DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) Research:

An Inventory of California's Urban Place Management Organizations

A Project Report

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Anthropology

San José State University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Applied Anthropology

By

Juan Carlos Aguirre

May 2024

The Undersigned Graduate Committee Approves the Project Report Titled

DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) Research:

An Inventory of California's Urban Place Management Organizations

By

Juan Carlos Aguirre

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2024

DocuSigned by:
Melissa Beresford
E141A9FDFBF949B...
Melissa Beresford, Ph.D. Department of Anthropology

DocuSigned by:
A J Faas
90E52F165DAB4EC...
A.J. Faas, Ph.D. Department of Anthropology

DocuSigned by:
Jan English-Lueck
9CDDDC475D2942E...
Jan English-Lueck, Ph.D. Department of Anthropology

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am profoundly grateful to several individuals whose support and guidance have been instrumental throughout my academic journey. First and foremost, I extend my most profound appreciation to Dr. Melissa Beresford, who not only served as my chair but also ignited my passion for academia during my undergraduate years. Your unwavering support and guidance have been invaluable. I am forever indebted to you for your fementorship, encouragement, and patience, especially during some setbacks in the course of my MA research. I could not have done this without your expertise, wisdom, and care – thank you!

I would like to thank Dr. A. J. Faas, whose mentorship and care have been consequential in my success throughout my tenure at SJSU. There are countless examples of you directly dedicating yourself to fostering my academic, professional, and personal growth. Your passion for excellence has been directly responsible for guiding me from an uncertain undergraduate student to a confident academic and professional. Time and time again, you have proven to be an incredible supporter of me and my work. I am forever indebted to you for your care and friendship — thank you.

Thanks to Dr. Jan English-Lueck, whose groundbreaking research in the anthropology of work has provided invaluable insights and guidance for my research process. Your expertise has been instrumental in shaping the direction of my research. Your creative teaching style and methodologies have allowed me to grow exponentially in my creativity — thank you.

I am grateful to Dr. Alfredo Huante, whose expertise in critical race theory and teaching style profoundly changed my viewpoint of myself and the world. This dramatic change in perspective allowed me to take my research far beyond what I ever imagined it could become.

You immediately embraced me and accepted me into the Chicano/Chicana Studies Department, making me feel right at home. For this, I am forever grateful to you — thank you.

I would be remiss not to acknowledge the unshakable support of my husband, James Aguirre, whose love, encouragement, and unwavering belief in me have been my greatest source of strength throughout this journey. My stress has been your stress, my milestones have been your milestones, and I share this accomplishment with you. You'll be my shotgun rider 'til the day I die—Gracias mi amor.

I want to thank my incredibly talented cohort: Chyna Lee, Sam Bass, Ethan Kelley, Nina Garcia, and Veronica Reyes. This journey has been one of the craziest rides I have ever experienced, and I cannot imagine having gone through this with anyone else. From Taco Bell to universal cry sessions. I love and appreciate every single one of you.

To my entire Chicano/Chicana Studies Department familia, I appreciate and love every single one of you. Alfonso, Annette, Naomi, Marlene, Theresa, Maria, Dr. Johnny, Dr. Vega, and the rest of my CCS course classmates and NACCS co-members, gracias por todo su apoyo y amistad. I can't wait to continue to laugh with all of y'all.

Finally, I extend my heartfelt thanks to my family and friends, whose support and encouragement have sustained me through the highs and lows of my educational journey. Their belief in me has been a constant source of motivation, and I am deeply grateful for their presence in my life. To all those mentioned above and countless others who have supported me, thank you from the bottom of my heart. Your guidance, encouragement, and unwavering belief in me have made this journey possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INSPIRATION TOWARD DEI RESEARCH AMONG CALIFORNIA-BASED URBAN PLACE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Forward

In the Fall of 2022, a group of anthropology scholars and activists grabbed food and drinks in Downtown San José after attending an anthropology workshop. While at the social gathering, A.J. introduced me to a tech industry consultant working on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). At the time I was still unsure about how to go about researching DEI, so I was grateful to have the opportunity to pick a DEI practitioner's brain.

Now, this next part is a bit fuzzy, but here is the gist: I started explaining to the DEI practitioner how I intended to research DEI in the workplace, and almost immediately, they sighed loudly and said, "Oh, you poor thing. I am so sorry to hear that. Don't get me wrong, DEI is imperative work, but you will discover that you are about to start a terrifyingly depressing and overwhelming journey! Good luck!"

Immediately, I felt the floor fall from under me, and, honestly, I left the conversation feeling bewildered. Why would a practicing DEI consultant say anything that might discourage a new, blossoming DEI researcher? I returned home that night with my feelings and inspiration slightly bruised. Still, a few weeks later, I had completely forgotten this interaction in Downtown San José and I continued the workplace DEI research course!

Now, a full year after that conversation with a practicing DEI practitioner and with my very first DEI research fully wrapped, I wholeheartedly appreciate their insight. DEI research is depressing and often paralyzingly frustrating. However, one other nugget of wisdom stood out in

my conversation with this DEI practitioner; they reminded me that although often difficult, DEI research is profoundly necessary.

Overall, my small interaction with a DEI practitioner heavily influenced my research on diversity, equity, and inclusion. I gained a multi-lens approach to DEI research that cautioned me to tread lightly when interacting with people and organizations that do not quite understand DEI as a fully developed concept. And, this newly developed perspective allowed me to be ready for disappointment and discouragement. Nevertheless, there's more to DEI research than exhaustive disappointment. In this report, I highlight the good, the bad, and the *necessary* work of DEI research.

Introduction

The genesis of my research on diversity, equity, and inclusion within California's urban place management industry stems from my personal experience as an employee of the San Jose Downtown Association (SJDA)–a Bay Area-based urban place management organization. I began my tenure with SJDA in August of 2022, and within the first week on the job, I attended my first board of directors meeting. In an effort to set a positive example, I arrived early at the meeting location and helped prepare the meeting space. As soon as I sat down at the conference table, my SJDA colleagues and board members began arriving. Quickly, the conference table filled up when someone (*I will not say who, to save them embarrassment, but primarily for my protection*) turned to me and said, "Would you mind moving away from the conference table and sitting in the back? The conference table is reserved for board members and other important people."

I hesitated. I knew that moving from the conference table would set a precedent that would force me to be complicit with White dominant workplace practices, something that goes

against every fiber of my being. Yet, not up for what could be a contentious conversation with a person with decision-making authority within a public setting, I complied and moved to the back of the room.

This specific experience gave me a lot more insight into the organizational culture of the San Jose Downtown Association than any of the documents I reviewed as part of my interview preparation and even as part of my onboarding process as a new employee. I remained nervous and a bit lost throughout the board meeting, yet few board members introduced themselves or bothered to say hello. More importantly, it became clear that status and tenure were criteria for belonging and being deemed "important" within the organization.

While sitting in the back of the room, careful not to disturb the "important" people at the conference table, I began writing down questions. Have there been other employees who have been excluded or made to feel unwelcome? Since I was only one of two people of color on staff, has diversifying personnel been a problem or topic the organization wishes to address? What about other DEI topics? What about the urban place management industry? Is someone in the urban place management industry working on DEI? How would frontline employees' experiences and understandings of DEI differ from those of leadership employees and board members? Would experiences and understandings be similar or on entirely different spectrums between roles, gender, race, ethnicity, ability, sexual orientation, etc.? These questions were the inspiration that led to my researching DEI within the urban place management industry.

Partnering with California Downtown Association's DEI Task Force

My partner and client for this project is the California Downtown Association (CDA), a collaborative volunteer group of over 50 urban place management organizations within California. Place management is an approach to urban planning that prioritizes people over

infrastructure. In addition to creating practical spaces, place management creates public spaces that encourage and inspire social engagement and cross-cultural interactions for many of the United States' downtowns or urban landscapes (Urban Design Lab 2023). Urban place management organizations are typically "nonprofit management associations that deliver vital services and activities within the boundaries of their districts. These place management organizations are often called Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), Business Improvement Areas (BIAs), Partnerships, and Alliances" (International Downtown Association 2024).

The California Downtown Association (CDA) is a nonprofit collective of business improvement districts (BIDs) in California whose primary purpose is to exchange and share imperative information, skills, and assistance in sustaining the long-term prosperity of urban centers (California Downtown Association 2022). In 2020, in direct response to the police killing of George Floyd, CDA–like many other American organizations at the time–tasked a small group to investigate organization-wide diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. The exploratory group began by examining the topic of race and place in America and the disproportionate impact COVID-19 had on black and brown communities. The original group eventually expanded into a comprehensive DEI Task Force, whom CDA charged to explore even more complex DEI issues and recommend best practices for the organization (International Downtown Association 2021, 5:40–5:55).

In early 2021, the newly formed DEI Task Force began setting DEI goals and programming. First, the task force created a DEI statement, which reads:

> The California Downtown Association values diverse, inclusive places and organizations that allow all to prosper. We value community as the foundation of which great cities are built, and we value a passion for the public realm and a fundamental belief in the

> vibrancy of cities for all people (International Downtown Association 2021)[1].

The task force then created a plan for a DEI Summit that included three separate convenings: panel discussions moderated by subject matter and industry experts, listening sessions featuring conversations by historically marginalized employees, and workshops on how individual sites could design their own DEI planning and initiatives. The first DEI Summit, which focused on race and place, was held virtually in early 2021. Unfortunately, due to the overwhelming work brought upon by the COVID-19 pandemic, the entire CDA membership temporarily paused DEI efforts indefinitely.

Then, in the Fall of 2022, I met with Steve Snider–the Uptown Downtown Oakland Community Benefit District's Executive Director and the California Downtown Association DEI Task Force Chair–to learn more about the urban place management industry's history with DEI. After my initial conversation with Steve and the rest of the DEI Task Force, the task force charged me with implementing a new DEI plan for California-based urban place management organizations. However, in order for me to determine the best DEI program for CDA, I first had to investigate what DEI *is*. In the following sections, I explain the literature and methodology that assisted me with designing my research project with the California Downtown Association.

Theoretical Framework

The topics of this report are thematically connected to several theoretical ideas and empirical evidence from secondary literature sources. In what follows, I present a scholarly foundation and methodology for creating a process to develop a diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) intervention for the California Downtown Association's DEI Task Force. I begin with a

[1] Found within the YouTube video time stamp between 6:30–6:50.

short exposition of DEI (diversity, equity, and inclusion). Following that, I posit that successful DEI strategies need robust organizational development strategies. Lastly, I analyze the DEI implementation limitations caused by White supremacy systems.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)

It is important to note that DEI practitioners and scholars still debate the DEI acronym and the spectrum of definitions the acronym combines. Several acronyms utilized by DEI practitioners in this sector include "JEDI," "DEIB," "IDEA," "D&I," and "EDI," where the "B" stands for "belonging," the "A" for "accessibility," and the "J" for "justice" (Zheng 2023, 19). Numerous DEI advocates suggest their acronym is the best. I am not an expert in the DEI industry, but for my analysis and writing, I will encompass all domains of this work (diversity, equity, inclusion, accessibility, belonging, justice, etc.) and refer to it as DEI, not because it is the best, but simply for consistency.

Scholars contend that organizations lack intentionality when designing DEI goals and programs (Ahmed 2007; Roscigno 2011; Zheng 2023). According to Vincent Roscigno (2011, 360), organizations often decouple what they profess to do and how they actually operate. For example, Sara Ahmed (2007, 593) contends that most organizations simply document DEI strategies by posting DEI statements on websites, social media, or internal memoranda. Yet, public displays and support of organization-wide DEI efforts often lack tangible, effective programs and measurable goals. Meanwhile, Lily Zheng (2023, 119) suggests that almost all DEI initiatives that do not intentionally measure how they impact the intended targeted audience will always be performative and open to criticism. Jeremy Bohonos and Stephanie Cisco (2021, 94) agree with Zheng and state that tracking diversity and inclusion work leads to documentation and a “paper trail,” which can keep organizational leaders with decision-making authority

accountable. According to Alexandra Kalev, Erin Kelly, and Frank Dobbin (2006, 591–592), for DEI to become institutionalized, someone in leadership and decision-making power must own the responsibility, strategy, and execution of DEI. Companies risk losing sight of the importance of DEI policy and initiatives if DEI work simultaneously becomes everyone's and no one's responsibility. This approach endangers systems of power inequalities to remain and reproduce (Roscigno 2011, 354).

Successful DEI practices should be continuous and malleable. For example, DEI practitioners need to iterate, celebrate, and reiterate their DEI strategies with all stakeholders, especially with marginalized, underrepresented groups, to build trust and successfully implement DEI design (Zheng 2022, 270). Celebrating all forms of success, whether small or large, builds momentum and a coalition of support toward the eventual targeted outcome (Hayes and Kaba 2023, 74). Moreover, encouraging minority workers to offer feedback and critique early drafts of DEI plans demonstrates the seriousness and intentionality of the effort, which results in a more substantial outcome and gains the support of minority groups (Zheng 2022, 271). According to Sean Tallman and Cate Bird (2022, 96), targeted outreach programs that include internal members from underrepresented groups and diverse backgrounds can ensure newly recruited minority individuals feel welcomed and comfortable in their new work environment.

Additionally, DEI workplace research conducted by Spencer Kaplan (2022, 13) discovered that when employers value and accept the identity markers of their underrepresented workforce, employees gain the power to be more authentic at work. When employees can genuinely express themselves without having to balance the integration of their unique identity into the work environment and can simply perform their job duties, it leads employees to become organizational champions and culture warriors. Having workplace champions results in better

talent, improves innovation and decision-making, and an overall balanced work environment. Overall, diversity, equality, and inclusion programs should be led by a decision-making authority figure, produce measurable and observable results, consider the perspectives of marginalized individuals, and be a continuous process of self-reflection.

Organizational Development

The most effective approaches and fruitful results for implementing novel organizational development practices within companies are hotly contested by academics (see Bertrand et al. 2019; Dobbin, Kim, and Kalev 2011; Jordan 1994). Ann Jordan (1994, 5) posits that organizations and the problems within them are complex and nuanced; thus, organizations need unique and specialized programming to help improve individual work environments. Because of organization-specific nuances, it could be challenging for companies to adopt the same behavioral methods as their competitors and have comparable levels of success. However, Marianne Bertrand and colleagues (2019, 191) posit that uniform policies like diversity quotas, have proven successful strategies for diversifying leadership positions across various organizations with unique cultures and standards. Bertrand and associates' findings directly refute the *pipeline argument*, which maintains that it is difficult to find good minority candidates because there are not enough available (Bozeman and Fay 2013, 5).

Furthermore, researchers (Jordan 1999; Dobbin, Kim, and Kalev 2011) argue that any organizational culture change requires a confluence of external and internal forces. For example, Jordan (1999, 19) contends that for a mass organization culture shift to succeed, a practitioner must employ a comprehensive strategy involving frontline staff and upper management. The intended result will eventually return to its initial, conventional form if every organization member fails to make a significant cultural shift. On the other hand, Frank Dobbin and

colleagues (2011, 389) find external social pressure to be a more significant indication of organizational transformation and accountability than internal support. Internal outcries are unlikely to be powerful enough to produce meaningful effects without a broader social or industry-wide call for specific strategy conversions. Overall, due to the complexity of organizational culture, companies looking to implement diversity, equity, and inclusion strategies successfully need to combine external pressure, internal buy-in, and a people-centric approach that is specific to the company culture and matches the values of its employees (Dobbin, Kim, and Kalev 2011, 339; Jordan 1994, 5; Jordan 1999, 19). With this winning combination, the likelihood of an organization significantly impacting any new policy, including DEI, is much higher.

Whiteness

According to Cristina Beltran (2020, 12), Whiteness is a form of power that simultaneously shapes and is molded by the public sphere. The way Whiteness operates as a construct is to sustain White membership at the top of the racial hierarchy by investing in the unequal distribution of money, power, and privilege while also materially excluding and demeaning those without membership. White membership can be vast and is not limited to White people. Anyone who understands and upholds White virtues and uplifts people based on class privilege, education, physical features, accent, acculturation, self-conception, and social consensus contributes to White hegemony (Haney-López 2003, 1).

What is more, Whiteness does not necessarily have to be overt to sustain itself. Charles Mills (1997, 96–97) describes how White people in positions of authority, whether with good or bad intentions, are impeded with an epistemology of ignorance–at times overt or covert–tactics to subjugate and exploit non-White people. The epistemology of ignorance is a phenomenon that

keeps those in positions of authority–typically White people, but not exclusively–from picking up new knowledge or experiences that differ from their preexisting understandings and experiences. This phenomenon often maintains White domination at the top of a racial hierarchy when White leadership decides to ignore cultural experiences hindering the advancement of non-White members.

Furthermore, other scholars posit that White privileges are so embedded in American culture that White advantages often go concealed and invisible to the scrutiny of any population (Case 2012; Beltrán 2020; Goetz, Williams, and Damiano 2020). For example, Beltrán (2020, 20) states that White dominance stems from everyday practices that assume White advancement over non-White groups as a "natural outcome of market forces and individual choices." Meanwhile, Edward Goetz and colleagues (2020, 145) argue that because the discussion of racial inequalities solely lay on one side of the color line–Blackness–White advantages go ignored by academics, practitioners, and general society. To illustrate, Kim Case's (2012, 84) research shows how White individuals who enter the workforce have an immediate advantage of being instantly accepted into a business when those in positions of authority do not give their Whiteness any second thought. A new White employee does not have to attempt to meet White standards because they automatically arrive having achieved those standards, unlike their non-White counterparts.

What is more, scholarly research shows that White supremacy and power remain pervasive because even non-White individuals strive for White membership (Haney-López 2003; Christian 2018; Flores 2021). For example, Michelle Christian (2018, 181) asserts that even groups and societies without White bodies are guilty of assigning status to skin tones with lighter hues. Often, these groups and societies learn symbolically and implicitly that Whiteness, White

institutions, White norms, and White values are something to strive for or–at the very least–negotiated with and responded to.

Additionally, Tatiana Flores (2021, 74) states that Whiteness does not belong to White people but instead is multiracial and must be understood as a political hue rather than a racial identity. The polity of Whiteness can be operationalized to construct membership criteria that members of the in-group and those striving for in-group status can use to cast others and themselves in or out of, which automatically compels them (explicitly or tacitly) to uphold White norms and practices. In doing so, the evolution of a ‘new White' can rise, where a growing number of minority individuals–those with fair skin, wealth, political connections, and status–virtually achieve a White identity, resulting in diminishing mistreatment accorded non-White individuals and the advantages of White membership (Haney-López 2003, 5). According to Ian Haney-López (2003, 6), if these two outcomes can be achieved by non-White people, then “one would be crazy to want to be anything other than White.” Overall, systems of White domination and power are ubiquitous because both White and non-White populations uphold White values and White privilege, resulting in unquestionable and often invisible White standards. These White ideologies impede the integration of DEI programs within work environments.

Methodology

The integration of scholarly themes surrounding diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), organizational development, and Whiteness has been pivotal in shaping my research methodology. By critically examining the intersections of these themes, I have cultivated a nuanced understanding of the complexities inherent in this study. Through an interdisciplinary

lens, I crafted a research question that unravels the intricate dynamics of marginalization, specifically addressing frontline employees' understanding and experiences with DEI. By focusing on frontline workers, I aim to foster a more inclusive and equitable research process that amplifies diverse voices and perspectives. I should note, however, that my research intentions of examining White dominance as a domain of DEI within urban place management organizations were not supported by the California Downtown Association. This is the paralyzingly frustrating aspect of DEI work that the DEI practitioner warned me about. While a minor setback for the study, I could still interweave some foundational theories into the final research question and execution.

With this in mind, this study answers the following: *(1) how do employees of urban place management organizations understand diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI)? (2) how do urban place management employees know whether DEI initiatives are successful?* Aligning workers' perspectives with workplace DEI policy and practices can create workplace norms and infrastructures that are more authentic and inclusive. By prioritizing frontline employees, place management organizations can institutionalize norms in their organizational culture that begin to abolish systems of White dominance in the workplace.

To answer the two research questions, I crafted an online survey that probed CDA workers' understanding and interpretation of successful DEI. The survey asked participants three main sets of questions. First, I asked employees to describe, in a general way, what they thought a diverse, equitable, and inclusive workplace looked like. I then asked employees to use a Likert scale to rate their specific UPMO location to determine how diverse, equitable, and inclusive their site is and to explain why they chose their ranking. I followed all qualitative questions with demographic questions that asked about employees' gender identity, age, race and ethnicity,

sexual orientation, educational background, (dis)abilities, salary, UPMO location, and their professional role.

To execute the study, I utilized a census sampling method to recruit participants from Northern and Southern California UPMOs, including Long Beach, Oakland, Pasadena, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, and Santa Monica. To further look at power dynamics and systems of White privilege, I recruited employees from various demographic backgrounds and UPMO roles. In so doing, I aimed to differentiate understandings and experiences of DEI between the most marginalized employees and the most privileged. To analyze the data, I conducted an inductive thematic analysis of the open-ended survey questions to determine how workers understood and experienced each domain of DEI separately. To help identify and code themes, I uploaded all survey responses to MAXQDA, a qualitative data analysis software tool. Afterward, I created codebooks from the initial thematic code findings, which helped identify or eliminate segments within the data that matched the codebook's rules. The rules of the multiple codes helped compartmentalize the understanding and experiences of DEI domains separately by demographic groupings.

Project Goals & Deliverables

I. Utilize anthropological research techniques to inventory DEI understanding and experiences among California-based urban place management organization workers.
II. Discover the indicators urban place management organization employees look for when acknowledging successful DEI strategies.
III. Provide the CDA DEI Task Force with an Executive Summary of the overall study, with significant research findings and recommendations.

IV. Advocate for reinvesting DEI strategies across the urban place management industry that are customized to meet the unique needs of each employee and location.

In the following chapters, I have written an article for future publication in Practicing Anthropology that shares urban place management organizations' employees' understanding and experiences with DEI (diversity, equity, and inclusion). The article includes an overview of the study's results with significant findings. In the final chapter, I discuss the project outcomes, contributions to anthropological scholarship, limitations, and recommendations for future applied research of DEI.

CHAPTER TWO

UTILIZING APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY TO INVENTORY DEI WITHIN CALIFORNIA-BASED URBAN PLACE MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Abstract

This study examines the understanding and experiences of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) among selected workers within California's urban place management industry. I partnered with the California Downtown Association (CDA) to utilize workers' unique experiences and understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion to clarify the debate among DEI scholars on what DEI is and how to start DEI initiatives. For example, should DEI solely focus on diversifying personnel? Should DEI focus on equity and fairness, and for whom? What does fairness even look like? Or, how are systemic White work standards advantageous for White people over non-White people? By gathering data from the California Downtown Association's employee network, I provide CDA and the place management industry a starting point on how to implement DEI programming that is appropriate to the needs of individual place management work locations and their employees.

Keywords: DEI (diversity, equity, and inclusion), belonging, accountability

Introduction

Following the 2020 murder of George Floyd and the subsequent social justice movement, numerous American companies hurried to explore or establish diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) programs. But more than three years later, many businesses that turned to DEI to appease social justice stakeholders are now cutting back on their DEI programs, especially as the concept of "DEI" has become a cudgel in U.S. partisan politics (see Asmelash 2023; and Razek and Rose

2023). Despite the political stigma, many organizations continue to see value in and remain committed to enacting DEI in the workplace. But challenges remain. One of the most significant challenges to launching DEI programs of substance effectively is understanding precisely what DEI *is* and how to know when it is being implemented successfully (Ahmed 2007; Bohonos and Cisco 2021; Kaplan 2022; Tallman and Bird 2022; Zheng 2023).

This study, conducted in partnership with the California Downtown Association, aims to answer this question by examining workers' perceptions and understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion practices in their employee network. In doing so, I provide evidence-based information that provides the CDA and the urban place management industry with a starting point for DEI programming that aligns with industry employees' perspectives and needs.

Study Overview

The California Downtown Association (CDA) is a collaborative volunteer group of over 50 urban place management organizations (UPMOs) within California whose mission is to exchange and share imperative information, skills, and assistance in sustaining the long-term prosperity of urban centers (California Downtown Association 2022). In 2020, in direct response to the murder of George Floyd, CDA assigned a small committee to investigate organization-wide efforts related to diversity, equity, and inclusion. This group eventually expanded into a comprehensive DEI Task Force, implementing a DEI goal and programming in early 2021. The DEI Task Force organized two DEI summits as part of Phase One of the strategy and carried out extensive research on DEI, the results of which were shared with the place management industry as a whole through monthly newsletters.

In February 2023, I met with Steve Snider, the Uptown Downtown Oakland Community Benefit District Executive Director, and the California Downtown Association’s DEI Task Force

Chair, to discuss Phase Two of CDA's DEI plan. Given that the majority of members of the CDA DEI Task Force are volunteers and that most UPMOs lack the necessary time and skills to undertake the preparatory work necessary to determine how to incorporate DEI into the workplace, the group sought advice on how to go from one phase of their first DEI strategy to the next. After my initial conversation with Steve and subsequent meetings with the CDA DEI Task Force, the team assigned me the task of figuring out how to steer them into the next stage of DEI implementation. Specifically, the DEI Task Force tasked me with determining what DEI program would be the most impactful for the urban place management industry.

To better understand what DEI program to launch, I first had to determine what DEI *is*. While there is much public discourse and scholarly literature about what DEI entails, initiatives that are grounded in employees' own understandings of these concepts are more likely to be successful because programs created for/by/and with the intended target audience instantly result in individual recognition, concept familiarity, universal vocabulary, and overall effectiveness. An anthropological approach to assessing workers' understandings of DEI provided an ideal path to inventory how workers understand what DEI *is* and when it is successful within the urban place management industry.

While there has been an increase in work focusing on DEI within anthropology, much of this work examines the need to diversify anthropology as a professional field and discipline (Ríos-Rojas 2014; Schuller and Abreu 2022; Tallman and Bird 2022; Lee et al. 2023; Wang and LaDousa 2024). Anthropologists have engaged less in broader debates on DEI as a broad field of practice in the workplace. Still, anthropologists are experts in discerning human culture, norms, and values. And there are countless anthropologists who have designed techniques to elicit and identify cultural schemas and normative behaviors that clarify how people construct identities

(Sadjadi 2019; Lan 2020), interpret their environments (Malinowski 1953; Vins et al. 2014), understand and utilize language to describe complex issues (Boellstorff 2007; Weiss 2016) interact with others (Baker and Beagan 2014; Faas 2017), maneuver through the nuances of work culture (English-Lueck, Darrah, and Saveri 2002; English-Lueck and Lueck Avery 2017), and navigate disparities faced by marginalized individuals and communities (Sankar and Luborsky 2003; Gonzalez and Marlovits 2020). I lean on the work of other anthropologists' foci to borrow and extend my examination of what 'diversity' 'equity' and 'inclusion' actually mean to urban place management organizations' employees so that I can identify and craft recommendations for DEI programs that have meaning for workers and align with their cognitive understandings.

With all of this in mind, the CDA DEI Task Force and I designed the study with the intention of casting a wide net to recruit as many place management organization employees as possible. Strategically, we determined to concentrate our efforts on assessing in-house employees, or those who had actual change-making authority or the ability to advocate for change within their UPMO site. With in-house employees in mind, we co-developed a questionnaire we knew could be vetted and approved by California's UPMOs from various geographical and geopolitical landscapes. To ensure that I, as a researcher, was not influencing respondents' comprehension of the terminology we were asking them to define, I intentionally formulated broad survey questions to capture definitions of DEI that would not normally be included in the current DEI lexicon, ones that respondents would most be familiar with.

Research Methodology

This study answers the following: *(1) how do employees of urban place management organizations understand diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI)? (2) how do urban place management employees know whether DEI initiatives are successful?* To answer these

questions, I crafted an online survey that probed UPMO workers' understanding of DEI and to inform me if/how DEI programs are currently being implemented and evaluated within their specific UPMO location. The survey asked participants three main sets of questions. First, I asked employees to describe, in a general way, what they thought a diverse, equitable, and inclusive workplace looked like. I then asked employees to use a Likert scale to rate their specific UPMO location to determine how diverse, equitable, and inclusive their site is and to explain why they chose their ranking. I followed all qualitative questions with demographic questions that asked about employees' gender identity, age, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, educational background, (dis)abilities, salary, UPMO location, and their professional role. The San José State University IRB approved the study under protocol #23-218.

Sampling

I recruited participants using a census sampling from a range of Northern and Southern California UPMOs. Eight CDA site leaders approved and agreed to have their employees participate in the survey: Long Beach, Oakland, Pasadena, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, and Santa Monica. These locations represent all of the major metropolitan areas across the West Coast of California.

Starting in November 2023, I distributed the online survey to all employees of the eight UPMOs – a total of 96 employees. To increase participation rates, I drafted a personalized email for all eight site executive leaders to communicate with their teams about the project. Each email introduced me as a researcher, explained the study, blessed the participation of staff from the executive, and included an embedded link to the survey. Additionally, each site executive carved out time within their work environment operating hours to allow employees to take the survey. A total of 75 employees (78% of the population) ranging from 8 UPMO sites answered the DEI

survey; however, only 45 survey responses (47% of the population) were fully completed and analyzable. Approximately 55% of the employees were from Northern California organizations, and 45% were from Southern California organizations. A total of 25 employees (55% of the population) self-identified as White, and 20 employees (45% of the population) selected a race/ethnicity category that is non-White.

Data Analysis

I conducted an inductive thematic analysis of the open-ended survey questions to determine how workers understood and experienced each domain of DEI separately. To help identify and code themes, I uploaded all survey responses to MAXQDA, a qualitative data analysis software tool. I created structural codes based on my survey questions, such as “Imagine a diverse workplace. What does that look like?” Then, I segmented each structural code so only responses to those structural codes appeared within the software. I then separately extracted thematic codes for each diversity, equity, and inclusion domain by looking at responses for one structural code at a time. For example, I created a thematic code called “heterogenous” when any response defining diversity mentioned a workplace that included people from diverse backgrounds.

I created codebooks from the initial thematic code findings, which helped identify or eliminate segments within the data that matched the codebook's rules. For example, the thematic codebook of “legitimization” strictly states that I could apply a thematic code to any structural code about inclusion that mentions any response with work environments that welcome or celebrate individuals’ authenticity, individuality, or grouping characteristics. The rules of the multiple codes helped compartmentalize the understanding and experiences of DEI domains separately.

Findings

In what follows, I discuss how the various employees of urban place management organizations define diversity, equity, and inclusion, where DEI currently stands within the place management industry, and determinants that point to successful future DEI programs. I explain the thematic code that enabled me to categorize responses for each DEI topic. I use employee responses as examples to illustrate what diversity, equity, and inclusion mean in the broadest sense within the urban place management industry. Subsequently, I showcase two thematic concepts that indicate how employees recognize successful DEI programming within their work environment: ideas of belonging as one theme and accountability as the final theme.

Defining DEI: Diversity

Diversity is the one domain of DEI where I discovered the most centralization and saturation across the entire dataset. Almost all respondents understand a diverse workplace to be an environment filled with a heterogeneous group of people, including people from various demographics, cultural heritage, socio-economic status, and lived and work experiences. For example, one employee indicated, “It looks like there is not one dominant clique. Everyone represents something different in terms of educational background, ideology, economic background, cultural background, experience, age, and interests” (non-White [Asian]/woman respondent).

Despite the apparent unanimous description of diversity among place management organization workers, it is essential to highlight that most respondents indicated that their sites do not reflect a diverse workplace and consider their specific sites to be homogenous. For example, one employee stated, “This industry seems to be full of well-meaning white people, and our team is no different” (White/man respondent). Another employee indicated, “I don't feel

that my current workplace is diverse. There are only a few individuals who are of different backgrounds, but I feel as a whole it's very bland" (non-White [Afghan American]/woman respondent).

Specifically, frontline employees call for more diversity within executive leadership roles and the boards of directors. For example, one employee indicated, "Having leaders/executives/superiors that are POC. Not having a majority of one race in the office, should be the priority," specifically when a UPMO introduces a diversity goal (non-White [Latino/a/x]/woman respondent). Overall, employees across the urban place management organizations understood diversity in their workplace to be a team with a variety of backgrounds and experiences but felt that their specific teams lacked true diversity.

Defining DEI: Equity

The understanding of equity is bimodally split between race and ethnicity. Unsurprisingly, eighty-six percent of the White employee population correlated equity with compensation, with very few non-White respondents mentioning compensation at all whatsoever. When I compared the average salary among White and non-White respondents, I found that the average wage is about $96,000 for both groups. To explain why White employees associated equity with income more than non-white employees, I looked at other demographic data. I started by examining the various pay scales across the different UPMOs and geographies. However, due to the sporadic cost of living throughout the different regions within California, I could not find any significant pay differences from region to region.

However, the employee compensation data indicates a significant difference between the highest and lowest-paid internal employees. For most participating UPMOs, with employee salary data available, there is more than $100,000 between the highest-paid and lowest-paid

employees (except for Oakland). San José has the most glaring pay equity difference (approximately $245,000), and Oakland has the most equitable difference (approximately $66,000)[2]. Of course, as expected, all the highest-paid employees of all the UPMOs are the site's executive leadership roles, who, on average, are White. Sadly, the aggregate data only further complicates the inquiry as to why White employees connect equity with money over non-White employees (a question/answer outside the scope of this research).

On the other hand, a significant number of non-White employees correlate equity with the theme of *affirmation*–referring to being heard or listened to, acknowledged, and recognized for their work. The concept of affirmation in a general way is explained as "everyone feel[ing] heard, and their voice is valued/respected" (non-White [Asian]/woman respondent). Even so, most non-White respondents' explanations of affirmation are quite negative. For example, one employee stated, "Many times there is anxiety in employees having the confidence to insert themselves [to voice their opinion]" (non-White [Mixed Race]/man). Another said, "I don't feel that the current CEO cares about what I do or my value" (non-White [Latino]/man). Interestingly, positive examples of affirmation came from a White employee who stated, "I am very outspoken and direct and receive a lot of positive reinforcement that my voice is welcome and matters" (White/man respondent), which further divides the White and non-White employees understanding and experience of equity within their work environment. Overall, employees' understanding and experiences of equity are separated by race, with White employees correlating equity with compensation and non-White employees correlating equity with affirmation.

[2] The salary data does not include UPMOs third-party clean and safe ambassadors, whose historically low salary averages would significantly widen the gap between the lowest and highest-paid employees within most UPMOs.

Defining DEI: Inclusion

When asked to define inclusion, the central theme that emerged for most place management organization employees is the idea of *multi-tiered collaboration systems*. The theme refers to the diverse representation of multiple departments, roles, demographics, and management levels within one organizational unit (project, committee, training, workshop, etc.). There is a bimodal distribution of examples of how employees discussed the idea of multi-tiered collaboration systems. The range of examples illustrates how some UPMO sites have multi-tiered collaboration systems while others do not. For example, an employee from a site that does not practice multi-tiered collaboration systems indicated, "I wish management would invite everyone to the table, regardless of ranking or job" (White/woman respondent). Conversely, a different employee indicated, "We have created a diversity action council here, and it has folks from all over the organization structure" (White/man respondent).

Additionally, the data also indicates that most place management organization employees understand inclusion as a practice of *legitimization*. The theme refers to initiatives that welcome or celebrate individuals' authenticity, individuality, or grouping characteristics. The idea of legitimization is centrally distributed within employees' responses, with almost no range deviation. On average, employees stated the importance that "everyone feels welcome within the workplace. Staff [can] come to work feeling safe and able to be their full selves through freedom of expression…" (White/man respondent). Overall, employees of the urban place management industry understand inclusion to be a combination of multi-tiered collaboration systems and the practice of legitimization.

Recognizing Successful DEI within UPMOs

Two central themes emerged as concepts that showcased to place management organization employees that DEI goals were successful in their work locations. Acceptance and belonging are domains of DEI found within numerous discourses and scholarly literature on diversity, equity, and inclusion. Even though I did not specifically ask employees to define acceptance and belonging, the concept of acceptance and belonging appeared within all three domains of diversity, equity, and inclusion responses. This finding is evidence that belonging is an essential ingredient of successful DEI practices.

The data indicates an apparent bimodal variance of ideas of acceptance and belonging distinctly divided between White and non-White respondents. White respondents tend to speak of exclusion and the lack of belonging more as a general practice within their firms and a practice experienced by others or by non-Whites. For example, one White employee states, "…we are not a very diverse office and have struggled to make others feel accepted in the past" (White/woman respondent). Additionally, there was not a single instance that I could find of White employees stating they did not belong or were not accepted within their work environment.

Meanwhile, non-White respondents explicitly mention how they are personally excluded or their lack of belonging to their work environments. For example, one non-White employee stated, "I do not belong in my current workplace…I feel isolated from the team (non-White [Afghan American/woman respondent). Non-White employees' discussion of exclusion ranges even more extreme; some indicate general discriminatory practices within their UPMO site. For example, one non-White employee stated, "…there is a noticeable divide that happens to coincide with racial and ethnic makeup" (non-White [Mixed Race]/man). Another non-White

employee stated, “I think certain individuals lighter skinned can get away with doing or saying things a person of color could never do” (non-White [Latino/a/x]/woman respondent). Overall, both White and non-White employees of urban place management organizations recognize that when employees are accepted and feel like they belong in their workplace, the organization is successfully implementing DEI initiatives.

Additionally, plentiful DEI research indicates that countless DEI programs are performative and lack leadership accountability and intentionality. Therefore, as I predicted, the theme of accountability, or the lack thereof, is centrally distributed among all three domains of diversity, equity, and inclusion survey responses. Numerous respondents indicated that their worksites have had conversations about starting DEI programs or have previously attempted some DEI initiatives. However, due to the lack of leadership accountability or follow through, DEI movements inevitably fizzle out, and the work environment returns to “business as usual,” preventing actual change. For example, one employee stated, “A few years ago, we had a staff member attempt to introduce a DEI process to the team…and then we literally never talked about it again…unsurprisingly, that employee left the [organization]” (White/man respondent). Another employee stated, “…we have not created a direct initiative to show our employees that we are actively addressing the issue” (non-White [Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander]/woman respondent). Overall, employees of urban place management organizations specifically call for DEI programs that are crafted with intentionality and have systems of accountability that lead to successful, measurable change, which, thus far, have not occurred at most California-based UPMO sites.

Discussion

This study investigates how urban place management organizations' employees understand or have experienced diversity, equity, and inclusion. I have drawn on data from a sample of forty-five employees across California. I anticipated finding innumerable iterations of people's understanding and experiences with DEI. Additionally, because California is traditionally a politically progressive state, I predicted I would find forward-thinking people with creative, established, and thriving DEI practices. However, my research experience and findings align with other workplace and DEI empirical studies, which indicate that work-based cultural shifts are paralyzingly frustrating and extremely difficult to execute (Ahmed 2007; Dobbin, Kim, and Kalev 2011; Jordan 1999; Tallman and Bird 2022; Zheng 2023).

Most of my study's participating UPMOs are large California-based urban centers with a diverse population. Few of the study respondents indicated a successful DEI practice worth championing. Despite that, I found respondents who provided the genesis of what could become meaningful DEI practices. For example, one site has "hired a director of people and culture who has worked…on diverse hiring practices," introduced a "diversity action council" that "leads programming and education across the entire company," and one more site "in an effort to retain staff…engaged in a job description evaluation and salary rightsizing" (White/men respondents). Nevertheless, site leaders must seriously invest in organization-wide efforts for these models to succeed.

Furthermore, I had assumed that answers from disparate geographic locations would contradict each other. However, I was surprised to find that the data from all regions generally agreed on what diversity, equity, and inclusion are or could be. In addition, I had trouble finding responses that deviated significantly between distinct demographic groupings. The only evident

distinction is how White versus Non-White employees understood equity and discussed feelings of belonging.

Recommendations

The following suggestions are based on my analysis of the questionnaire responses combined with over eighteen months of participant observation and immersion across various UPMO sites across California. At a minimum, I provide one recommendation for each domain of DEI and include recommendations on addressing the additional themes of belonging and accountability. Each participating site should apply my recommendations individually in ways that best suit the conditions and capabilities of the UPMO location. Each site leadership should be responsible and accountable for determining how to apply the suggested outputs.

Applied Diversity

I recommend that place management organizations establish a goal of celebrating diversity. UPMOs can achieve this goal by creating systems or programs that intentionally celebrate and recognize individual or unique groupings. For example, on International Women's Day, recognize employees identifying as women. This approach will legitimize and affirm employees' unique group characteristics and increase their belonging to the work environment. In the long term, the urban place management industry, or at minimum, the California Downtown Association, can create affinity groups or employee resource groups (ERGs) that allow unique groupings to be in community with one another. These affinity groups and ERGs can even further recommend strategies for celebrating diversity for their specialized group.

Applied Equity

I recommend that place management organizations follow one of the participating sites' successful practices of engaging in a job description evaluation and salary rightsizing. Rightsizing disparaging pay gaps will aid UPMOs' decenter White work-based standards that maintain White people at the top of the social and workplace hierarchy. Additionally, I suggest that place management organization site leaders equally distribute work opportunities (conferences, workshops, training, etc.) among all staff, ensuring historically marginalized individuals or employees have access to opportunities. Specifically, UPMO site leaders should ask themselves, do the executive leaders have to go to another conference when middle and lower management has not had any conference experience? And what about front-line staff?

Applied Inclusion

I recommend that place management organizations ensure that multi-level personnel and varied demographics are represented in internal systems, including retreats, working groups, brainstorming sessions, strategic planning, and organizational development. This approach will give varied voices numerous chances to be recognized, heard, and included in organizational decision-making, which will lead to the development of innovative and creative strategies. A great starting point for implementing a multi-tiered collaboration system is ensuring that whoever leads the efforts of examining and executing this report's findings and recommendations comprises a diverse mixture of employees across the organization.

Applied Belonging

I recommend that place management organizations further investigate and take stock of potential racist and discriminatory behavior and actions within their sites. If discriminatory

actions are found, act accordingly to amend bad practices. Additionally, simple acts that welcome individual employees into their work environment, including times of onboarding, birthdays, special holidays, or work milestones, can further create a sense of belonging to the UPMO location.

Applied Accountability

I recommend that place management organizations assign a person with decision-making authority to participate in all DEI practices and planning. The staff representative with authority should build a coalition of other internal stakeholders to help execute the applied recommendations of diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging. The DEI coalition should set clear DEI goals that are strategic, measurable, impactful, and relevant to their UPMO site, with precise and dedicated time parameters.

Conclusion

Employing an anthropological lens to investigate employees' understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as distinct units of analysis rather than a singular construct offers a nuanced perspective that illuminates the intricacies and complexities of DEI as a construct and the varied human understanding and experiences with DEI as a general practice. By delineating these concepts as separate units of analysis, anthropologists can delve into the cultural, social, and historical contexts shaping individuals' interpretations and experiences within the workplace and their connection to DEI programming. Utilizing an anthropological approach to examine DEI in the workplace can uncover how DEI dimensions intersect and diverge within organizational cultures, shedding light on power dynamics, privilege, and resistance, resulting in organizational change that addresses the multifaceted nature of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

This project helps the California Downtown Association's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Task Force learn how its employees understand and experience DEI. I used ethnographic research methods to examine the employees of urban place management organizations' unique understandings of diversity, equity, and inclusion separately. By breaking down and treating DEI as three different measures of analysis rather than just one, I was able to distinguish between how people understand DEI as a concept and the similarities and differences between them. Although the data findings suggest that people see DEI as one distinct concept, I was able to isolate the subtle variations for my research.

Although I anticipated finding countless interpretations of DEI, most research findings are thematically centered among all research participants. Data centralization provides me with a clear and direct pathway to create meaningful DEI programs and strategies that will significantly benefit the participating urban place management organizations. The DEI initiatives include celebrating diversity, equitable distribution of resources, multi-tiered systems of collaboration, assuring welcoming work environments, and systems of leadership accountability. By implementing DEI programs that align with employees' direct insights, needs, and recommendations, urban place management organizations can strengthen their chances of creating sustainable initiatives that are authentically diverse, equitable, and inclusive.

CHAPTER THREE

DEI RESEARCH REFLECTION, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE APPLICATIONS

Summary of Key Findings

After completing an inventory of urban place management organizations' employees' understanding and experiences of diversity, equity, and inclusion, I can now identify how DEI is understood among California-based UPMOs. Place management organization employees understand diversity as a heterogeneous workforce but acknowledge that most UPMO locations lack diversity. White employees correlate equity with fair pay scales among various roles, while non-White employees understand equity to be a practice of being valued. UPMO employees associate inclusion with a workplace culture where employees from all levels of the organization are included in essential group work, such as committees, brainstorming, task forces, etc. Inclusion also means that diverse workers are celebrated for their unique identity markers.

Furthermore, investigating DEI within the urban place management industry helped me identify markers highlighting pathways toward successful DEI programming. For example, when employees feel they belong to their work environment, it indicates a robust organizational culture. Nevertheless, currently, only White-identified employees feel like they belong within the urban place management industry, while non-White-identified employees do not. Another indicator of successful DEI practices is leadership accountability, which needs improvement throughout the urban place management sector.

Research Limitations

The Politics of DEI

One of the most significant limitations of my study is DEI itself. As stated in the theoretical section of chapter one, DEI as an area of research and practice is still in flux. Due to this, even the various contributing members of the California Downtown Association DEI Task Force could not agree on what exactly this project's objectives should have been. While some CDA DEI Task Force members desired to dismantle the entire industry with abolitionist and decolonization ideas, others simply wanted to inventory employee demographics and call it a day. Even the final research question(s) and online survey and survey questions went too far for some committee members, while others felt it needed to go further.

The internal debate among CDA DEI Task Force members resulted in two members refusing to participate in the study and an active campaign against the project among non-committee members. This precarious and awkward situation made it difficult to get clear direction on how to proceed throughout the project, resulting in a limited number of potential research participants.

Sample Size

Another challenge in executing this study was the sample size. California has over 50 UPMO locations with a combined network of approximately 750 employees. Yet only eight UPMOs–a network of roughly 100 employees–agreed to participate in the study. Out of the approximately 100 employees, only 45 (45% of the population) participated in the study. Additionally, most of the participating place management organization employee participants came from two significant centers of population within California: The Bay Area and the Los

Angeles region. No rural UPMO agreed to participate in this study, thus no rural region is represented within this study.

Methodological Limitations

Due to time and geography constraints, the types of research methods I could use to execute this study were limited. An online survey was the most practical instrument for gathering data from various regions of California. However, anonymous surveys did not permit me to follow up or clarify responses with respondents. The disconnect between myself and the research participants prevented me from corroborating the themes I identified within the data with the respondents. It prohibited me from diving deeper into emerging topics as significant data points. Therefore, a mixed-method approach that combined an online survey with follow-up interviews could have bolstered and triangulated my data collection, analysis, and overall findings.

The Race Lens

Since the Murder of George Floyd in 2020, the prevailing framework for diversity, equity, and inclusion research and design within organizational structures has often defaulted to a narrow focus on race. However, this approach fails to fully capture the complexities of identity incorporating a multiplicity of characteristics, particularly regarding gender, sexuality, and class, which magnify the impact of race disparities. Overlooking the intersections of gender, sexuality, class, and race conflates and obscures the dimensions of inequities experienced among place management organization workers.

Even though my study intended to conduct a thorough analysis that compared DEI understandings and experiences among various identity markers, including age, socioeconomic status, gender identity, sexual orientation (dis)ability, and others, my data and analysis also

defaulted to comparing UPMO employees by race. However, my study's sample size and the place management industry's largely homogenous demographics limited me to concentrate on race. Future research efforts should prioritize addressing these intersectional facets to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted challenges within DEI initiatives. This would, in turn, foster more effective strategies for promoting true inclusivity and equity within the urban place management industry.

Implications for Future Research

My study's findings, which investigate diversity, equity, and inclusion within the urban place management industry, have significant implications for future research in anthropology and other disciplines. For anthropologists specifically interested in business and work-related research and applications, future research could focus on developing more inclusive methodologies that actively involve marginalized and often forgotten workers in the research process, fostering collaborative knowledge production and empowering frontline worker voices. For example, when an organization hires a business-focused practitioner to investigate and implement a work-based cultural shift, the practitioner can purposefully adapt the original goal to integrate the needs and perspectives of frontline employees. This process could delve deeper into the lived experiences of the most marginalized workforce and the mechanisms through which their understandings and experiences can impact work-related decision-making processes.

For other disciplines, my research underscores the necessity of continued exploration into the intricate dynamics of power, privilege, and representation within social groups. Additionally, an interdisciplinary lens allows researchers and practitioners to integrate theories and practices from various disciplines in creating research methodologies that swing toward a pendulum that strays away from systems of White standards and elitism. For example, by leaning on successful

research practices and theories from various disciplines, I extended my study's capacity by integrating a social justice framework when advocating for demographic information, including income information for research participants. This advocacy allowed me to clarify pay inequities among urban place management organizations' employees based on race, ethnicity, roles, and status. My study also opens avenues for further investigations into using anthropological inquiry to create a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive urban place management industry. Anthropological methods implemented by place management organizations can increase the industry's efficacy on DEI, improve the work environment for all workers, and see a return on investment with staff retention. Employees will ultimately choose to stay in the industry due to their increased sense of purpose and belonging.

Call to Action

As members of the urban place management industry navigate the complexities of urban development and place management, it is paramount for stakeholders within the industry to embrace a proactive stance towards diversity, equity, and inclusion. The knowledge gained from this study provides helpful direction in the effort toward DEI inquiry and application. I call upon all stakeholders to earnestly consider integrating these research findings and applied recommendations into their place management organizational practices and work environments. In so doing, each UPMO location can prioritize inclusivity, recognize every individual's inherent worth and dignity, and create more equitable and resilient work environments for all to thrive and enjoy.

Final Reflection

As I take the final step toward concluding my inquiry into urban place management organization employees' understanding and experiences with diversity, equity, and inclusion, I can honestly say that the journey has been simultaneously frustrating, exciting, and necessary. By researching a topic of discussion that is hotly contested among U.S.-based politics and organizations, my primary contact at the California Downtown Association, Steve, and I had to continuously advocate and convince proponents of DEI that this study was necessary and could positively impact the industry. Nevertheless, it was exciting to find supporters of this research ranging a bimodal spectrum: on one side, overt executive leadership with decision-making power, and on the other, covert frontline employees desperately seeking industry-based focus on creating more diverse, inclusive, and equitable workplaces. Finding these DEI champions and supporters gives me insight and hope that my DEI study (and DEI as a general practice) can continue.

Still, I am not entirely convinced. I pause on my enthusiasm for seeing DEI fully integrated into the urban place management industry. As an industry employee, I can attest that some changes have been made within my specific UPMO site to prevent newly recruited employees from experiencing the exclusionary practices I experienced my first week on the job. Nevertheless, I have been an obstinate and obnoxious advocate for the necessity of DEI work from within. Without DEI champions, it is most likely that DEI work will not be taken seriously or intentionally integrated into place management organizational work culture, resulting yet again in DEI goals that are performative and meaningless. However, I choose to be optimistic that the urban place management industry is capable of change and will soon be an industry that is diverse, inclusive, and equitable for all employees.

CUMULATIVE REFERENCE LIST

Ahmed, Sara. 2007. "You End Up Doing the Document Rather than Doing the Doing: Diversity, Race Equality and the Politics of Documentation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (4): 590–609.

Asmelash, Leah. 2023. "DEI Programs in Universities are Being Cut Across the Country. What Does this Mean for Higher Education?" CNN. https://www.cnn.com/2023/06/14/us/colleges-diversity-equity-inclusion-higher-education-cec?cid=ios_app.

Baker, Kelly, and Brenda Beagan. 2014. "Making Assumptions, Making Space: An Anthropological Critique of Cultural Competency and Its Relevance to Queer Patients." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 28, no. 4 (September): 578-598.

Beltrán, Cristina. 2020. *Cruelty as Citizenship: How Migrant Suffering Sustains White Democracy*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Bertrand, Marianne, Sandra E. Black, Sissel Jensen, and Adriana Lleras-Muney. 2019. "Breaking the Glass Ceiling? The Effect of Board Quotas on Female Labour Market Outcomes in Norway." *The Review of Economic Studies* 86, no. 1 (January): 191–239.

Boellstorff, Tom. 2007. "Queer Studies in the House of Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36:17-35.

Bohonos, Jeremy W., and Stephanie Sisco. 2021. "Advocating for Social Justice, Equity, and Inclusion in the Workplace: An Agenda for Anti-Racist Learning Organizations." *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 2021, no. 170 (June): 89–98.

Bozeman, Barry, and Daniel Fay. 2013. "Minority Football Coaches' Diminished Careers: Why is the "Pipeline" Clogged?" *Social Science Quarterly*, (March), 1–30.

California Downtown Association. 2022. "About California Downtown Association." California Downtown Association. https://californiadowntown.com/about/.

Case, Kim A. 2012. "Discovering the Privilege of Whiteness: White Women's Reflections on Anti-Racist Identity and Ally Behavior." *Journal of Social Issues* 68, no. 1 (March): 78-96.

Christian, Michelle. 2018. "A Global Critical Race and Racism Framework: Racial Entanglements and Deep and Malleable Whiteness." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 5 (2): 169–185.

Dobbin, Frank, Soohan Kim, and Alexandra Kalev. 2011. "You Can't Always Get What You Need: Organizational Determinants of Diversity Programs." *American Sociological Review* 76, no. 3 (June): 386–411

Gonzalez, Roberto J., and John Marlovits. 2020. “Life Under Lockdown Notes on COVID-19 in Silicon Valley.” *Anthropology Today* 36, no. 3 (June): 11-15.

English-Lueck, J.A., Charles N. Darrah, and Andrea Saveri. “Trusting Strangers: Work Relationships in Four High-Tech Communities.” Information, Communication & Society 5, no. 1 (2002)

English-Lueck, J.A., and Miriam Lueck Avery. 2017. “Intensifying Work and Chasing Innovation: Incorporating Care in Silicon Valley.” *Anthropology of Work Review* 38, no. 1 (June): 40-49

Faas, A.J. 2017. “Enduring Cooperation: Time, Discipline, and Minga Practice in Disaster-induced Displacement and Resettlement in the Ecuadorian Andes.” *Human Organization* 76, no. 2 (June): 99–108.

Flores, Tatiana. 2021. “Latinidad is Canceled: Confronting and Anti-Black Construct.” *Latin American and Latinx Visual Culture* 3 (3): 58–79.

Goetz, Edward G., Rashad A. Williams, and Anthony Damiano. 2020. “Whiteness and Urban Planning.” *Journal of American Planning Association* 86 (2): 142–153.

Haney-López, Ian. 2003. “White Latinos.” *Harvard Latino Law Review* 6, no. 1 (January): 1–8.

Hayes, Kelly, and Mariame Kaba. 2023. *Let This Radicalize You: Organizing and the Revolution of Reciprocal Care*. Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books.

International Downtown Association. 2021. “DEI Summit April 2021.” YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mHgdlw0JEdc.

International Downtown Association. 2024. “About the Industry.” International Downtown Association. https://downtown.org/about-the-industry/.

Jordan, Ann T. 1994. “Organizational Culture: The Anthropological Approach.” *Special Issue: Practicing Anthropology in Corporate America: Consulting on Organizational Culture* 14, no. 1 (January): 3–16.

——. 1999. “An Anthropological Approach to the Study of Organizational Change: The Move to Self-Managed Work Teams.” *Practicing Anthropology* 21, no. 4 (Fall): 14–19.

Kalev, Alexandra, Erin Kelly, and Frank Dobbin. 2006. “Best Practices or Best Guesses? Assessing the Efficacy of Corporate Affirmative Action and Diversity Policies.” *American Sociological Review* 71, no. 4 (August): 589–617.

Kaplan, Spencer. 2022. “Bringing Your Full Self to Work: Fashioning LGBTQ Bankers on Wall Street.” *Anthropology of Work Review* 43, no. 1 (June): 5–15.

Lan, Liangping. 2020. “Agentive Identity Construction through Narrative Socialization in a Professional Community of Practice in China.” *Linguistic Anthropology* 30, no. 3 (July): 389-411.

Lee, Jocelyn, Sarah Carr, Lissa J. Herzing, Claire Norton, and Leah Palmer. 2023. “Chapter 2 Diversity is Not Enough: Advocating and Organizing for Inclusion in Archaeology.” *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 34, no. 1 (August): 17–27.

Malinowski, B. (1953). Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mills, Charles W. “‘Naturalized’ Merits.” In *The Racial Contract*, 91–134. Cornell University Press, 1997. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt5hh1wj.7.

Razek, Raja, and Andy Rose. 2023. “University of Wisconsin System Board Approved Deal for $800 Million in State Funding that Cuts Back Diversity Initiatives.” CNN. https://www.cnn.com/2023/12/13/us/university-of-wisconsin-diversity-initiatives-funding?cid=ios_app.

Ríos-Rojas, Anne. 2014. “Managing and Disciplining Diversity: The Politics of Conditional Belonging in a Catalonian Institute.” *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 45, no. 1 (February): 2–21.

Roscigno, Vincent J. 2011. “Power, Revisited.” *Social Forces* 90, no. 2 (December): 349–374.

Sadjadi, Sahar. 2019. “Deep in the Brain: Identity and Authenticity in Pediatric Gender Transition.” *Cultural Anthropology* 34, no. 1 (March): 103–129.

Sankar, Adrea, and Mark Luborsky. 2003. “Developing a Community-Based Definition of Needs for Persons Living with Chronic HIV.” *Human Organization* 62, no. 2 (Summer): 153-165.

Schuller, Mark, and Christina Abreu. 2022. “Reproducing the "White Public Space" in Anthropology Faculty Searches.” *American Anthropologists* 125, no. 1 (December): 186-193.

Tallman, Sean D., and Cate E. Bird. 2022. “Diversity and Inclusion in Forensic Anthropology Where We Stand and Prospects for the Future.” *Forensic Anthropology* 5 (2): 84–101.

Urban Design Lab. 2023. “Placemaking In Urban Design.” Urban Design lab. https://urbandesignlab.in/placemaking-in-urban-design/.

Vins, Holly, Amber Wutich, Alexandra Brewis, Melissa Beresford, Alissa Ruth, and Christopher Roberts. 2014. “Children's Perceived Water Futures in the United States Southwest.” *Human Organization* 73 (3): 235-246.

Wang, Chenyu, and Chaise LaDousa. 2024. “The Agency of "Doing Something": Ethnographic Research on Subject Positions at Predominantly White Institutions.” *Journal for the Anthropology of North America* 27, no. 1 (January): 4–18.

Weiss, Margot. 2016. “Always After: Desiring Queerness, Desiring Anthropology.” *Cultural Anthropology* 31 (4): 627-638

Zheng, Lily. 2022. *DEI Deconstructed: Your No-Nonsense Guide to Doing the Work and Doing It Right*. Oakland: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY PROTOCOL

Part 1. Understanding and Experience with DEI

1. Imagine a workplace that you consider to be diverse. What does that look like?
2. How diverse do you consider your current workplace to be?
3. Why did you give this rating?
4. Have there been intentional initiatives to cultivate diversity in your workplace? If yes, what are they? Do you think they are working well? [Explain]
5. Imagine a workplace that you consider to be equitable. What does that look like?
6. How equitable do you consider your current workplace to be?
7. Why did you give this rating?
8. Have there been intentional initiatives to cultivate equity in your workplace? If yes, what are they? Do you think they are working well? [Explain]
9. Imagine a workplace that you consider to be inclusive. What does that look like?
10. How inclusive do you consider your current workplace to be?
11. Why did you give this rating?
12. Have there been intentional initiatives to cultivate inclusion in your workplace? If yes, what are they? Do you think they are working well? [Explain]

Part 2. UPMO Work Environment Experiences

1. Do you feel genuinely accepted or that you belong at your current workplace?
2. Why did you give this rating?
3. Do you feel that you are treated fairly compared to others at your current workplace?
4. Why did you give this rating?

Part 3. Demographics

1. Gender Identity [select one]
    a. Man
    b. Woman
    c. Transgender
    d. Non-Binary
    e. Other
2. Age [select one]
    a. 18 – 24
    b. 25 – 34
    c. 34 – 44
    d. 45 – 54
    e. 55 – 64
    f. 65 – 74
    g. 75 or more
3. Race/Ethnicity [select all that apply]
    a. White or Caucasian
    b. Black or African American

    c. Asian or Asian American
    d. Hispanic or Latino/a/e/x
    e. Middle Eastern or North African
    f. Native American or Indigenous
    g. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
    h. Other
4. Sexual Orientation [select one]
    a. Straight
    b. Gay
    c. Lesbian
    d. Bisexual
    e. Asexual
    f. Pansexual
    g. Questioning
    h. Other
5. Education Completed [select one]
    a. Trade School or Technical Certificate
    b. High School Diploma or Equivalent (GED)
    c. Some College
    d. Bachelors Degree
    e. Masters Degree
    f. Doctoral Degree
6. What is your estimated salary?
7. What is your exact salary?
8. Do You Have Any Disabilities
    a. If Yes, What is Your Disability?
9. In which city is your UPMO located?
10. What Type of Role Do You Have at Your UPMO?