

# Race and Public Administration

**Edited by Amanda Rutherford and  
Kenneth J. Meier**

First published 2020

ISBN 13: 978-0-367-89671-3 (hbk)

ISBN 13: 978-0-367-86199-5 (pbk)

ISBN 13: 978-1-003-01763-9 (ebk)

## Chapter 1

---

### **The Common Denominator**

Persistent Racial Gaps in the Administration of Policy

Amanda Rutherford and Kenneth J. Meier

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

# 1 The Common Denominator

## Persistent Racial Gaps in the Administration of Policy

*Amanda Rutherford and Kenneth J. Meier*

### Introduction

Issues of race, race relations, and representation have become increasingly present in the United States and in several other countries around the world. Demographically, the U.S. is expected to have no single majority race or ethnicity by the year 2055; although attention is often directed at Latin America, Asia has replaced Latin America and Mexico as the biggest source of immigrants entering the U.S. (Cohn and Caumont, 2016; Pew Research Center, 2015). The proportion of multiracial Americans is growing at a rate that is three times larger than the population rate increase overall (Parker et al., 2015). Recent Census estimates include an adult population consisting of over 2 percent (now close to 10 million) individuals who identify as multiracial; Pew Research estimates this number may rise to nearly 7 percent of the U.S. adult population even though many individuals do not self-identify themselves in this way (ibid.). Yet recent maps informed by NASA mapmaking techniques show that while the U.S. is more diverse, many cities are still defined by racial segregation (University of Cincinnati, 2017). Stories of racial divides continue to fill political news headlines at the local, state, and federal levels. Issues of race are not confined to the U.S. context either, though the majority of this text is U.S.-centric given that race and ethnic issues range over geographic locations and are, thus, affected by local contexts. This includes the ethnic profiling of Roma throughout the European continent, hate speech targeting Koreans in Japan, and positive connotations of whiteness in Latin American countries.

Despite the salience of race as an identifier, one that is accompanied by a multitude of presumptions, theoretically driven research seeking to understand attitudes, biases, and experiences that differ by race and ethnicity in a way that can offer tools to practitioners tasked with public policy and management issues has casually ebbed and flowed within public administration scholarship. This text argues that there is a clear need to provide timely information on what we do and do not know about issues of race and equity to current and future civil servants, private contractors, and nonprofit governing boards. That scholarship can and should inform practice that can be used to address issues of race and equity rather than overlook, ignore, or deny them.

The aim of this book is not to argue for or against scientific research related to distinctions across racial categories. We agree with scientists working across fields from biology to sociology that race is a social construct with little biological or genetic meaning. Indeed, scientific research has consistently failed to identify a clear and objective logic for racial distinctions. That said, the social constructions of race have been and continue to prove powerful bases for how policies are formed and implemented throughout the world. These differences are observed across more policy arenas than can be counted—health, education, environment, social welfare, housing, the labor market, energy, public safety, and more. As such, the primary goal of this book is to synthesize what various bodies of research have discovered about race in a set of policy areas as well as to identify what contradictions, unanswered questions, and best (or worst) practices exist in understanding how to move forward in conducting theoretically informed research that can provide evidence-based policy and management guidance to practitioners in the field of public administration.

It is also not the intention of this book or its contributors to ignore other areas in which conversations on equity or discrimination should occur and, at times, overlap with race. Instead, we would argue that these groups merit a separate study that cannot be easily incorporated in the current text in order to be discussed adequately and to provide more than a passing nod to decades of history, policy development, and other changes that affect the lived experiences of millions of people.

This chapter sets the stage for this discussion in four sections. First, a small set of key terms are defined as a reference that can be used when reading each of the substantive chapters in the volume. Second, we discuss changes in the role and representation of racial minorities—most often those who are Black—in the U.S. bureaucracy. While we do not intend to emphasize one race more than others, necessarily, most research until the 1980s has focused on the status of Black individuals in the bureaucracy rather than Hispanics, Asian Americans, or Native Americans, among other groups. Third, a brief history of research on race, including the normative desire to achieve social equity, in the field of public administration will be reviewed. For the practitioner reading this text, this should provide some framework for considering the development of a fairly new field as it overlapped with policy changes and politically salient events. For the scholar, such a history should provide a window into considering the continuous need for understanding the role of race in politics and administration rather than simply controlling for racial groups as additional variables. Finally, an overview of the book, including a summary of each chapter in this volume, is detailed prior to jumping into the rest of the text.

## **Important Terms**

Before discussing race in public service and how public administration scholars have studied issues related to race, it is important to define a few terms that are

woven throughout the rest of the text. These serve as a reference guide to the reader and a starting point for gaining knowledge of other concepts.

*Racialization* can be defined as the process of constructing racial meaning, whether in the policy process or through interpersonal interactions. This includes the process of defining racial categories and how these categories relate to other ideas. In other words, this helps us to understand race as a social construction rather than as some constant that does not change over time. Racialization includes decisions of who might be counted as part of a particular race, which often leads to different assumptions and types of treatment for each of these constructed groups.

Next, *racism* can be broadly defined as a system of advantage or disadvantage based on race (Tatum, 2001; Wellman, 1993). This definition has been broken down into multiple types of racism, though here we will highlight two. First, we often consider overt or discreet acts of individual or *interpersonal racism* involved in direct, face-to-face interactions between two or more people. It is this type of racism that includes name calling, the use of slurs, and other forms of aggression. While debated, many groups argue that this type of racism is, in some places, less prevalent today than in prior decades. A second form of racism, however, is just as important and is often less well recognized. *Institutional racism* involves instances of racial discrimination or inequality in organizational or institutional contexts. This type of racism may or may not have an overt intent but can be tied to inequality across racial lines. Examples might include how state appropriations are allocated to local school districts, where nuclear waste sites are located, or how accessible voting sites are for minority communities. In many cases, misperceptions of groups can be formalized more permanently through institutions and public policy.

Aside from racism, policies may often be formed or implemented in a way that is identified as *race-conscious* or *race-neutral*. The former type is typically aimed at closing a particular gap between or among racial groups. For example, the recent *Fisher v. University of Texas* (2016) case revolved around the constitutional use of race as one component of review for admission to postsecondary education. In this case, the University of Texas considered race as one of many factors in determining which students would gain admission. On the other hand, race-neutral policies do not explicitly take race into account. In the case mentioned here for admission to universities, this might look like a policy that places weight on socioeconomic status or geographic location, while not taking account of race of the applicant. Other common examples include not hiring someone with a felony conviction or not renting to individuals with felony convictions. It should be noted, of course, that while these policies do not explicitly touch on race, they are likely to have adverse effects that further racial inequities. For example, racial minorities are much more likely to experience some level of contact with police. This overrepresentation in the criminal justice system will likely lead to housing or hiring policies that have a disproportionate effect on people of color.

Finally, two particular types of policies beyond those that are generally race-conscious and race-neutral should be highlighted when considering race in public administration. First, *equal employment opportunity* is defined by the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) as “freedom from discrimination on the basis of protected classes such as race, color, sex, national origin, religion, age, disability or genetic information.” Such protected classes—often those defined via Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—fall under federal (and often state) laws, which are enforced by the EEOC. This generally includes hiring, firing, promotion, training, and a variety of other organizational level policies and processes. Second, *affirmative action policies* are defined as, “those actions appropriate to overcome the effects of past or present practices, policies, or other barriers to equal employment opportunity” (EEOC, 1979). Affirmative action policies and plans may be voluntary (particularly in the private and nonprofit sectors), part of compliance with federal regulations, or part of a court mandate following evidence of discrimination, and are generally seen as a more proactive step than equal employment which only prohibits discrimination. Importantly, following the *Regents of University of California v. Bakke* (1973) case, the judicial system in the United States has ruled that quotas are illegal and do not constitute affirmative action, though many misperceptions related to affirmative action policies involve the equating of affirmative action to quota systems. In the same case, the court also determined that affirmative action policies should pursue a “compelling government interest” and that they must be “narrowly tailored to pursue that interest” (*Regents of University of California v. Bakke* 1973). This means such policies are held to the most stringent standard—strict scrutiny—of judicial review when issues of constitutionality are raised.

## **Race and the Development of the Civil Service in the United States**

With these terms in mind, we next provide a condensed history of the role of racial minorities in the U.S. bureaucracy. As mentioned above, much of the early history revolves around the Black-White divide, as this was most salient to prior scholars until the late 1900s. Nevertheless, the story is telling of what progress has been made as well as what gains have yet to be achieved.

As the American colonies developed into an independent nation, and a system bureaucracy was established to aid in governance processes, employment in the federal service was understood to be limited to White citizens. Voting, of course, would provide additional limitations for political participation for people of color until at least the post-Civil War years, if not longer, in many jurisdictions. In terms of civil service, though there was often a shortage of troops during the Revolutionary War, few were eager to enlist Black soldiers. As additional systems of bureaucracy were statutorily cemented in the early 1800s, non-White individuals (and more specifically Black individuals) were explicitly barred from carrying mail for the post

office (Krislov, 1967); this statute was strictly enforced through the 1820s and was not dropped until the 1860s.

After the passing of the 15th Amendment, electoral and appointed positions were highly desirable commodities among many communities of color as a way to gain influence and status that might not otherwise be attainable. Though a multitude of barriers to representation were still faced in many areas of the country (this included but was not limited to the South), minor civil service appointments were encouraged and praised. In 1869, the first Black person was selected to hold a federally appointed position as Ebenezer Bassett became the minister to Haiti. Later, under President Rutherford B. Hayes, additional positions were filled by racial minority groups; this was perhaps in an attempt to appease groups of color when federal troops were withdrawn from the South after Reconstruction. Perhaps unsurprisingly, gains in minor administrative roles in the federal civil service were at times more accessible than both appointed and elected positions in states and local municipalities, where Jim Crow laws and segregation presented formidable forces. Even in the Northern states, increasing rates of immigration brought to the surface various forms of explicit stereotypes and biases toward many racial and ethnic minority groups. Additional gains and losses for people of color would depend on the party and executive in office. By the end of the 1800s and following the adoption of a merit system for many civil service positions, estimates, though imperfect, suggest there were nearly 3,000 Black employees in Washington, DC (*ibid.*). The 1900 Census estimated the total population of the United States to be 76,212,168. Of this total population, an estimated 8.8 million, or 11.6 percent of the population, were Black.

In the early 1900s, preferences were still made for White employees. For example, James Aswell of Louisiana introduced a bill in Congress that would require segregation among federal employees and would also prohibit the employment of a Black person as the superior of a White person (*Commission on Reform in the Civil Service, 1914*); the policy was not successfully passed but was quite revealing in illustrating the biases of many powerful individuals in government. Under President Woodrow Wilson, the federal government resegregated its workforce, resulting in the reassignment of many Black federal employees. In many cases, photographs were also required as part of an individual's job application and could be used to make distinctions among candidates in discriminatory ways.

World War II and the New Deal provided some prospects for additional employment for people of color in bureaucratic posts. Additionally, Executive Order 8802 under Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1942, prohibiting discrimination in the national defense industry was generally considered the first federal action to promote equal opportunity. Importantly, World War II created imbalances in labor supplies and demands that provided work for a number of minority groups, though many were employed in temporary or lower-level positions. In 1948 with Executive Order 9981, President Truman desegregated the armed forces and prohibited discrimination on the basis of race,

color, religion, or national origin in the military services. In 1961, President Kennedy established a more expansive committee on equal employment. A few years later, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), a bipartisan five-person commission and a general council, was established by the Civil Rights Act (CRA) of 1964 and was tasked with the enforcement of federal laws related to discrimination. The CRA included protections in federal employment not just for race but also for color, religion, sex, and national origin. While many implementation and enforcement issues remained, the EEOC and CRA provided a step forward for many racial and ethnic groups.

Since the early 1980s, wider availability of data on the federal workforce has enabled research documenting minority employment. Such work shows that racial minorities, including Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, and Asian Americans, tend to be overrepresented in lower-level positions (grades) and underrepresented in higher-level grades; this type of trend is often referred to as position segregation. The average grades of each of these groups has improved over time, but none have outgained or surpassed White bureaucrats. Between 1981 and 2000, the average grade in the executive branch went from approximately 8.6 to 10.1 for Whites, 8.4 to 9.8 for Asian Americans, 6.5 to 8.7 for Hispanics, 6.4 to 8.4 for Blacks, and 6.5 to 8.2 for Native Americans (Kim, 2005). Further, in 1980, White males accounted for 86 percent of the Senior Executive Service, the highest level of federal employees. In 2008, this share decreased to 65 percent, and discussions of diversity and representation at the top of the civil service continue (Pitts and Wise, 2010). Additional research using the Federal Human Capital Survey or the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey shows that non-White bureaucrats tend to have more negative perceptions of the quality of work done by their agency and lower perceptions of job satisfaction (Pitts, 2009). There is also some evidence that job satisfaction rates improve for racial and ethnic minorities when higher levels of racial and ethnic diversity are observed at the managerial level in these federal agencies (Choi, 2013).

## **Developing the Discussion of Race in the Study of Public Administration**

As the participation of racial minorities in bureaucratic positions has evolved, a range of articles, books, and commentaries that mention racial discrimination (unequal treatment) or racial inequality (unequal outcomes) in some way in public administration scholarship have appeared. Most of these developments have occurred in the last 60 years, beginning around the time of the civil rights movement and continuing through today.

Prior to the 1960s, the job of the public administrator was largely focused on being efficient and economical (as it often is today), such that issues of inequity or injustice were not perceived as salient or central in a normative or descriptive way (Fredrickson, 1990). However, whether in conjunction with or in response to the civil rights movement of the late 1950s and early

1960s and the passage of landmark pieces of legislation, including the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Right Act, the term “social equity” was proposed as an additional pillar of public administration (the other three are efficiency, effectiveness, and economy). While this may often link to issues of race, such a term can also broadly refer to being responsive to the needs of citizens, which can include needed recognition of implicit or explicit racial biases. Social equity can also be described as fairness or as the understanding of different equalities of outcomes in the process of policy implementation. Interestingly, while social equity was proposed and debated as part of the responsibility of the public administrator, it would take some time before this pillar was more formally embraced by national associations. Many have since noted the dearth of scholarship in leading journals that directly speaks to issues of social equity. For example, Gooden (2015) recently found that less than 5 percent of the scholarship published in the highly regarded journal *Public Administration Review* between 1940 and 2013—a total of 208 articles—related to the term social equity.

Greater attention to equity, under which racial disparities can fall, continued through the 1970s as proponents of New Public Administration placed greater emphasis on normative questions and supported the idea that administrators should use public administration as a tool for social justice. Many scholars also joined in, calling on administrators to advocate for underrepresented groups and to ensure all groups were represented in government. Renewed work on the importance of a representative bureaucracy, or a bureaucracy that reflects the make-up of the population it represents, appeared during this period (e.g., Meier, 1975; Meier and Nigro, 1976). Nevertheless, some tensions remained, and few schools formally incorporated this type of training into their education of students who would enter government or related positions. Even at the doctoral level, Walter Broadnax (2010) recalls, “It was suggested that if you wanted to pursue a ‘good academic job,’ you would not write a dissertation exploring the impact of racial and ethnic minorities on municipal public organizations.”

In 1981, the American Society for Public Administration, one of the largest professional associations for public administrators in the United States, included in its publications on professional ethics the importance of equality, or the idea that citizen A is equal to citizen B, and equity, or the adjusting of provisions such that citizen A is made equal to citizen B (Fredrickson, 1990). Acceptance of social equity as a pillar of public administration, though certainly contested, gradually became more widespread among scholars (whether this was also more accepted among practitioners is an open question). This came at a time when immigration rates in the United States were increasing. In 1980, the Census recorded that 6.2 percent of the U.S. population was foreign-born, and this share increased to 7.9 percent by 1990 (Gibson and Lennon, 1999). Yet, race was not often made a central discussion of either policy formation and implementation or organizational management in research within the public administration discipline.



The 1990s brought some shifts in research, as increasing technology and data availability allowed scholars to more carefully examine trends related to race and ethnicity in the workforce (e.g., Cornwell and Kellough, 1994; Kim and Lewis, 1994; Lewis and Nice, 1994; Riccucci and Saidel, 1997). The Organized Section on Race, Ethnicity, and Politics was established in the American Political Science Association in 1995, where scholars developed increasing interest in voting laws and patterns and the link between particular voting rules and the representation of racial minorities in locally elected positions. These advances also led to scholarly evaluation of how organizations were “managing diversity.” The term diversity management spread via practitioner-based reports and academic scholarship and essentially focused on tactics that allowed organizations to foster work environments that welcomed people from a variety of backgrounds (Kellough and Naff, 2004). Yet whether diversity programs that fall under this umbrella term are meaningful or not is still debated (e.g., Dobbin and Kalev, 2016), and they can fail to bring the importance of race to the forefront of the practice of public administration.

Instead, two topics have held the focus of much discussion related to racial biases, equal treatment, and equal outcomes among those active in the field of public administration—the discretion afforded to front-line (or street-level) bureaucrats and the normative good found in the pillars of representative bureaucracy theory. Bureaucratic discretion has been at the forefront of public administration since the inception of public administration as a field of study. While discretion itself is inevitable—administrators have to answer new questions, address gaps in formal policies, and more—questions have revolved around how much control politicians can and should have over bureaucrats, the difficulty in monitoring full implementation of policy at the local level, and how to develop professional norms and expectations among front-line workers. Recent examples abound. Stivers (2007) considers discretion in the wake of Hurricane Katrina and finds that administrators stuck to policies, fraught with institutional discrimination, rather than creatively aiming to lessen harm. Similarly, Keiser, Mueser, and Choi (2004) find that non-Whites are sanctioned at lower rates than Whites overall in the context of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and that this occurs because non-Whites live in areas with lower overall sanction rates. The authors also find that non-Whites are sanctioned more compared to Whites in local areas, raise questions related to administrative discretion in the provision of sanctions, and argue that, regardless of the underlying explanation, welfare reform and policy implementation are not race-neutral.

Second, representative bureaucracy has attracted persistent attention in recent years, and many public administration scholars agree normatively that a bureaucracy that reflects the population it serves is likely to have benefits for policy implementation and public responsiveness (or in the words of Krislov [1974], “the many minds brought to bear may not guarantee the best decision but they clearly guard against the worst”). Like bureaucratic discretion, this concept extends back to at least the 1940s and received growing attention in

the 1960s and 1970s. The theory argues that different social origins lead to variance in social experiences which, in turn, then shape attitudes and behaviors. Two forms of representation have been studied within this theory. Passive representation occurs when various demographic groups are proportionately staffed in an agency—this focuses primarily on what an organization looks like descriptively and does not require consideration of any actions, though there is recognition that the mere presence of groups may influence an individual’s own actions, the actions of other bureaucrats, or the actions of clientele. Second, active representation encompasses what actions and behaviors link the presence of a group to policy outcomes or other benefits experienced by the group an individual represents. Within the field of public administration, research abounds, though passive representation is often admittedly easier to measure than active representation. A database hosted by the Project for Equity, Representation, and Governance (2019) lists 191 entries for recent research on representative bureaucracy, and the database is certainly not all-inclusive. Of course, while research continues to document the potential positive influence of representation on policy outcomes for racial minority groups, it does not consider the full scope of the role of race in the creation, implementation, and management of policy. Assumptions within the theory may also have limitations. For example, in comparing representative bureaucracy theory and the perceived advantage of representation for clientele to street-level bureaucracy theory and the constraints that may hamper discretion, Watkins-Hayes (2011) found that many Black and Latina clientele do not view same-race welfare administrators as sharing some distinct commonality, though opinions also varied according to specific experiences. In other words, organizational constraints and contexts can play a key part in shaping the role of race in administrator-clientele relationships.

While this research has certainly grown within academic circles, popular attention to racial disparities beyond the confines of representation or administrative discretion has also burgeoned in the last few years. In 2014, as the public watched news stories about Michael Brown and unrest in Ferguson, Missouri, one of dozens of jurisdictions where the actions of administrators were questioned, additional scholarship was circulated on the need to pay attention to race in public administration. In *Race and Social Equity: A Nervous Area of Government*, Gooden (2014) argues that racial inequity must be tackled head-on rather than feared or grouped in with managing diversity or a number of other discussions. Additionally, Foldy and Buckley (2014) in *The Color Bind: Talking (and Not Talking) About Race at Work* remind readers that color blindness can reinforce existing structures, including existing systematic racism, while a color-cognizant approach can provide more productive outcomes. Similar to Gooden, the authors recognize that openly addressing race can be uncomfortable for many; they also argue that color cognizance can be difficult to enact, which leaves organizations and its employees in a difficult bind. Finally, Alexander and Stivers (2010) speak directly to scholars in discussing the “ethic of race.” Here, the authors state:

Remarkably little public administration scholarship has explored the dynamic of race as manifest in patterns of policy interpretation and discretionary judgments of individual administrators. We argue that scholarship in the field has failed to come to terms with how this neglect has contributed to maintaining long-standing policies and practices with racist interpretations.

They argue that failing to talk about race within the field serves as a hindrance to fundamental notions of democratic politics.

## **The Role of This Book**

This book serves as a link between theoretically informed research in public administration and those students and professionals trained to work in the trenches of public and nonprofit organizations. Recent calls have certainly been made to face racial inequality head-on and to have meaningful conversations about the formation and implementation of policy that can lessen (and eventually eradicate) the current institutional racism that perpetuates unequal treatment and outcomes across a range of policies. Interestingly, many students in public administration programs and public affairs schools may be likely to earn a degree without exposure to such discussions; those who do are in classes where adequate materials and meaningful texts can be hard to come by without being too broad or too narrow in scope. For example, thousands of students earn a Masters of Public Administration in the course of each academic year. However, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) does not require any specified diversity, equity, or race component to curriculum for schools seeking accreditation, and the majority offer very low levels of any type of curriculum related to the general topic of social equity (Perry, 2005).

We view race as a critical component in this learning process. While other types of diversity are of vital importance, individuals, particularly those in the United States, are often socialized in terms of some racial identity that stems from current social constructions. It remains a powerful force that penetrates virtually every aspect of an individual's lived experience, particularly in terms of direct or indirect interaction with government, including policymakers and bureaucrats. As such, we need a current guide—a roadmap of sorts—to better understand what we do and do not know about race in a variety of policy realms.

## **Overview of the Book**

In the following chapters, this volume seeks to identify the current state of affairs of race in public administration in five particular policy areas—education, health, digital access, criminal justice, and nonprofit governance. In addition to these policy areas, where most research is U.S.-centric, the volume includes a

chapter commenting on race in public administration in contexts around the world. Each policy chapter provides a discussion of current knowledge, policies, and trends and also offers an assessment of which questions are still unanswered and which problems persist. Importantly, while these policy realms receive a great amount of attention in this text, many others—the labor market, housing, environment, social welfare, and local government, for example—do not. This should not be taken as an indicator of lack of importance but rather reflects natural limitations that exist in assembling a range of experts with limited time constraints to communicate about race in public administration and policy in a timely manner. In some cases, themes may arise across chapters that provide takeaways for areas of policy not covered in depth in this text; in other cases, themes and the ability to transfer tools from one area to another will be rather limited.

Chapter 2, by Jason A. Grissom and Ashley Jones, focuses on race among teachers and administrators in the K-12 education system. Teacher and principal racial and ethnic diversity has become an important subject of education policy conversations at the federal, state, and local levels, yet the K-12 workforce is not keeping pace with the changing racial and ethnic demographics of the student population enrolled in public schools. This chapter reviews the evidence on educator diversity on two fronts. The authors first synthesize research from multiple disciplines on the benefits of a diverse educator workforce for public school students. An accumulating body of rigorous evidence suggests that these benefits, particularly for students of color, are substantial and span multiple outcomes, including achievement, discipline, absenteeism, and assignment to gifted education. Second, the authors discuss what is known about the factors associated with recruiting and retaining educators of color; these factors are particularly important, given that pipeline strategies have many holes and often prove insufficient. The authors note that challenges in this area are substantial and require intentional, multifaceted strategies to be implemented to diversify the workforce and realize the benefits of educator diversity. Despite its focus on K-12 education, Chapter 2 has broad applicability to public organizations in general as it demonstrates the various ways that public employees can affect an organization's clientele and illustrates the generic problems of increasing the diversity of the public sector workforce. The concerns of K-12 education are often replicated in other service delivery organizations that interact with diverse populations.

In Chapter 3, Jill Nicholson-Crotty and Sean Nicholson-Crotty discuss race in the criminal justice system with a particular focus on the salient issue of policing in the United States. Given the large body of evidence that racial minority groups are disproportionately more likely to experience a variety of encounters with police—traffic stops, car searches, arrests, and more—the authors synthesize and critique existing research on the causes of and solutions to these inequalities. In considering both individual level and institutional or environmental level biases, the authors look for patterns among a mixed body of sometimes contradictory findings. After discussing some partial solutions that

may be achievable through a number of local-level policy changes, the author discusses questions that remain—such as who Black police officers feel they should represent—and give needed attention to institutional factors that may accentuate or lessen the role of implicit bias in decision-making.

Ling Zhu and Kenicia Wright provide an in-depth review of the role of race in health care policies and services and highlight clear inequities in health along racial lines in Chapter 4. The authors offer a synopsis and critical assessment of existing research on the determinants of health and health care inequalities. The authors compare trends in racial and ethnic diversity in the U.S. population with the composition of health care bureaucrats and show that the increased diversity of the public has significantly exceeded the growth of minority health care workers, despite evidence and expectations that more racial and ethnic diversity among these administrators is likely to have some effect in reducing inequalities. The authors consider new frontiers in health inequality with a particular focus on research related to race, representative bureaucracy, and health inequality as well as intersectionality theory and health inequality across scholarly disciplines.

Digital governance, which generally aims to foster links between government and citizens through information sharing and interaction, is examined in Chapter 5 by Adrian Brown, Karen Mossberger, and Seong Cho. Through open data portals, social media, and mobile applications, the ways governments connect with citizens are growing ever more varied. Both scholars and practitioners acknowledge the democracy-enhancing potential of technology as a key benefit and goal of digital governance strategies. While technology can provide a pathway for access to government, for people of color, historical discrimination leading to exclusion from political engagement, as well as race and place-based differences in technology access and use can potentially preclude citizen engagement online. As such, the authors focus on communities of color, specifically addressing the role of race and ethnicity in internet access and use (devices, platforms, and activities online), how technology use is patterned across cities and neighborhoods, and the implications of these trends for inclusive governance. The authors consider mobile versus internet use, the promotion of affordable broadband, and the effectiveness of outreach programs.

Kelly LeRoux next turns attention to nonprofit organizations in Chapter 6 with original data and analysis. Nonprofit organizations play an essential role in the American safety net, providing for basic needs and essential social services in local communities throughout the United States. Despite shifting demographics in the American population, nonprofit human service organizations remain surprisingly unrepresentative of the communities they serve. As such, nonprofits are facing increased demands to diversify their governing boards according to the notion that the commitment to diversity begins at the top. At the same time, nonprofits are receiving additional pressure for performance from their funding entities as well as the public. Using a mixed-method explanatory sequential design, this chapter combines quantitative and qualitative data to first present an analysis demonstrating a statistical link between

racial diversity on nonprofit boards and both objective (financial) and subjective (self-reported) measures of performance. The underlying mechanisms of the diversity-performance relationship are further studied through a multi-case comparison based on document analysis and interviews with nonprofit CEOs and board chairs.

In Chapter 7, Alketa Peci, Andre Dantas Cabral, Eunji Lee, and Vanessa Brulon Soares provide a glimpse of the larger role of race in multiple international contexts. The authors argue that public administration can play a role in institutionalizing racial categories, biases, and unequal outcomes but can also promote racial equity within and beyond the public sector, often creating contradictory effects. The authors discuss a range of social and historical contexts around the world that shape modern discussions of race in particular countries and argue that this same context should play a large role in understanding how public administrators can seek to achieve racial equity in their jurisdictions today. To support their arguments, the authors examine race in the United Kingdom, Brazil, and South Korea.

The book's conclusion in Chapter 8 by Kenneth J. Meier and Amanda Rutherford reviews common themes across chapters and identifies additional insights for recognizing the role of race in public administration, including in policy implementation, performance management, and policy feedback. They add discussion of other areas of public policy where race is an important concern, including employment, housing, environment policy, and welfare policy. These additional cases illustrate how the issues raised by other chapters often play out in similar manners across policy areas. Recommendations are provided for how to move the discussion of race forward by both current and future practitioners as well as scholars of public administration.

## References

- Alexander, Jennifer, and Camilla Stivers. 2010. "An ethic of race for public administration." *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 32(4): 578–597.
- Broadnax, Walter D. 2010. "Diversity in public organizations: A work in progress." *Public Administration Review* 70: S177–S179.
- Choi, Sungjoo. 2013. "Demographic diversity of managers and employee job satisfaction: Empirical analysis of the federal case." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 33(3): 275–298.
- Cohn, D. Vera, and Andrea Caumont. 2016. "10 demographic trends shaping the U.S. and the world in 2016." Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Available at: [www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/03/31/10-demographic-trends-that-are-shaping-the-u-s-and-the-world/](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/03/31/10-demographic-trends-that-are-shaping-the-u-s-and-the-world/). (accessed July 1, 2019).
- Commission on Reform in the Civil Service. 1914. "Segregation of clerks and employees in the civil service, hearings before the Commission on Reform in the Civil Service." Available at: [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_States\\_Civil\\_Service\\_Commission](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Civil_Service_Commission)
- Cornwell, Christopher, and J. Edward Kellough. 1994. "Women and minorities in federal government agencies: Examining new evidence from panel data." *Public Administration Review* 54(3): 265–270.

- Dobbin, Frank, and Alexandra Kalev. 2016. "Why diversity programs fail, and what works better." *Harvard Business Review* 94(7): 52–60.
- EEOC (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission). 1979. *EEOC Guidelines on Affirmative Action*, 29 C.F.R. § 1608.1(c). Available at: [www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/29/part-1608](http://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/29/part-1608)
- Foldy, Erica Gabrielle, and Tamara R. Buckley. 2014. *The Color Blind: Talking (and Not Talking) About Race at Work*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Frederickson, H. George. 1990. "Public administration and social equity." *Public Administration Review* 50(2): 228–237.
- Gibson, Campbell J., and Emily Lennon. 1999. "Historical Census statistics on the foreign-born population of the United States: 1850 to 1990." Working Paper no. 29. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Gooden, Susan T. 2014. *Race and social equity: A nervous area of government*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.
- Gooden, Susan T. 2015. "PAR's social equity footprint." *Public Administration Review* 75(3): 372–381.
- Keiser, Lael R., Peter R. Mueser, and Seung-Whan Choi. 2004. "Race, bureaucratic discretion, and the implementation of welfare reform." *American Journal of Political Science* 48(2): 314–327.
- Kellough, J. Edward, and Katherine C. Naff. 2004. "Responding to a wake-up call: An examination of federal agency diversity management programs." *Administration & Society* 36(1): 62–90.
- Kim, Chon-Kyun. 2005. "Asian American employment in the federal civil service." *Public Administration Quarterly* 28(3/4): 430–459.
- Kim, Pan Suk, and Gregory B. Lewis. 1994. "Asian Americans in the public service: Success, diversity, and discrimination." *Public Administration Review* 54(3): 285–290.
- Krislov, Samuel. 1967. *The Negro in federal employment: The quest for equal opportunity*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Krislov, Samuel. 1974. *Representative bureaucracy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lewis, Gregory B., and David Nice. 1994. "Race, sex, and occupational segregation in state and local governments." *The American Review of Public Administration* 24(4): 393–410.
- Meier, Kenneth J. 1975. "Representative bureaucracy: An empirical analysis." *American Political Science Review* 69(2): 526–542.
- Meier, Kenneth J., and Lloyd G. Nigro. 1976. "Representative bureaucracy and policy preferences: A study in attitudes of federal executives." *Public Administration Review* 36(4): 458–469.
- Parker, Kim, Juliana Menasce Horowitz, Rich Morin, and Mark Hugo Lopez. 2015. "Multiracial in America." Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Available at: [www.pewsocialtrends.org/2015/06/11/multiracial-in-america/](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2015/06/11/multiracial-in-america/) (accessed July 1, 2019).
- Perry, Susan White. 2005. "Social equity for the long haul: Preparing culturally competent public administrators." PhD dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Pew Research Center. 2015. "Modern immigration wave brings 59 million to U.S., driving population growth and change through 2065: Views of immigration's impact on U.S. society mixed." Available at: [www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2015/09/28/modern-immigration-wave-brings-59-million-to-u-s-driving-population-growth-and-change-through-2065/](http://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2015/09/28/modern-immigration-wave-brings-59-million-to-u-s-driving-population-growth-and-change-through-2065/)



- Pitts, David W. 2009. "Diversity management, job satisfaction, and performance: Evidence from US federal agencies." *Public Administration Review* 69(2): 328–338.
- Pitts, David W., and Lois R. Wise. 2010. "Workforce diversity in the new millennium: Prospects for research." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 30(1): 44–69.
- Project for Equity, Representation, and Governance. 2019. "Representative bureaucracy DB." Available at: <https://d2wldr9tsuuj1b.cloudfront.net/6327/documents/2019/4/RBdatabase.html> (accessed March 15, 2018).
- Riccucci, Norma M., and Judith R. Sidel. 1997. "The representativeness of state-level bureaucratic leaders: A missing piece of the representative bureaucracy puzzle." *Public Administration Review* 57(5): 423–430.
- Stivers, Camilla. 2007. "'So poor and so black': Hurricane Katrina, public administration, and the issue of race." *Public Administration Review* 67(s1): 48–56.
- Tatum, Beverley D. 2001. "Defining racism: Can we talk?" In P.S. Rothenberg (Ed.) *Race, class, and gender in the United States: An integrated study* (pp. 100–107). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- University of Cincinnati. 2017. "New digital map shows changing racial diversity of America." Available at: [www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/04/170421123301.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/04/170421123301.htm) (accessed July 1, 2019).
- Watkins-Hayes, Celeste. 2011. "Race, respect, and red tape: Inside the black box of racially representative bureaucracies." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(suppl. 2): i233–i251.
- Wellman, David T. 1993. *Portraits of white racism*. 2nd edn. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

## **Cases Cited**

- Fisher v. University of Texas*, 579 U.S. (2016).  
*Regents of University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265(1978).