levels since 1986. Henry provides slightly different breakouts for federal and subnational employees and makes several interesting comparisons to private sector employment. He cites studies that show that more women occupy senior management positions in government compared to women who work in Fortune 500 companies (280). While the presentation seems to indicate that the characteristics of public servants adequately reflect the characteristics of the citizenry (Berkley and Rouse and Henry), one book warns that the imperfect match between the socioeconomic characteristics of administrators and citizens may lead administrators to misrepresent the public interest (Rosenbloom and Kravchuk).[11]

Cultural Competency, Equity Measures, and Ethics

There are several gaps in social equity coverage. The need for administrators to understand how different cultures communicate and relate to government officials is noticeably absent in introductory texts. There is no coverage of distribution equity and ways to achieve or measure it. The consideration of the relative merits of equal distribution, some form of differentiated equality, redistribution, or equal results is missing. Finally, the texts do not link discussions of administrative ethics to the equity construct.

HOW TO PRESENT EQUITY IN AN INTRODUCTORY COURSE

If equity is a major but poorly defined pillar in public administration and if, reflecting the uncertainty in the larger field of public administration, introductory textbooks have typically offered only partial coverage of the topic, how can social equity be introduced to students in survey courses in public administration? Surely the topic is too important to reserve for more advanced courses. In addition, the survey course is likely to be the only opportunity to make many students—most undergraduates or students in other graduate degree programs who take only one course in public administration—aware of social equity. Despite its importance, however, social equity is, as we have seen, a complex and multifaceted topic that may be difficult to cover quickly, and the survey course is already filled with many important topics. Beyond whether and how much coverage, another issue is whether instructors are prepared to cover the topic. Is extensive preparation required before instructors of the survey course can adequately address social equity?

In our view, social equity is so important that it should be included in the survey course, and instructors are adequately prepared to cover the topic even with limited backup in most textbooks. Furthermore, there is sufficient time and space in the survey course to effectively introduce the concept. Two teaching strategies are currently used. First, if one were to use a textbook like Shafritz and Russell, the indepth coverage of the topic in a separate chapter would support making this the topic for a week of classes. A second approach taken by most authors is to load largely procedural equity issues into the human resources chapter. Another, possibly preferable, approach may be indicated. The instructor can increase the salience of social equity by including meaningful references to it throughout the course and linking it to the very definition of the field and to the ethical expectations of public administrators. This third approach goes beyond the way in which

most textbooks currently address the topic and represents an "equity-across-the-survey-course" approach.[12]

Social equity can be given its due without a major reallocation of time. Most instructors are well aware that the survey course is already crowded with basic content; the seven textbooks considered in this investigation average 540 pages. Still, equity can be highlighted in many places. The following are examples of general topics that offer a place to cover particular facets of equity.

History and development of public administration offers an opportunity to address the following aspects of social equity:

- Early historical context in the United States: Regime values of liberty, freedom, and equality; and the recognition of systemic sources of inequality in the United States at its founding.
- The emergence of public administration as a practice in the Progressive Era: The promotion of fairness and due process as well as the reduction of particularistic benefits and arbitrary treatment of citizens as an essential part of civil service reform in particular and of the creation of a differentiated professional public administration in general.[13]
- Expansion of public administration in the New Deal: Public administrators' involvement in an expanding range of policies and programs that addressed social and economic needs.
- Political and social turmoil of the '60s and changes in administrative thought: The civil rights movement's challenge of public administration to recognize and change practices that perpetuated discrimination; New Public Administration's role in expanding the thinking about equity to include a redistribution of resources and efforts to increase the participation of disempowered groups, and its role in challenging public administrators to reconsider their responsibilities to elected officials, on the one hand, and citizens, on the other.

Budgeting and financial management discussions might include the redistribution of funds, the role of citizens in determining funding priorities, and

efforts to distribute funds in an equitable manner. Rosenbloom and Kravchuk briefly mention equity as an important value in tax policy (288). For example, most observers would find an income tax system that required wealthy people to pay little or no tax to be unfair. The shift from services funded by general revenues to a fee-for-service approach to financing has equity issues.

Human resource management discussions could include procedural equity issues and human resources topics, which are well covered in all textbooks, as noted earlier.

Implementation of public policies could introduce equity in a discussion of contracting-out governmental activities. Because most texts already discuss privatization of governmental functions, a follow-up discussion could include a comparison of competing public-private value precepts. In the public policy section of the course, instructors may branch into a discussion on how certain public policies seek to overcome disparities. The Balanoff reader (2000) has an article on how the city of Austin is addressing the digital divide.

Public management could incorporate social equity measures related to quality of service and the results of government programs into a broader discussion of benchmarking and performance management.

Communication offers another opportunity to address social equity. Several textbooks take up the issue of communication (Berkley and Rouse; Starling; Denhardt and Grubbs). The topic, however, is usually directed toward communication within an organization. Instructors could tap into the latest research that examines cultural differences in communication in an effort to better serve an increasingly diverse citizenry (see, e.g., Dulek, Fielden, and Hill, 1991).[14]

Ethics, which is often presented at the end of the course, provides an opportunity to cement the importance of equity by linking it to ethics. Equity could be included in discussions of discretion. One textbook supplement (Watson, 2002) offers an ethics vignette that makes this connection. In the scenario, the student is asked to take on the role of a mayor's assistant when an allegation of racial profiling is made against the jurisdiction's police department.

Students can examine the ASPA code to identify provisions that deal with social equity and suggest tenets that might be added.

CONCLUSION

The current stock of introductory textbooks cover social equity in one of two ways—as a stand-alone chapter (Shafritz and Russell) or as a prominent feature in a human resources section (all the other texts). We suggest that instructors adopt a third approach that weaves social equity into the content covered throughout the entire course. This requires instructors to use a bit of creativity, because most introductory textbooks do not provide social equity material across all content areas. Social equity may be incorporated into most topics, including history of the field, budgeting, human resources, policy implementation, performance measurement, communication, and ethics among others. If social equity is going to have substance as the third pillar of public administration, it needs to be given more salience and visibility. Students starting in the introductory course should consider what it means to promote equity and how this value can be linked to action.

ENDNOTES

1. Frederickson (1980) split the first and omitted effectiveness in his formulations of the pillar concept.
2. The performance measurement movement in the public sector has its genesis in the experiences of successful private sector enterprises (Peters and Waterman, 1982). This may have contributed to the social equity blind spot in current public sector measurement initiatives. Social equity is a distinctly public value that is largely absent from profit-maximizing companies. According to one commentator, equity provides a key contrast between public and private administration: "In governmental management great emphasis tends to be placed on providing equity among different constituencies, while in private business management relatively greater stress is placed upon efficiency and competitive performance (Allison, 1980, 387)."
3. Elements of equity are evident in the field's first textbook (White 1926). Administrative activity is guided by a "principle of consistency" that requires the delivery of services without respect to a person's race, religion, or other circumstances (18-19).
4. Furthermore, there is tension between the ideals of equality and freedom. We have probably done more to advance the latter than the former in the United States, and used the protection of freedom and individual initiative as a reason for not seeking greater equality.
5. National Academy of Public Administration, Standing Panel on Social Equality, *Issue Paper and Work Plan,* October, 2000; amended November 16, 2000. Phillip Rutledge is the panel chair. More than 150 persons have chosen to be part of the panel.
6. The criteria have not been reviewed or approved by the entire panel as of December 2002. The panel hopes to have a set of criteria to measure the state of equity in major policy areas in the United States. Individual agencies could use the same standards to conduct an equity inventory of their programs, procedures, and performance.
7. There has not been a discussion in the panel about the role of the public administration "community" in advocating consideration of fundamental policy change. It is possible that organizations involved in public administration may raise issues and seek to encourage debate about new approaches to policy that address pervasive problems, e.g., universal access to health care or eliminating differentials in criminal penalties that have clear racial impact.
8. Similar observations could be made about the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) statements of values. In the Code of Ethics, Tenet 11 is to "handle all matters of personnel on the basis of merit so that fairness and impartiality govern a member's decisions...." Statement 6 in the Declaration of Ideals is as follows: "Advocate equitable regulation and service delivery, recognizing that needs and expectations for public services may vary throughout the community."
9. In addition to the categories discussed, two other topics might be related to equity: citizen participation efforts fostered by administrators to equalize participation and offset socio/economic factors that retard participation; and the impact of contracting out on staff or service recipients. Neither topic is related to equity in the introductory texts.
10. This was not always the case. An earlier edition of one popular text (Gordon, 1986, 51-52) includes a discussion of social equity. By the 1990s, references to social equity were dropped.
11. According to Rosenbloom and Kravchuk, the public service contains more middle-class persons than the general population, and the top ranks of government are filled with a disproportionately high number of whites and males (557).
12. In MPA programs, following the introductory discussion in the survey course, an "equity-across-the-curriculum" approach should be continued.

13. It will be useful to also avoid the simplistic argument that the founding of public administration in the United States was based on the principle of a dichotomous separation of spheres. The founders in the Progressive Era sought to establish a differentiated public administration but one connected to elected officials and the public, a public administration that would help to shape policies in ways that would promote the public interest, and a public administration that would independently defend laws and values supporting fairness in the face of political pressure. This was not a passive, compliant, value-neutral, and strictly separated public administration. Wilson argued that the law should be administered with enlightenment and equity, and Goodnow was concerned about pursuing truth and maintaining impartiality in public administration (Svara, 1999).

14. For example, persons from high-context cultures (China, Saudi Arabia) rely heavily on nonverbal cues and less on what is actually being said. In low-context cultures (Germany, United States) the spoken word is more important than body language in oral communication. By understanding the differences in communication styles, public administrators would be better prepared to serve all citizens in an equitable manner.

REFERENCES

Allison, Graham. 1997. "Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects?" In Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, eds., *Classics of Public Administration,* 4th edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 383-400.

Ammons, David. 2001. *Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local Performance and Establishing Community Standards,* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Balanoff, Howard, ed. 2000. *Annual Editions: Public Administration 01/02,* 7th ed. Guilford, CT: Dushkin.

Broadnax, Walter D., ed. 2000. *Diversity and Affirmative Action in Public Service.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Cigler, Beverly A. 2000. "A Sampling of Introductory Public Administration Texts." *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* 6(1):45-53.

Dulek, Ronald E., John S. Fielden, and John S. Hill. 1991. *International Communication: An Executive Primer. Business Horizons,* 34(1):20-25.

Frederickson, H. George. 1980. *New Public Administration.* University, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Frederickson, H. George. 1997. *The Spirit of Public Administration.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gordon, George J. 1986. *Public Administration in America,* 3rd ed. New York: St. Martin's Press.

National Academy of Public Administration. 2000. Standing Panel on Social Equity, *Issue Paper and Work Plan,* October.

Peters, Thomas J., and Robert H. Waterman, Jr. 1982. *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies.* New York: Warner Books.

Sharp, Elaine B. 1990. *Urban Politics and Administration.* New York: Longman.

Stillman II, Richard J. 1991. *Preface to Public Administration: A Search for Themes and Directions.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Svara, James H. 1999. "Complementarity of Politics and Administration as a Legitimate Alternative to the Dichotomy Model." *Administration & Society,* 30(6):676-705.

Svara, James H. 2001. "The Myth of the Dichotomy: Complementarity of Politics and Administration in the Past and Future of Public Administration." *Public Administration Review,* 61(2):176-183.

Svara, James H., and James R. Brunet. 2003. "Finding and Refining Complementarity in Recent Conceptual Models of Politics and Administration." In Mark R. Rutgers, ed., *Retracing Public Administration (Research in Public Administration, Vol. 7).* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: JAI Press, 185-208.

Waldo, Dwight. 1955. *The Study of Public Administration.* New York: Random House.

Watson, Robert P., ed. 2002. *Public Administration: Cases in Managerial Role-Playing.* New York: Longman.

White, Leonard D. 1926. *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration.* New York: Macmillan.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION TEXTBOOKS

Berkley, George, and John Rouse. 2000. *The Craft of Public Administration,* 8th ed. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Denhardt, Robert B., and Joseph W. Grubbs. 2003. *Public Administration: An Action Orientation,* 4th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Milakovich, Michael E., and George J. Gordon. 2001. *Public Administration in America,* 7th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Henry, Nicholas. 2001. *Public Administration and Public Affairs,* 8th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rosenbloom, David H., and Robert S. Kravchuk. 2002. *Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector,* 5th ed. New York: McGraw Hill.

Shafritz, Jay M., and E. W. Russell. 2003. *Introducing Public Administration,* 3rd ed. New York: Longman.

Starling, Grover. 2002. *Managing the Public Sector,* 6th ed. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.

James H. Svara teaches administrative ethics and the doctoral course in foundations of public administration in the Public Administration Program at North Carolina State University. He has a special interest in the roles of elected and administrative officials and recently coauthored *Leadership at the Apex: Political-Administrative Relations in Western Local Governments* with Paul Erik Mouritzen. He is a fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration and an honorary member of the International City/County Management Association.

James R. Brunet regularly teaches the introduction to public administration course at North Carolina State University. His research interests cover the foundations of public administration and the administration of justice in the United States. His latest work on strategic planning and state courts appears in *State and Local Government Review.*