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Abstract. Once had been emphasized in the New Public Administration (Frederickson, 1990), equity is subsequently named as the fourth pillar of public administration by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) in 2005, together with the other three pillars, namely Economy, Efficiency, and Effectiveness (called as 4Es). The pillar of equity emerged with the development of public administration reflecting the success of economic development in both developed and developing countries that still raise injustice issues. Keban (2001) stated that social equity and social justice must be fundamental principles in public administration. Subarsono (2008) and Kumorotomo (2014) also confirmed that for choosing public policy alternatives, one of the variables to consider is “able to promote equity and fairness in society” or guarantee equal resources across the country. Unfortunately, of the four pillars of public administration, the application of equity is still far behind that of the other three pillars: economy, efficiency, and effectiveness (Andrews & Van de Walle, 2012; Wang & Mastracci, 2012; Johnson-III, 2011; Charbonneau & Riccucci, 2008; Miller, Kerr, & Ritter, 2008). To precisely declare social justice as an objective of public policy is still not much of a challenge to the public administrator (Wooldridge & Gooden, 2009). This review is intended to discuss and examine the emerging issue of social equity in public administration and its application on the public policy performance measurement that has not received the same attention as the other three pillars. This is expected to provide an academic contribution to advance equity in the development of public administration particularly in Indonesia.
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INTRODUCTION

New Public Administration is considered as the initial discourse of social equity in public administration. The presence of a new public administration shows the form of critical thought to the performance of the old or classic public administration that is much too focused on economic parameters. In other words, this new paradigm of public administration criticizes the conventional one that highly emphasizes economic standards. Frederickson (2010) suggested that classic or conventional public administration based on the question of 1) how can we offer a better service than the existing resources (efficiency)? and 2) how do we maintain the level of service with less cost (economic)? The new public administration questions whether the service provided is paying attention to social justice (equity). It is underlined here that the new public administration stresses that the performance of public administration should not
only be judged on the achievement of economy, efficiency and effectiveness, but also underscores the value of equity (fairness). Further, Frederickson (2010) called the inclusive values in the context of social equity as a key component in the practice of the new public administration.

The emergence of new public administration that was first pioneered by Frank Marini and several young scientists of public administration is referred to by Pramusinto, Kumorotomo, & Purwanto (2005) as “a critic against the public administration that have already well-established with the principles of administration (effectiveness and efficiency) while in practice often ignore the values of justice (equity) within the community”. A clear and deep understanding of social justice will lead the awareness of public administrators as well as the objective attainment of public administration itself. The commitment of the new public administration emphasizing on the embodiment of human values and justice shows that the public administrators and the theories of the public administration are not to be neutral and value-free. This indicates that in the development of public administration, social equity was recognized as an important pillar for the future of public policy/public administration studies and was subsequently named as the fourth pillar of public administration.

More effort is needed to raise equity to a level equal to that of the other three pillars. Norman-Major (2011) asserted that despite social equity being recognized as an important pillar, it still remains a neglected concept in the study of public administration. Several studies about performance measurement on policies and organizations which only focus on the pillars of economy, efficiency and effectiveness, show the underdevelopment of equity. For instance, Putra & Wirawati (2015) outlined the main measurement of public sector organization’s performance using the concept of value for money that based on three elements: economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, in carrying out its activities. Other study asserted that efficiency is the basis for the achievement of public service objectives (Manzoor, 2014). The study of Bartuseviciene & Sakalyte (2013) also described the three as common ways of measuring performance.

Another consideration that is discussed to illustrate the underdeveloped pillar of social equity is that social equity has not yet been widely explored and covered well in the literature of public administration/public policy. Svara & Brunet (2004) reported the findings of their research which shows that only a few public administration books in the United States discuss social equity. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that social equity is included in the curriculum of public administration (Johnson & Svara, 2011; Gooden & Portillo, 2011). Another example of recent evidence for the underdeveloped pillar of equity when compared to the other three pillars of public administration is the study findings of Gooden (2015), which show that the proportion of publications discussing social equity (specifically issued by PAR-Public Administration Review) during the period 1940 to 2013 (73 years) was less than 5%.

However, recent studies show that steps are being taken for research with greater emphasis and consideration on the social equity pillar. To illustrate, Davis, et al. (2013) pointed to the dimension of equity in assessing a hospital’s performance using a method called a broad three-dimensional matrix: efficiency, effectiveness, equity. Other studies that further highlight the pillar of equity have also been found. Nonetheless, the main issues and concerns of the mentioned researches and discussions relating to social equity are still more focused on the study of gender and race (Gooden & Portillo, 2011; Johnson-III, 2011; Frederickson, 2010). This lead to the further thought that the study of social equity, including in assessing and measuring the achievements of an institution or program performance, should not only focus on gender and race but also include other related aspects such as disability, region/demographics, language, social status, economic status, immigration status, and the like.

DISCUSSION

Equity is a universal value as well as a development objective of all nations since justice can be regarded as the most fundamental human need. Various definitions of equity are discussed in the literature. On the one hand, the various definitions increase knowledge and strengthen understanding of the concept of it, but on the other hand it implies an ambiguity and complex interpretation in practice. The concept of equity shares a common orientation around concepts of equality, fair, and just even though they are often used interchangeably since they have similar meanings. Gooden (2015) highlighted that equity and equality have different meanings in public administration. Equity refers to fair or just distribution of such services or policies while equality indicates a sameness or identical distribution. Social equity is also discussed in terms of diversity, multiculturalism, and ethics. Frederickson (2010) stated that social equity is “a point of view, a system of beliefs, an attitude, and at its best, an ethics”. While public administration may aspire to certain ideals, Maynard-Moody & Musheno (2012) highlighted that social equity is realized when put to practice, not when discussed in principle. It means that to advance the pillar of equity, a real action is required. In the word of Frederickson (2010) this imperative action is stated as “walking the talk”. Without developing indicators, implementing, reviewing, and acting upon periodically, there will be no ways to affirm that all citizens have equal access and benefits to services (Wang & McFadden, 2106).

In the development of the science of public administration, equity, named then as social equity, is recognized as an important pillar for the future of policy and public management (Frederickson, 2010; Rosenbloom, 2005; Svara & Brunet, 2005) Frederickson (2010) stressed that social equity relates to fairness in the organization, management of the organization, and the delivery of public services by the organization. In this context, the social equity questions covers who these organizations and the public services are provided to and are they 1) well run?; 2) Efficient?; 3) Economical?; 4) more or less provided fairly?. In line with this, Kumorotomo (2014) explains that the work for social justice is tantamount to optimally guarantee that every citizen gets their rights and obtain a fair share of the prosperity of society. Riccucci (2009) insists on equity as the value of a democratic
constitution, saying that, in general, social equity can be demonstrated as “the democratic constitutional values of fairness, justice, equal opportunity, and equally.” This is in line with the main definition of social equity by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) in 2000 that then became a major reference (including by Frederickson; 2010; Gooden, 2010; Noorman-Major, 2011). The mentioned definition of social equity was originally quoted as follows: “the fair just and equitable management of all institutions serving the public directly or by contract, and the fair 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”

The issue of social equity occupies an important position in the study of public policy and public administration. In the public policy process, public administration should be able to pay attention to the aspects of social equity in every decision and action taken, so as not to harm the public, and there will be no inequality in society as a result of injustice in the distribution and allocation of resources. Kumorotomo (2014) argued that the pillar of efficiency is critical to maintain and manage resources; however, it must be ensured that its utilization fulfills the aspects of equity. Referring to this important highpoint, according to Frederickson (1990) social equity can be used as “1) the basis for a just democratic society; 2) in influencing the behavior of organizational man; 3) the legal basis for distributing public services; 4) the practical basis for distributing public services; 5) understood in compound federalism; 6) a challenge for research and analysis”. In fact, the application of social equity as the fourth pillar of public administration has not received the same attention as the other three pillars: economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. In the words of Svara and Brunet (2004), the underdeveloped condition of equity is illustrated by the disparity between the measures available for equity compared to those available for efficiency and effectiveness. Attention to equity being considered as less relevant than other pillars was described by Jones (2009) as although equity is attracting growing explicit attention in development discourse, and despite it is being of widespread intuitive value, it is often seen as somehow less relevant than some other issues, such as efficiency and economic growth.

The cause of the underdevelopment of social equity compared to the other three pillars, according to some public administration scholars, is due to the “lack of clear definition of social equity” (Norman-Major, 2011; Frederickson 2010; Rosenbloom, 2005). The National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), which already provides a definition of social equity is also still difficult to precisely define in a more specific context on what and how to achieve equity (Svara and Brunet, 2004). Therefore, the first step that must be performed is to find a specific and applicable definition of equity in the local context. Exploration and study of the definition and practice on applied social equity of public policy makers, including formulators and implementers, becomes very important because the clarity of definition and identification of the main dimensions of equity is one of the key pillars of applications and also strengthening the position of the equity pillar in public administration. Norman-Major (2011) and Rice (2004) highlighted this matter as follows:

“we must clearly define social equity, develop clearer measures for it; and, most important, educate public administrators to include equity at the same level of consideration as economy, efficiency, and effectiveness when developing and implementing public policies” (Noorman-Major, 2011:234).

“social equity can best be achieved if public administrators, public managers, and public service delivery personnel have a clear understanding and appreciation of diversity and diversity management that is built into the organization’s culture” (Rice, 2004:144).

Jos (2016) reminded us that a commitment to social equity is often thought to require that administrators engage in explicit forms of direct policy advocacy but the inter-organizational, cross-sector networks that characterize 21st-century administration offer many opportunities to advance social equity by ensuring procedural fairness. In achieving equity in public service, it is recognized that there may be different sources or services required for different individual or groups, that the social, economic, and cultural disadvantage of individual or groups might need the provision of more resources or services than those who are not disadvantaged (Wooldridge & Gooden, 2009). Actually, some research emphasizing the study on the equity pillar has been conducted. However, the topic of research and discussion related to social justice are still more centered on gender and racial studies (Gooden & Portillo, 2011; Johnson III, 2011). Frederickson (2010) also clearly stated that “concerns about race and gender have been at the core of the study of social equity for several decades”. This has not been studied in Indonesia; nonetheless it can be assumed that study about social equity in Indonesia is similar to that worldwide, that is, more focus placed on gender studies. Various textbooks and articles on gender equity in public administration/policy and other related studies are easy to find. In relation to this condition, the study on social equity should not only focus on gender and racial studies but also cover other relevant aspects such as disability, demographic area, language, social status, economic status, and the like. As stated by Wooldridge and Gooden (2009):

“Much of the social equity research to date has been focused on race, gender, and class… However, there are other important inequities such as sexual orientations, religion, region, disability status, immigration status, veteran’s status, and language of origin” (Wooldridge and Gooden, 2009:223).

Besides the fact that the topics studied for social equity mostly cover gender and race/ethnicity, publications on social equity remain neglected. As mentioned above, the proportion of articles discussing social equity published on the Public Administration Review, during the period 1940 to 2013 (73 years) only reached less than 5% with 36.1% and 32.2% covering the topics of gender and race respectively (Gooden, 2015). In more recent update and broader topic on equity addressing the issues on diversity in public administration research, Carrizales & Sherée Gaynor (2013) reviewed over 700 articles published in 30 journals over the 5-year period from 2006 to 2011.
The diverse topics highlighted included race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, faith and spirituality, class and equity, ageism, culture and language, and disabilities. Out of the 7112 articles reviewed, only 11.84% were classified as articles discussing the issue of diversity. Out of the 30 journals, 10 were classified as 10 top ten journals in terms of the highest percentage of diversity articles published. The findings are shown in Table 1, and as discussed above, the topic that was addressed most was race/ethnicity.

**Table 1. Top Ten Journal for Diversity Research Publication 2006-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Total Articles Published</th>
<th>No. of Articles on Diverse Issues</th>
<th>Total Percentage of Diverse Articles</th>
<th>Diverse Topic Most Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Public Management &amp; Social Policy</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65.57%</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Quarterly</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Urban Affairs</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.26%</td>
<td>Class, Equity and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Affairs Review</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.04%</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Health and Human Services Administration</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Policy Analysis &amp; Management</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>Class, Equity and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Public Personnel Administration</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.28%</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Psychology</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.74%</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Public Affairs Education</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.22%</td>
<td>Class, Equity and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Policy Review</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.34%</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Carrizales & Sherée Gaynor, 2013

Interestingly, despite the recognition of equity as a pillar of public administration, in the US, where the pillar was born, textbooks of public administrations discussing social equity are limited. Svara & Brunet (2004) reported their study findings on US literature as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. Social Equity Coverage in Public Administration Textbooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Due Process</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Sexual Harrasment</th>
<th>EEO/AA</th>
<th>Representativeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkley/ Rouse</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denhardt/ Grubbs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milakovich/ Gordon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenbloom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kravchuck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shafritz/ Russell</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starling</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: Svara & Brunet, 2004

While discrimination and sexual harassment are almost discussed in all books, only 1 out of 7 works of literature covers the definition of social equity. It was also mentioned that procedural fairness/cultural competence, other equity measures, and ethical aspects of equity were not found as a part of the contents of the mentioned textbooks. In Indonesia, while it needs further advanced searching, textbooks discussing social equity in public...
administration and public policy are found limited. One of few text books, not to mentioned those discussed broader issues with social equity discourse as a chapter, that has been found include Keadilan Sosial dalam Kebijakan Publik (Social Justice in Public Policy) by Afsdy Saksono.

In addition to defining an applicable definition in the local context and especially in the public policy sphere, another important factor for the pillar of equity is the determination of the equity indicator in performance measurement (Rice, 2004). Frederickson (2010) explained that the study of social equity in public administration is a form of performance measurement. It is also emphasized that in the context of public administration, social equity is important to measure the success and impact of a public organization (Johnson & Svara, 2011). Measurement of social equity dimensions will be very helpful to find a more precise definition and applicable for further examination of when and how social equity can be achieved. The importance of indicators of measurement of achievement of social justice was also proposed by Charbonneau & Riccucci (2008) as well as by Woolridge and Gooden (2009) who stated that there is a need to identify whether social equity has been achieved. The development of these equity performance indicators requires a clear and applicable definition of equity. Although not necessarily stand alone as a measure, equity indicators can be accepted and/or elaborated in performance measurement or evaluation that is still dominated by the pillars of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. According to Pitts (2011), what is needed is a step forward to conduct a study that leads to a step forward and “can feasibly be accomplished” so as not to only dwell on the argument of why social equity is important. The commitment to conduct a study on social equity in the realm of public policy was also reminded by Svara & Brunet (2005):

“without an awareness of and concern for social equity, administrators might simply follow the letter of the law or fail to question whether the law should be changed. The concern for social equity also can guide administrator in the exercise of discretion under the law. Having a commitment to social equity is, therefore, crucial as major perspective in public administration... social equity deserves the prominence of pillar status” (Svara and Brunet, 2005: 253-254).

Performance is mentioned as one of the six strategic dimensions of public administration by Keban (2014). Using the analogy of the body system, we can describe the performance as the main part of the support system for survival and achieving the goal. Furthermore, Keban (2014) explained in more detail that the performance dimension consists of individual performance, group, organization, and program or policy implementation performance. Individual performance indicates the implementation and achievement of their key tasks while group performance assesses the outcomes of the group responsibilities. The performance of the organization/ institution describes the achievement of organizational goals and missions, while the program performance is a description of success achievement of the program or policy implementation objectives. According to Matei & Enescu (2013) quoting the opinion of Bruijn (2004), the functions of performance measurements include:

- creates transparency, encourages learning, and can have a consequence.
- There has been very little research on the role of social equity in public service performance measurement (Charbonneau & Riccucci, 2008). Performance measurement in public policy such as in the evaluation of policies or evaluation of an organization through performance measurement has been dominated by the measurement indicators for the 3E’s (Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness). There are several types of measurements with a range of performance indicators that are used by public administrators and managers as a preference method for the evaluation and assessment of public policy. Of the various methods available, the majority are still the main indicators of the three pillars. In other words, again the measurement of equity is underdeveloped compared to the measurement of efficiency and effectiveness. Svara & Brunet (2004) described the issue of performance measurement that is also still dominated by efficiency and effectiveness as follows: “outfitted with score-cards, report cards, benchmarks, and customer satisfaction survey, the modern administrator is well equipped to measure the efficiency and effectiveness of governmental operations”.

Gooden & Myers (2004) underlined that social equity could be a measure of public policy evaluation criteria and policy recommendations, confirming also that “social equity needs to be incorporated into policy analysis at the same level as efficiency and economy” Wang & McFadden (2106) emphasized that the value of social equity in the allocation of public services, both for public and private, needs to be considered as important as productivity and efficiency in its performance measurement. With the equity as the fourth pillar of public administration, the measurement performing considering only the 3E’s is referred to as a performance measurement using a traditional indicator (Tampieri, 2005 cited the opinion of Mayne, 1997). Performance measurement indicators of the above mentioned 3E’s can be visualized as follows (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Traditional Indicator of Performance Measurement of Mayne
Source: Tampieri, 2005:62

Similarly, Keban (2014) citing Henderson-Stewart (1990) also stated that one of the popular models for performance measurement is the 3E’s indicators. Economy measures the ratio of cost of revenue and expenditure, efficiency is assessed by the intermediate between the results achieved and the costs incurred, and effectiveness is judged by the accuracy of the results in accordance with the plans or the program. Nevertheless, there is a difference between the Mayne and Henderson-Stewart models as the latter uses four performance aspects (cost,
This development has been noticed as a very important change since the public or beneficiaries of the program need to be involved for policy implementation to achieve its objectives. In the words of Matei & Enescu (2013) this is referred to as quadrilateral performance instead of performance triangle.

**Figure 2. Process of Performance Measurement of Henderson-Stewart**

Source: Keban, 2014:223

In recent developments, indicators have been further discussed and evaluated in relation to their achievement of the objectives of public policy. It should be noted that, as also stated by Frederickson (2010), the discussion described above does not mean that the three pillars are not important. Instead it reminds and confirms that in a government that is the most productive, efficient, and economical, inequality and injustice is also found. Kumorotomo (2014) asserted the fact that the success of development is not equitably beneficial to the entire community. In other words, the dominance of the pillars of economy, efficiency, effectiveness and allowing the equity pillar to be left behind will result in static injustices. In a more clear statement, Charbonneau and Riccucci (2008) explained that “attention to the improvement of effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery may sacrifice the democratic constitutional values of fairness, justice, due process, and equity, sometimes referred to collectively as social equity”.

In discussing the application of social equity in public administration, besides the many examples of gender issues, the implementation of inclusive education policy might be one example. Social equity in the field of education is said to be central to the principle of human rights. According to UNICEF (2011), the two main issues related to equity in education are the equality of rights, which basically means a guarantee of certainty that individual or social conditions which include gender, social, and economic status, as well as ethnicity, religion or race are not barriers to obtaining education, and inclusiveness, namely the guarantee of minimum standards of education for all. Referring to some scholars’ arguments, Moore & Morris (2009) highlighted that equity in education is closely monitored because besides education being the most important developmental service offering its role as the major determinant of one’s life chances, equity in education is a political imperative and therefore, the judicial mandate for equity in the area of education is clearer than that in other public services.

The policy of inclusive education is the latest education policy and the focus of discussion worldwide as a real action to achieve education for all. The policy of inclusive education refers to a philosophical and juridical basis that emphasizes the equality of rights for all without exception. Philosophically, it is clear that human rights apply anywhere and in any context. Especially in Indonesia, Pancasila with the principle of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (Unity in Diversity) is the basis of the nation emphasizing the principle of justice. In addition, the 1945 Constitution of Indonesia accommodates the rights of each citizen including in education. This is also supported by the issuance of Presidential Instruction No. 3 year 2010 on an equitable development program and the Law No. 20 year 2003 about the national education system. In more specific for the policy of inclusive education in order to complement the endeavors of the government to realize social justice for all citizens, Indonesia has enacted the Regulation of Ministry of Education (a.k.a Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional/Permendiknas) No. 70 year 2009 about inclusive education.

The development of an inclusive education service approach is a tangible step towards realizing the achievement of social justice as mentioned by Polat (2011) that inclusion in education is a step towards social justice. The movement toward inclusive approaches in education is inherent in the principles of human rights, the promotion of social justice, and the right to education for all (Forlin, 2013) as well as dismissing the practice of inequality and injustice (Polat, 2011). Berlach & Chambers (2011) explained that the first major step in inclusive education is having an accurate understanding of what it is. This is in line with the importance of justification for the existence of equity pillars in public policy which is still widely questioned both for reasons of context understanding and other factors. Ro’fah (2016) also warned that the study of inclusive education should not only focus on the issue of resources and curriculum but it is important to move to the fundamental aspect that is a broader perspective.
of inclusion.

To sum up, every aspect of public policy must ensure equity as the provision of all the nation’s resources especially in regards to marginalized groups or groups that are most disadvantaged. It is important to note that a public policy that is still in favor of a strong group and results in the proliferation of disadvantaged groups means unequal development (Kumorotomo, 2014). The succeed and impact indicators of the national development as well as the performance of organizations and program implementation should not only be measured by the achievement of economic factors. Therefore, public service providers must be able to develop and assert criteria and measurement of equity as well as understand the impact on service delivery based on public dignity and well-being. Promoting social equity is a continual process and should be part of all public service performance measures and service delivery processes. In other words, it is imperative to advance social equity as the pillar of public administration to reach a balance with the other three pillars.

CONCLUSION

Social equity, as the fourth pillar of public administration, is underdeveloped due to an unclear definition. As a result, unlike the other three pillars, the pillar of equity also lacks common indicators for performance measurement. This indicates that a more serious and deeper study of social equity is imperative in public administration and public policy research. It is highlighted that social equity is an important pillar to be incorporated into policy analysis at the same level as the pillar of efficiency, effectiveness, and economy. Commitment to the study of social equity in public policy as discussed above, is highly suggested since there is a need to clearly define social equity, develop its clearer measures, and importantly, educate public administrators to be able to place social equity at the same level of consideration as the other three pillars both in the development and implementation of public policy. Ignoring social equity may lead public administrators to simply follow the letter of the law or fail to question wether the law should be changed or even abolished. The concern for social equity also can guide public administrators in the exercise of discretion under the law. Having a commitment to social equity is, therefore, crucial as major perspective in public administration since social equity deserves the prominence of pillar status. Consequently, public administrators, public managers, and public service delivery personnel must have a clear understanding and appreciation of the diversities of the organization’s culture in order to best achieve social equity.

Simply put, it is strongly recommended that more studies and further researches on the application of social equity should be conducted. It is also important to conduct further research on social equity coverage in the Indonesian public administration/public policy literature as well as to explore to what extent it has been applied in the public administration curriculum. In addition, while several studies on social equity have been performed, they are mostly focused on race and gender. It is now time to spread out to other marginalized targets or topics such as immigrants, economic status, disability, and other related issues. With more tangible understanding, social equity can be understood as a distributive justice and therefore, reminded that if scholars were to expressly acknowledge the existence of various definitions of social equity by explicitly defining the term each time it emerged as a central theme it might lessen confusion. In conclusion, a step forward has to be seriously taken in order to advance the pillars of equity as well as to further contribute to the development of public administration. A serious study on social equity becomes very important in public administration and public policy research. In other words, the equity pillar needs to receive the same level and attention as the other three pillars of value in public policy standards. As for the case in Indonesia, much work needs to be conducted, including reviewing the curriculum of the public administration and text-books and articles published in journals of public administration or public policy addressing issues of social equity in a broader context as opposed to one specific topic such as gender issues.
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