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Against the backdrop of increasing scholarly interest in and social awareness of diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) issues over the past few years, this study offers a systematic review of DEIA literature in the public administration field since the murder of George Floyd in May 2020. Based on the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) selection protocol, 109 articles related to DEIA issues were identified in public administration journals. Findings feature recent DEIA research trends emerging from the selected journal articles in terms of author characteristics, geographic focus, theoretical grounds, and methods. Based on the findings, issues addressed within DEIA research are identified and discussed, and agendas for future DEIA scholarship in public administration are suggested.

INTRODUCTION

The public administration field has evolved in terms of its attention to the issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA). While few, if any, studies focused on diversity in the early 1900s, in the 1960s, following passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (CRA), diversity research grew more popular (Sabharwal et al., 2018). Title VII of the CRA prohibits discrimination based on race, color, sex, religion, and national origin. As Aiken et al. (2013) noted, the CRA “signaled a fundamental shift in the treatment of racial and gender diversity” (p. 383). The 1970s and 1980s were marked by increased scholarly interest in diversity issues from the racial and gender perspectives (Sabharwal et al., 2018). Since then, scholarly research has expanded in terms of both focus and locus. The research focus has broadened to cover not only the topic of diversity but also those of equity, inclusion, and accessibility (Frederickson, 1990; Ivancevich & Gilbert, 2000; Miller, 1998; Sabharwal, 2014; Yu & Lee, 2020). The locus has expanded to include not only gender and race but also sexual identities and orientations, disabilities, intersectionality, and so on (Fay, Hicklin Fryar, et al., 2021; Keiser & Haider-Markel, 2022; D. Lee et al., 2021; Nelson & Piatak, 2021).

The recent occurrences of multiple tragic incidents such as the murder of George Floyd and hate crimes against Asian Americans during the COVID-19 pandemic, and relevant social movements have stimulated public awareness of and attention to the concept of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) as a single entity. Figure 1 presents Google trends data for the search term “diversity, equity and inclusion,” showing significant increase in public attention to the term DEI immediately after the death of George Floyd at the end of May, 2020, and continued upward trends in public interests in DEI since then.

Similar to the heightened public attention to DEI, scholarly interests in DEI issues have also escalated since the recent tragic incidents (Cappelli, 2020; Randolph et al., 2023; Sisco et al., 2022). Universities and academic publishers made public statements in support of DEI in societies (Randolph et al., 2023), and academic journals and scholars have made efforts to further investigate DEI issues through special issues and symposia (e.g., Public Administration Review, Public Integrity, Management Decision, etc.). Additionally, with the issuance of Executive Order 14035 in 2021, which introduced accessibility as a new dimension added to the discourse of DEI (The White House, 2021), it is reasonable to include accessibility as part of the entity. With accessibility added as a new dimension, the term DEIA (or IDEA or EDIA) has been used as a single entity by both scholars and practitioners (Mullin et al., 2021; National League of Cities, 2023; Syed et al., 2023; U.S. Department of State, 2022).

Given the high level of social awareness and scholarly attention to DEIA issues over the past few years, it is worth
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exploring recent DEIA literature and their trends. By so doing, we can assess where the current DEIA research is heading toward in terms of research foci and scope, examine the degree to which such research is diverse and inclusive, and identify areas for future research. It is within this context that the present study offers a systematic review of recent DEIA literature in the field of public administration since the period of George Floyd’s death.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we discuss concepts of diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility, and how they are distinct yet interrelated with one another. Then, we describe the research methods we used to identify DEIA research in the field of public administration, followed by a report on our study findings. Finally, we discuss recent trends in DEIA research, identify gaps in the existing literature, and suggest directions for future research.

**CONCEPTUALIZATION OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION, AND ACCESSIBILITY**

The present research conducts a systematic review of recent literature on DEIA holistically, rather than focusing on only one of the four concepts. The four concepts of DEIA are each distinct yet interconnected with one another, and as McCandless et al. (2022) pointed out, the growing normative expectation is that public administration must contribute to building a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive public institutions, and to creating more accessible public services for everyone: that is, the achievement of all of DEIA. The present research provides a systematic review of recent research on DEIA, and in so doing, we first discuss the concept of each of DEIA while also offering brief discussion on how the four concepts are related to each other as appropriate.

**Diversity**

Multiple perspectives have been presented on the meaning of diversity and what it comprises. While a number of scholars define diversity as variations or variability among individuals on multiple dimensions (Cox, 1995; Langfred, 2007; Wise & Tschirhart, 2000), some criticize this perspective, arguing that diversity should pertain to a particular set of disadvantaged groups (Caudron & Hayes, 1997). These critics support their argument by noting that the broader definition of diversity that encompasses all groups and a range of human differences may dilute attention to historically disadvantaged and underserved groups (Caudron & Hayes, 1997). However, understanding the concept of diversity narrowly in relation to only particular groups places the inclusivity of academic research at risk, as only certain dimensions may receive scholarly attention, leaving a variety of other dimensions underexplored.

Thus, this study adopts the more common definition that views diversity as "the collective (all inclusive) mixture of human differences and similarities along a given dimension" (An & Lee, 2021; Cox, 1995; Lundy et al., 2021; Roh, 2009; Wise & Tschirhart, 2000, p. 387). Among the many dimensions are race, gender, sexual identities/orientation, age, national origin, religion, political views/party affiliation, education level, occupation, first language, and socioeconomic status, among others. Given the purposes of this study, we did not limit our focus to individual dimension(s) of diversity. Rather, we inclusively and comprehensively reviewed all studies that explored varied dimensions of diversity published in the selected journals within the noted timeframe.

**Equity**

The concept of equity, or social equity in public administration, has received growing scholarly attention since the 1968 Minnowbrook conference, and the concept is closely related to Rawls’ (1971) theory of justice. In his seminal work, *A Theory of Justice*, Rawls (1971) asserts that a “fair” distribution of social and economic advantages is a key to combatting inequities in a society. To reach social consensus concerning what is fair or just, Rawls (1971) suggests deliberation and discourse from “the original position” by putting ourselves behind a “veil of ignorance” and, thus, not considering our own situations in our deliberations. As such, the chosen principle of justice, according to Rawls (1971), is the distribution of social and economic goods “to
the greatest benefit of the least advantaged,” as anyone can be a member of a disadvantaged group (p. 302).

Other scholars have also used the notion of fairness as a fundamental concept in their discussions on equity (Denhardt, 2004; Gooden, 2015; Johnson & Svara, 2015; McCandless et al., 2022; McDonald & McCandless, 2021). For instance, Gooden (2015) defined equity as “the fair or just distribution of [government] services or policies” (p. 372). Denhardt (2004) described equity as below:

Equity, of course, involves a sense of fairness or justice—specifically, the correction of existing imbalances in the distribution of social and political values. In contrast to equal treatment for all, equity proposes that benefits be greater for those most disadvantaged. (p. 105)

According to McDonald III and McCandless (2021), the most extensively used definition of social equity in the field of public administration is the one suggested by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA). The NAPA also uses fairness as a core concept in defining social equity:

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. (Johnson & Svara, 2015, p. 19)

In accordance with other scholarly literature, the present research also understands equity as a concept based on fairness. Additionally, following the NAPA’s definition, we consider equity comprehensively in its dimensions. Indeed, equity involves asking and reflecting on the question of “efficient, effective, and economical [public service] for whom?” and can “most commonly and easily [be] defined as fairness, due process, and justice” (Guy & McCandless, 2012; McDonald & McCandless, 2021, p. 237; emphasis added).

Cautioning against the interchangeable use of the terms of equity and diversity, public administration scholars suggest that the two concepts are related yet distinct (Gooden & Portillo, 2011; Rice, 2004). Gooden and Portillo (2011) note that diversity, as a concept that refers to differences among individuals, is directly related to representative bureaucracy, as diverse individuals in a society have the right to be represented in their governing bureaucracy. Diversity in the public workforce equips public organizations with “the resources to view problems, policies, interventions, and the clients they serve more comprehensively and most importantly, more accurately” (Gooden & Portillo, 2011, p. i64). Thus, diversity is “not the same as social equity,” but “a vital social equity asset” consisting of the pillar of social equity (Cepiku & Mastrodascio, 2021; Gooden & Portillo, 2011, pp. i64–i65; Rice, 2004). As McCandless et al. (2022) put it, bureaucracies being reflective of societies (i.e., diversity) is a critical asset to achieve fairness (i.e., equity).

Inclusion

The concept of inclusion has been explored often in workplace settings. Workplace inclusion has been defined as "the degree to which an employee is accepted and treated as an insider by others in a work system" (Pelled et al., 1999, p. 1014). Studies suggest that inclusive organizations acknowledge individual employees’ unique characteristics, seek and value different employee voices as vital for organizational decision-making, and thus, make their employees “feel part of critical organizational processes” (Miller, 1998; Mor-Barak & Cherin, 1998, p. 48; Sabharwal, 2014).

Just as diversity is considered a vital asset to accomplish social equity (Cepiku & Mastrodascio, 2021; Gooden & Portillo, 2011; Rice, 2004), so is inclusion (Livingston, 2020). As Livingston (2020) pointed out, truly equitable policies and practices can be developed only when people from diverse backgrounds are included in and heard during the decision-making process. While both diversity and inclusion are critical assets to achieve equity, inclusion extends beyond the concept of diversity. Verna Myers’ metaphor provides an intuitive understanding of the concepts of diversity and inclusion, and how the latter is one step further than the former: “diversity is being invited to the party; inclusion is being asked to dance” (Myers, 2015). As Myer’s metaphor implies, while diversity is about involving people who have different backgrounds and characteristics, being inclusive is about making those people feel like part of their communities at work and in society (Barboza-Wilkes et al., 2022; Lim & Kim, 2013; McCandless et al., 2022; Mor-Barak & Cherin, 1998).

Thus, as Winters (2014) noted, “perhaps the most salient distinction between diversity and inclusion is that diversity can be mandated and legislated, while inclusion stems from voluntary actions” (p. 206). Organizations may be able to hire members of marginalized groups and make their workforce diverse, but enabling the diverse workforce to thrive is not possible without inclusion (Mor Barak et al., 2022). Inclusion is not mere tolerance of differences but appreciation and valuing of the differences (Mor Barak et al., 2022; O’Donovan, 2017). Hence, every individual, not just those of majority group, are “fairly treated, valued for who they are, and included in core decision making” in inclusive environments (Nishii, 2015, p. 1754).

Based on the afore-discussion, we define inclusion as the extent to which individuals of all backgrounds (feel that they) are appreciated and welcomed as part of their organization and/or society.

Accessibility

While accessibility has been explored in various policy areas, such as education, public health, and transportation (Seale, 2013; Soltani et al., 2012; van Gaans & Dent, 2018), more recently, accessibility has been considered a dimension of DEIA and discussed within that context. On June 25, 2021, President Biden signed the Executive Order on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in the Federal Workplace (Executive Order 14035), introducing accessibil-
ity as a new dimension of DEIA (Floore, 2022; The White House, 2021). Biden’s Executive Order 14035 launched a government-wide initiative on DEIA, charging all federal agencies with developing DEIA strategic plan based on the analysis of the current state of DEIA in each agency.

In the United States, accessibility has traditionally been understood as compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. § 794d; Rhoads, 2021), which requires that federal agencies make information and communication technology (ICT) accessible to people with disabilities so they have access to information comparable to the access by people without disabilities. However, Executive Order 14035 expands the meaning of accessibility beyond ICT accessibility for people with disabilities to encompass accessibility to broader public services and programs for underserved communities (Rhoads, 2021). Accessibility also includes providing appropriate accommodations so people with disabilities may equally access employment opportunities and participate in activities (The White House, 2021).

As such, accessibility is a key to promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion. Accessibility is essential to cultivating the public workforce reflective of the true population (i.e., diversity), to ensuring equitable public service provision (i.e., equity), and to creating and fostering an inclusive environment (i.e., inclusion) (Karner, 2018; Lucas et al., 2016; Rodriguez, 2015; Sabella, 2022).

Based on the discussion above, this study refers to accessibility as the degree to which individuals have equal access to employment opportunities, and to public goods, services, programs, and activities regardless of their personal characteristics (e.g., disabilities, geographic locations, etc.) (Richey, 2020). A key to ensuring accessibility is the removal of all barriers that prevent people, including underserved communities, from approaching and utilizing those services, programs, and opportunities (Ellul & Ellul, 2021; Ponke, 2022; The White House, 2021).

METHODS: SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

We adapted the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) selection protocol (Liberati et al., 2009) for our systematic review of recent public administration research on DEIA. A PRISMA flowchart supports the validity of systematic literature reviews by guiding the scientific identification of target literature. Figure 2 presents the adapted PRISMA flowchart presenting the review procedures we used to identify, include, and select source journals and relevant articles for the present research.

Source Journal Identification and Selection

We explored two databases – Web of Science: Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and Scimago Journal & Country Rank (SJR) – using the search term “public administration” to identify a list of relevant journals indexed in each database (data source) for our systematic review. The search was conducted in February 2022. From the Web of Science SSCI, we identified 42 publications classified as public administration journals. The SJR includes rankings of all journals potentially relevant to the public administration discipline. Therefore, to increase the odds of relevancy, we focused on the Tier 1 and Tier 2 journals classified as public administration, which resulted in the identification of 62 journals. Then, based on a review of each journal’s scope, focus, and mission, we included journals directly relevant to the public administration discipline. Additionally, we considered journal language (English only) as well as its online accessibility. This generated 72 journal sources. As the final step of our source journal search, we eliminated duplications (30) from the list. Consequently, 42 public administration journals were identified as the final data source for our systematic review (see Appendix for the full list).

Article Identification and Selection

Following the PRISMA protocol, in March 2022, we conducted an article search of the 42 journals’ official websites using the following key inclusion criteria:

- Search Term: [“diversity” OR “equity” OR “inclusion” OR “accessibility”]. Articles that contained any of these terms at least once anywhere within the text were included in the initial search list.
- Research Design/Type: Empirical research articles (quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods) were included. Commentary, viewpoint, review, theoretical, opinion, and note articles were excluded.
- Publication Period: Studies published online from June 2020 to December 2021 were included. We excluded studies that were published during that timeframe but had been available online prior to June 2020.
- Relevance: We included articles highlighting topics, objectives, and research questions that directly examined issues relevant to the search terms. Articles that included the search terms but did not contain in the main body any constructive discussion of issues relevant to the search terms were excluded.

Based on these inclusion criteria, we first used the set of search terms noted previously [“diversity” OR “equity” OR “inclusion” OR “accessibility”] and the defined publication period [June 2020–December 2021] for the initial search (N = 4,241). Second, we reviewed the titles, abstracts, and study designs (empirical research articles only) to narrow the initial list of article samples to (N = 203). Third, we eliminated articles published online before the established timeframe to eliminate the gap years between publication date and actual issue date. We also excluded any articles that did not fit the inclusion criteria that we missed in the previous screening. From this process, 75 articles were eliminated, resulting in a list of (N = 128) articles for review. Throughout each step of the screening process, we continuously and iteratively discussed our work to address any identified discrepancies, disagreements, or conflicts until we reached consensus to establish a more reliable dataset. Lastly, each author reviewed the main bodies of all 128 articles, after which we identified and resolved any remaining disagreements we had on the inclusion of specific articles.
This left the final selection of articles for analysis at \((N = 109)\).

The total number of relevant articles \((n=109)\) is noteworthy considering the relatively short timeframe for the study. It implies that scholarly attention to DEIA issues have escalated since the recent incidents such as the death of George Floyd. A comparison with the number of studies examined in previous systematic review literature makes it clearer that 109 articles is a relatively large number that reflects heightened scholarly attention. For instance, Sabharwal et al. (2018) conducted a systematic literature review of diversity research in the field of public administration for 75 years of time period (1940-2015), and they identified a total of 348 relevant studies with an average of 4.64 articles per year. Cepiku and Mastrodascio’s (2021) systematic review of equity research over 28 years from 1990 through 2018 identified 145 relevant articles in total, with an average of 5.18 articles per year. In comparison, a total of 109 articles identified in this study for the period from June 2020 to December 2021, with an average of 72.7 articles per year, is noteworthy and a large number compared to the previous publication trends. The escalated scholarly interests are also in line with the afore-discussed heightened public attention to DEI issues.

Data Coding and Analysis

We developed a codebook that corresponded to our research questions and conducted a systematic content analysis to build a dataset for the 109 studies during March and April 2022. Both authors performed the content analysis in multiple phases, each of which involved collective and iterative revisions and discussion.

First, we developed the codebook and a coding scheme that included the coding categories "journal title," "article title," "online publication month and year," "author(s) (gender, institution's country affiliation, and discipline)," "geographic focus of research," "research inquiries," "keywords" (provided in the articles), "definition," "use of theory," "methods," and "findings." We subsequently engaged in a long discussion on the criteria for the coding categories to establish a common ground/understanding.

Second, each author individually conducted an initial round of coding. After the first round, we identified that variations of concepts (different words but same meaning) were used in the articles' keywords, definitions, research questions, theories, methods, and findings. To identify a list of representative concepts, each of us conducted axial coding of the varied keywords. Then, we interactively compared and discussed the axial coding results and addressed any discrepancies in our conceptions.

Next, we conducted core-coding of the axial codes to identify thematic dimensions of the core concepts: a) subjects, b) spectrums, and c) approaches. Lastly, after final review of the collective coding results, we identified the common and inclusive code list that fell under each dimension. We acknowledge that readers may have different approaches to developing codes. In our case, all codes were established based on consensus between the authors and the logic of saturation. We used the dimensions and core concepts to identify conceptual perspectives of the selected DEIA research.
FINDINGS: RECENT DEIA RESEARCH TRENDS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

On average, 2.36 articles that referenced DEIA research were published per journal during the observation period: however, the number of articles was disproportionate across the journals. Out of the 42 journals, 12 did not publish any articles addressing DEIA issues during the study period. When those 12 journals are excluded from analysis, then the average number of articles addressing DEIA published per journal during the observation period increases to 3.3 across 30 journals. Figure 3 presents the number of articles published each month during the observation period.

Authors of DEIA Research in Public Administration

A majority of the 109 articles that addressed DEIA issues were co-authored: while 25.7% (28 of 109) were written by one author, 74.3% (81 of 109) were co-authored. Of the co-authored papers, about half (49%, or 40 of 81 articles) were co-written by two authors, and the rest (51%, or 41 of 81) were penned by three or more authors.

Analysis of the gender composition of the 233 authors of the articles reviewed indicated that 122 (52%) were male and 111 (48%) were female: neither gender was more heavily involved in conducting DEIA research. However, analysis of the gender composition of first authors, who lead the research project and often propose the research idea for the project, showed somewhat deviated results. Out of 109 lead/first authors, 49 (45%) were male, and 60 (55%) were female; hence, female scholars assumed a higher percentage of lead authorship.

In addition to author gender composition, the authors’ disciplines (as presented in Table 1) were also examined. The discipline that the highest percentage (43%) of authors studied in was public administration/public affairs/public policy, associated with 98 of the 228 total authors. The second most frequently represented discipline was political science, represented by 16.7%, or 38 of the 228 authors. The diverse disciplines associated with the authors of the papers under examination included other areas of study with notable representation as well, including social work (8.3%), sociology (7.9%), and business (6.1%).

Table 1. Author Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration/Public Affairs/Public Policy</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science/Politics</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Social Policy/Social &amp; Policy Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Management</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Educational Policy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For brevity purpose, only top eight (8) disciplines are presented in the table. Other identified author disciplines are as follows: anthropology (1), computer science (2), medicine/public health (2), psychology (2), adult education (1), agriculture (1), criminology (1), data science (1), European studies (1), geography (1), other (practitioner) (2).

Table 2 presents information about the countries affiliated with the authors’ institutions, another factor investigated in this review. Several authors held more than one institutional affiliation, so the sample size (n = 233) for the country affiliation of the author’s institution is slightly
Table 2. Author Institution’s Country Affiliation

| Affiliated Country (count) | United States (128), Israel (11), S. Korea (10), Spain (9), United Kingdom (8), Austria (6), Canada (6), China (6), Denmark (6), Australia (5), Brazil (5), Norway (5), Italy (4), The Netherlands (4), Sweden (4), India (3), Chile (2), Finland (2), Greece (2), Bangladesh (1), Belgium (1), France (1), Mexico (1), Pakistan (1), Peru (1), Scotland (1) |

greater than the total number of authors. Most author institutions (128 out of 233, or 55%) were from the United States.

Geographic Focus of DEIA Research in Public Administration

As Figure 4 indicates, the geographic foci of DEIA research have been disproportionate. Of the 109 articles reviewed, DEIA issues in the United States were most frequently in focus, at 53 articles, followed by Israel (6), Canada (4), China (4), India (4), multiple countries in comparative studies (4), Austria (3), Brazil (3), Denmark (3), Norway (5), United Kingdom (3), Australia (2), Greece (2), Spain (2), the Netherlands (2), and 14 other countries (countries colored in gray produced no relevant publications during the study period).

Conceptual Perspectives of DEIA Research in Public Administration

Keywords: Dimensions and Core Concepts of DEIA Research. From an analysis of all keywords of the selected articles, we identified 44 core concepts of DEIA research (see Table 3 for details). Each core concept represents any possible word variations used to represent the concept (different words but same meaning) and is distinct from other core concepts (see list in Table 3). Then, we reviewed the core concepts and identified their three dimensions: subject, spectrum, and approach. “Subject” refers to the subject matter (e.g., people, organization, group, place, unit, sector) on which the DEIA article focuses, while “spectrum” indicates the way the DEIA concept was worded or used in the articles reviewed. The “approach” encompasses strategies (behavioral, psychological, organizational, social, political, institutional) introduced by/discussed in the selected articles as key to advancing DEIA issues and initiatives.

Definition and Research Questions: Major Topics and Issues in DEIA Research. By analyzing the frequencies at which the core concepts were included in the DEIA definitions and research questions in the selected articles, we identified those that received substantial attention in the DEIA research (see Table 4). The leading concepts addressed in DEIA research in the subject dimension were gender, sexuality, and identity (35), race/ethnicity (30), and migration (15). The two most commonly addressed in the spectrum dimension were inclusion (26) and (in)equality (22), followed by diversity (12) and (in)equality (10). In the approach dimension, representation (28) was the leading concept.

Author Gender and Subjects of Focus. We further delved into the subjects of focus in recent DEIA research by exploring if the subject matter for research differs depending on author’s gender. In case when an article was written by multiple authors, which is the case for the majority of the reviewed articles (74.3%, or 81 of 109 articles), we utilized information on the first author’s gender to examine subject differences by author’s gender. This is because the lead author is often the one who ideates a research topic. The results are presented in Table 5.

Figure 4. Geographic Focus of DEIA Research in PA
Table 3. Dimensions and Core Concepts Used in DEIA Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Core Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Academia/Education; Age; Economic/financial; Gender; Sexuality &amp; Identity; Health; Human Service; Intersectionality; Lived Experiences; Migration; Minority; NPO/3rd Sector; Race/ethnicity; Religion; Society; Street-Level Bureaucracy; Urban/rural/small town; Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum</td>
<td>Accessibility; (Anti)discrimination; Diversity; (In)equality; (In)equity; Inclusion; Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Attitudes/Behavior; Representation; Belonging; Change; Civic/Community Engagement; Digital Media; Justice; Hierarchy; Implementation; Institution; Integration; Interaction; Investment; Leadership; Public Goods; Partnership; Politics; Social structure; Training; Welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Core Concepts Used in DEIA Definitions and Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Core Concept (Count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Gender, Sexuality, &amp; Identity (35), Race/Ethnicity (30), Migration (15), Minority (11), Intersectionality (6), Economic/Financial (4), Human Service (4), Health (4), Street-level bureaucracy (4), Academia/education (2), Age (2), Lived experience (1), NPO/3rd Sector (1), Religion (1), Veterans (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum</td>
<td>Inclusion (26), (In)equality (22), Diversity (12), (In)equality (10), (Anti)discrimination (4), Accessibility (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Representation (28), Justice (5), Civic/Community Engagement (2), Leadership (1), Politics (1), Welfare (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there are generally no notable differences in the subjects of focus depending on the author’s gender, however, one noteworthy difference is that female sole authors and research teams with female lead author (female author hereafter for brevity) published much more research in the subject area of gender, sexuality and identity than male sole authors and research teams with male lead author (male author hereafter for brevity) (24 articles for female vs. 11 articles for male).

Theoretical Grounds of DEIA Research. Table 6 shows the coded results concerning theoretical grounds frequently used in the DEIA research in the selected articles. DEIA is a complex, multifaceted issue. Hence, scholars have sought to understand many dimensions of DEIA from various perspectives. The first group of theoretical approaches frequently employed in the DEIA research was representation theories. Topics explored from the representation angle include diversity and equality considerations in personnel decisions and strategies (e.g., Foley et al., 2021; Hassan & O’Mealia, 2020), factors that influence minority and intersectional group representation at the managerial and leadership level (e.g., Figueroa Huencho & Araya Orellana, 2021; Hawes, 2021; Marvel, 2021; Mousa, 2021), the effects of various group representations on individual, policy, and organizational outcomes (e.g., Baniamin & Jamil, 2021; Dhillon & Meier, 2022; Fay, Hicklin Fryar, et al., 2021; Hatmaker & Hassan, 2021; Hawes, 2021; Jung & Ronquillo, 2021; Merritt et al., 2020; Sanghee Park & Charles Mwihambi, 2021; Sunggeun Park, 2020; Potter & Volden, 2021), and the influence of minority representation in political and bureaucratic entities on behaviors of bureaucrats (e.g., Choi & Hong, 2021; Headley & Wright, 2020; Li, 2021). While the specific focus may vary, studies that employed the representation approaches tended to investigate efforts for better representation of diverse groups in the public sector and the determinants and effects of such representation.

Table 5. Subject of Focus by Author Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Gender of the lead author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n=49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia/education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic/financial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, sexuality, &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectionality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO/3rd sector</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-level bureaucracy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/rural/small town</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total number of subjects of focus for each gender does not necessarily equate to the number of lead authors in each gender group. This is because there can be multiple subjects of focus in a single research (e.g., both gender and race being explored in a single article).

Theories concerning social identity construction and social categorization have also been frequently applied in DEIA research. These theoretical perspectives explain that people use criteria (e.g., gender, race, religion, education) to categorize themselves and others into different social groups (i.e., us [in-group] versus them [out-group]) and favor those who belong to the group with which they identify
Table 6. Theoretical Grounds Frequently Used in the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical grounds</th>
<th>Dimensions &amp; Core Concepts</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation (e.g., representative bureaucracy theory, theory of symbolic representation)</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Baniamin &amp; Jamil, 2021; Dhillon &amp; Meier, 2022; Fay, Hicklin Fryar, et al., 2021; Foley et al., 2021; Hassan &amp; O’Mealia, 2020; Hatmaker &amp; Hassans, 2021; Lewis et al., 2021; Mousa, 2021; Sanghee Park &amp; Charles Mwihambi, 2021; Potter &amp; Volden, 2021; Choi &amp; Hong, 2021; Diab &amp; Cohen, 2021; Figueroa Huencho &amp; Araya Orellana, 2021; Funk &amp; Molina, 2021; Hawes, 2021a, 2021b; Headley et al., 2021; Headley &amp; Wright, 2020; Jung &amp; Ronquillo, 2021; Keiser et al., 2021; Langarita et al., 2021; H. Lee, 2022; Li, 2021; Marvel, 2021; Merritt et al., 2020; Sunggeun Park, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity construction and social categorization (e.g., social identity theory, inclusion-exclusion, homophobia principle, social categorization theory)</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Butz &amp; Fording, 2022; Cardador et al., 2022; Glyniadaki, 2022; Hatmaker &amp; Hassans, 2021; Lehner et al., 2021; Marvel, 2021; Merritt et al., 2020; Moon &amp; Christensen, 2022; Qu &amp; Paarlberg, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectrum</td>
<td>Butz &amp; Fording, 2022; Cardador et al., 2022; Glyniadaki, 2022; Lehner et al., 2021; Marmo et al., 2021; Marvel, 2021; Moon &amp; Christensen, 2022; Ohemeng &amp; McGrandle, 2022; Qu &amp; Paarlberg, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias, discrimination, stereotyping (e.g., discrimination theories, racial bias and discrimination, racial classification model, bureaucratic discrimination, discriminatory policing; theories of systemic and individual bias)</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Assouline et al., 2022; Butz &amp; Fording, 2022; Ham &amp; Yang, 2020; Lahey &amp; Oxley, 2021; Mackenzie-Liu et al., 2021; Noor et al., 2021; Oberfield &amp; Incantalupo, 2021; Pfaff et al., 2021; Porumbescu et al., 2021; Shoub, 2022; Smith et al., 2021; Yuval, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectrum</td>
<td>Assouline et al., 2022; Butz &amp; Fording, 2022; Ham &amp; Yang, 2020; Lahey &amp; Oxley, 2021; Mackenzie-Liu et al., 2021; Noor et al., 2021; Oberfield &amp; Incantalupo, 2021; Pfaff et al., 2021; Porumbescu et al., 2021; Shoub, 2022; Smith et al., 2021; Yuval, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical theories (e.g., feminist theory, critical race theory, intersectional perspectives)</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Allsop &amp; Richez, 2021; Bishu &amp; Heckler, 2021; Funk &amp; Molina, 2021; Mousa, 2021; Fay et al., 2021; Lewis &amp; Emidy, 2022; Olivares &amp; Piatak, 2022; Yu, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectrum</td>
<td>Bishu &amp; Heckler, 2021; Funk &amp; Molina, 2021; Lewis &amp; Emidy, 2022; Olivares &amp; Piatak, 2022; Yu, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i.e., in-group). The DEIA literature promoting this school of thought as theoretical grounding tended to explore how in-group and out-group perceptions and dynamics affect attitudes and behaviors. Specific topics explored under this category include the impact of similarities between managers and employees and between bureaucrats and citizens on managerial/bureaucratic decision-making and behaviors (e.g., Hatmaker & Hassan, 2021; Marvel, 2021; Merritt et al., 2020), bureaucratic sense-making of out-group clients and use of discretion (e.g., Glyniadaki, 2022), diversity and heterogeneity in an organization/community and its effects on member behaviors (e.g., Moon & Christensen, 2022; Qu & Paarlberg, 2022), and determinants and effects of individual sense of belonging and inclusion to their organization/community (e.g., Lehner et al., 2021; Marmo et al., 2021; Ohemeng & McGrandle, 2021).

Some DEIA research were based on theories related to bias, stereotyping, and discrimination. DEIA research from this angle has primarily explored biases and stereotypes against members of minority and intersectional groups, and discrimination against the members of these groups. These topics have been studied in a variety of contexts and settings, for instance, interpersonal relationships in the workplace (Smith et al., 2021), hiring process (Lahey & Oxley, 2021), policy decisions (Butz & Fording, 2022), public health (Assouline et al., 2022), and policing (Shoub, 2022; Yuval, 2021). While a majority of the studies examined bureaucratic discrimination against certain citizen groups (e.g., Assouline et al., 2022; Mackenzie-Liu et al., 2021; Noor et al., 2021; Oberfield & Incantalupo, 2021; Pfaff et al., 2021; Shoub, 2022; Yuval, 2021), some scholars, pointing out that discrimination can happen the other way...
around as well, have explored citizen discrimination against certain groups of bureaucrats (Porumbescu et al., 2021). In addition, while studies in this group have explored bias, stereotypes, and discrimination related to various subjects, such as gender and sexual identity (Mackenzie-Liu et al., 2021; Smith et al., 2021), intersectionality (Lahey & Oxley, 2021; Smith et al., 2021), immigrants (Yuval, 2021), and religion (Paff et al., 2021), the subject of race appears to have received the most scholarly attention (Butz & Fording, 2022; Noor et al., 2021; Oberfield & Incantalupo, 2021; Porumbescu et al., 2021; Shoub, 2022; Smith et al., 2021).

Finally, some of the DEIA research reviewed was based on critical theories such as feminist theory, critical race theory, and intersectionality. DEIA research from the critical theory perspectives explores how the existing system of power continues to affect minority and intersectional groups in various ways, such as in terms of employee voice behavior (Yu, 2021), pursuit of leadership positions (Bishu & Heckler, 2021; Mousa, 2021), or arts participation (Olivares & Piatak, 2022). They examine current systems of oppression against and disadvantages for members of minority and intersectionality groups and advocate for changes to existing systems.

Methods of DEIA Research in Public Administration

The findings indicate that a majority of the DEIA studies in the articles reviewed adopted a quantitative approach (65.1%), followed by a qualitative approach (30.3%), and a mixed-methods approach (4.6%). The most frequently used source of data was archival data (34.3%). Some examples of archival data used in the sample include traffic stop records, veterans review and appeal board decisions related to military sexual assaults, administrative data from government-owned enterprises, and administrative records on job postings, among others. Surveys (29.8%) and interviews (22.9%) were also frequently used as data sources. Experiments (7.6%), focus groups (3.1%), observations (1.5%), and ethnographic participation (0.8%) were cited as sources of data as well.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
What Do We Know? Trends in Recent DEIA Research

The present study aimed to synthesize the DEIA research in the field of public administration over the past few years, during which society has witnessed multiple extremely concerning incidents, such as the murder of George Floyd and the shooting of individuals of Asian heritage in Atlanta, which have evoked additional scholarly attention to DEIA issues. What do we know about recent DEIA research in the field? How diverse and inclusive is such research? To answer these questions, the findings from a systematic review of 109 articles were coded under four themes: author characteristics, geographic focus, theoretical grounds, and research methods.

Authors. Analysis of the DEIA research article authorship characteristics indicates a gender gap in terms of leadership in conducting DEIA research. A comparison of the number of male and female authors of the DEIA articles reviewed uncovers no noticeable gender differences, with male and female authors each responsible for approximately half of the authorship. However, the analysis of gender composition of lead authors shows that female scholars assumed a higher percentage of lead authorship than male scholars. In addition, the analysis of subject area differences by author gender suggests that female authors conducted much more research on gender, sexuality and identity than male authors. The finding is in line with previous systematic review research which suggested that female authors tend to focus more on gender-related diversity issues than their male counterparts (Sabharwal et al., 2018).

Next, findings on the locations of authors’ institutional affiliations suggest that a majority of authors (55%) identified with the United States as their affiliation country. Considering that the United States is one of the largest and most diverse countries in the world, scholars, like anyone else in the country, likely have been exposed, either directly or indirectly, to various DEIA issues. For this reason, the high number of authors in our sample whose institutions were affiliated with the United States was not surprising.

Finally, given that the journals selected for review were classified as public administration journals (PA journals hereafter for brevity), the finding that many of the authors represented the public administration and policy discipline and the closely related field of political science was not unpredictable. Nevertheless, despite the dominance of public administration as an author discipline, the full list of authors’ disciplinary backgrounds represented in the DEIA research published in the PA journals reviewed was diverse. Considering the diverse spectrum of DEIA research areas and contexts, such interdisciplinary efforts may help to further advance DEIA research and practice.

Geographic Focus. Our analysis uncovered an uneven geographic representation in the DEIA research identified for the review, with a disproportionately high representation for the United States. Considering the varying types, levels, and scopes of diversity that exist within the country, the disproportion may be attributed to DEIA issues in the United States being more pressing than in many other countries. Similarly, DEIA seems more likely to be an issue in geographically large countries, such as the United States, Canada, China, India, and Brazil. Still, multiple studies focused on smaller sized countries in Western Europe, possibly due to the strong public attention to multiculturalism issues and experiences in those countries following the recent influx of immigrants fleeing from civil wars or humanitarian crises. Despite geographic size or racial/ethnic/linguistic diversity, however, most countries in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, Africa, and Latin America did not receive much attention in the DEIA research examined.

Major Topics and Theoretical Grounds. Findings from the keyword analysis uncovered many present and emerging DEIA research areas and approaches to examining DEIA issues. A variety of core concepts identified in the subject dimension shows that recent studies on DEIA have explored a multitude of subject areas. While the analysis results in-
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dicate that the traditionally popular subjects, such as gender and race/ethnicity, still receive most of the scholarly attention, emerging subject areas in recent DEIA research were also revealed. The prevalence of such subjects as gender and race/ethnicity in DEIA research may reflect the continuing urgency of addressing these issues; nevertheless, many other subject areas exist that need scholarly and practitioner attention for an overall improvement of DEIA in society. In that regard, the focus on diverse subject areas, such as sexual identity, intersectionality, migration, religion, veterans, and so on, in recent DEIA research is encouraging. Additionally, various core concepts identified under the approaches dimension illustrate ways for researchers and practitioners to navigate as they work to enhance DEIA in society.

The coded results concerning theoretical grounds of the identified DEIA research show that DEIA has been explored from multiple theoretical perspectives. One of the most frequently employed has been representation theories. While the specific focus may vary, recent DEIA studies based on the representation theories have primarily sought to understand both efforts to improve representation of historically marginalized groups in the public sector, and determinants and effects of such representation. Next, social identity construction and social categorization theories were also frequently applied as theoretical frameworks in the recent DEIA research. DEIA studies that employ this school of thought tend to investigate in-group and out-group (or “us versus them”) perceptions and dynamics and examine how such perceptions and dynamics affect individual attitudes and behaviors in the contexts of manager-employee relations, bureaucrats-citizen relations, and so on.

Additionally, some DEIA studies used theories on bias, stereotyping, and discrimination as their theoretical foundations. These studies primarily focused on exploring biases, stereotypes, and discrimination against members of minority and intersectionality groups, whether it is within a bureaucracy, from bureaucrats to citizens, or from citizens to bureaucrats. These studies have been conducted in a variety of domains, such as policy making, public health, and policing. Finally, critical theories have received growing scholarly attention. Recent DEIA research based on this philosophy explores how the existing system of power oppresses members of minority and intersectionality groups and argues for changes to existing systems.

Methods. Analysis of the articles reviewed indicates that the quantitative approach is dominant in recent DEIA research. Considering that studies have primarily sought to explore the determinants and effects of DEIA-related phenomena (e.g., representation, “us versus them” perceptions, stereotyping, discrimination), the employment of quantitative methods as a dominant analytic approach seems useful. However, the use of the qualitative approach is also not rare: qualitative methods were employed for approximately 30% of the identified studies. The identified qualitative studies often used interviews and focus group sessions with public managers, street-level bureaucrats, and nonprofit employees to gain deeper understanding of the status quo of DEIA and public employees’ DEIA-promoting or hindering decisions and behaviors, as well as the thought processes behind them (e.g., Bishu & Heckler, 2021; Cardador et al., 2022; Eriksson, 2022; Foley et al., 2021; Glyniadaki, 2022).

Where to Go? Directions for Future DEIA Research

DEIA has been a consistently examined research topic and social issue, but as discussed above, both scholarly and public attention to DEIA subjects significantly increased in the wake of the murder of George Floyd and other recent incidents. The comparably greater number of DEIA research articles (N = 109) published in public administration journals during the relatively short observation period for this systematic review signifies the growing interest in and importance of DEIA issues in the public administration discipline.

Findings from this systematic review provide distinctive implications to advance DEIA research and practice. First, the findings indicate that most recent DEIA studies have been geographically focused in the United States. Considering that other parts of the world also face DEIA issues – for instance, migration and social inequality issues in the European Union (European Commission, 2022) – future DEIA research should expand its geographic reach beyond the United States and target other parts of the world as well. Second, and relatedly, future research would benefit from examining if and how topical focus is different depending on the geographic focus of the research and other factors such as author institution’s country affiliation. We considered exploring the differences by these factors. However, as discussed in the Findings section, the geographic focus of the reviewed articles and author institution’s country affiliation were both disproportionately concentrated on the United States, which made it difficult to explore and determine whether or not there are notable subject area differences depending on these factors. Future research should examine the nexus between such factors as geographic focus of the study and the topical focus of the research.

Third, considering the overarching effects of DEIA in public administration on many other social sectors, more interdisciplinary research efforts are needed to better tackle DEIA issues. Fourth, while recent DEIA research has explored various subject areas, the primary focus still leans toward gender and race/ethnicity issues. Future studies should pay more attention to important underexplored subject areas, such as religion, disability, and intersectionality, to name just a few.

Additionally, representation theories were the most frequently employed theoretical perspectives in the DEIA studies reviewed. Considering the rich history of representation research in the field of public administration, and with representative bureaucracy being “one of the most heavily analyzed concepts in public administration” (Meier, 2020; Merritt et al., 2020, p. 453), this finding is not very surprising. Our results indicate that the popularity of research on representation and representative bureaucracy continues. However, other theoretical perspectives also provide useful foundations for DEIA research and should be
Further utilized in future research. They can serve as useful lenses through which to better understand how the "us versus them (others)" dichotomy in our perceptions of the world, as well as our biases and discrimination against others, hamper the achievement of true DEIA in our society. They also help to inform the public that these issues occur at the societal system level as well as at the individual level, demonstrating that system level changes should also be made to promote DEIA.

Finally, only five of the 109 articles reviewed applied a mixed-methods approach, although such an approach can illuminate a more holistic understanding of and more accurate knowledge on a topic. Future DEIA research would benefit from employing the mixed-methods approach.

While highlighting several useful implications for future research, the present research is not without limitations. First, the study is limited in that its observation period was relatively short for a systematic review. While the observation period was set considering the aim of this study – that is, to synthesize the DEIA research published after the recent occurrences of multiple extremely concerning incidents, such as the murder of George Floyd –, the relatively short observation period limited the ability to capture a more comprehensive understanding of DEIA research in the field. Future research can expand by considering a longer observation period to determine if the DEIA research trends identified in the present research still hold true for an extended number of samples. Additionally, future research may involve comparative studies to examine similarities and differences in DEIA research trends before and after an incident such as George Floyd’s death or the Atlanta attack on individuals of Asian heritage. Finally, future research would also benefit from conducting a meta-analysis of existing studies on various DEIA topics (e.g., meta-analysis of diversity management studies) and cumulating findings across studies.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Full Journal List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration &amp; Society</th>
<th>Local Government Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Science Quarterly</td>
<td>Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Review of Public Administration</td>
<td>Nonprofit Management and Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia &amp; the Pacific Policy Studies</td>
<td>Policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Journal of Public Administration</td>
<td>Policy and Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Public Administration</td>
<td>Policy and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Public Policy</td>
<td>Policy Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Policy Analysis</td>
<td>Policy Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Policy Studies Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Service Organizations Management Leadership and Governance</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Public Administration</td>
<td>Public Administration and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Public Sector Management</td>
<td>Public Administration Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Public Management Journal</td>
<td>Public Management Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Review of Administrative Sciences</td>
<td>Public Performance and Management Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis</td>
<td>Public Personnel Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of European Public Policy</td>
<td>Public Policy and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Policy Analysis and Management</td>
<td>Publius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Public Policy</td>
<td>Review of Public Personnel Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Social Policy</td>
<td>Social Policy and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lex Localis</td>
<td>VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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