

THE COSTS OF RETREATING FROM DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION: Methodology and Tables

1. Methodology

A. Data

Data come from the 2025 Annual LGBTQ+ Community Survey (ALCS) and were collected online from September 29 to October 27, 2025, among U.S. adults aged 18 and older. The LGBTQ+ sample was drawn through the HRC Foundation’s Community Marketing & Insights research panel of LGBTQ+ adults as well as from participants recruited from community organizations, while the non-LGBTQ+ sample was fielded by [PSB Insights](#) during the same period. To ensure demographic representativeness, PSB used quotas for respondents’ race, age, geography, education, and gender.

See the [complete ALCS methodology and data quality report here](#), including detailed documentation for sampling, quality control, benchmarking, weight construction, and scaling.

B. Estimation Strategy

The analysis was limited to N = 3,683 public and private sector workers who reported having an employer with at least 100 total employees across all locations of operation. A series of logistic regression models are estimated in Stata using the `svy: gsem` command within a recursive structural equation framework. This is to evaluate how employer DEI rollbacks contribute to increasingly exclusionary workplace climates and, ultimately, productivity loss. Each stage of the model treats the preceding outcome as a structural predictor of the next, allowing for an examination of how exclusion and bias cascade through the workplace environment. Formally, each endogenous variable X_j is modeled as a function of both exogenous covariates C' (e.g., demographics and sector) and earlier endogenous variables X_k recursive specification assumes no feedback among outcomes, consistent with theoretical expectations that structural harms accumulate sequentially rather than simultaneously. Due to the binary outcomes, the general form of each estimated equation is:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\Pr(X_{ji} = 1)}{1 - \Pr(X_{ji} = 1)}\right) = \alpha_j + \sum_k \beta_{jk} X_{ki} + C'_i \gamma_j + \varepsilon_{ji}$$

where β_{jk} captures the association between prior workplace conditions and the probability of experiencing a given outcome (e.g., stigma and bias at work, hostile workplace, flight risk, and productivity decline).

Predicted probabilities and odds-ratios were derived from design-based estimates. Two sets of weighted analyses were performed:

1. National estimates were calculated using the scaled weight (*allwt_scaled*) to produce estimates representative of the U.S. workforce, balancing LGBTQ+ and non-LGBTQ+ respondents according to population shares.
2. Parallel subgroup analyses were calculated using the unscaled weight (*allwt*) within LGBTQ+ and non-LGBTQ+ samples to maximize precision and preserve subgroup sample size while maintaining demographic alignment with external benchmarks.

Predicted probabilities were calculated at the means to illustrate substantive differences across groups and employer contexts (DEI rollback vs. no rollback). Robust standard errors and 95 percent confidence intervals were computed using design-based weighting to account for sample structure and non-independence of observations.

C. Variables

All variables were constructed from self-reported responses to items included in the 2025 Annual LGBTQ+ Community Survey (ALCS) and non-LGBTQ+ supplemental. Binary indicators were created for each outcome to represent the presence or absence of a given workplace condition or behavior. Each variable corresponds to a distinct stage in the theoretical model linking employer DEI rollbacks to workplace climate and employee outcomes. The variables are defined as follows:

- **Any DEI-Related Workplace Change**: Indicates whether respondents reported any action by their employer that reduced, rebranded, or eliminated diversity, equity, and inclusion-related activities in the last 12 months. This includes public announcements of DEI or workplace changes, direct employee notification of a rollback, rebranding of DEI initiatives, ending or scaling down DEI trainings, employee resource groups (ERGs), sponsorships, or inclusive benefits. Respondents reporting at least one such action are coded 1; all others are coded 0.
- **Stigma and Bias at Work**: Indicates whether respondents reported experiencing any identity-based discrimination at work/their job in the last 12 months. Also includes respondents who reported if they either felt like they would be passed over for opportunities for advancement or felt like they had no legal rights or workplace protections in the last 12 months. Respondents reporting any discrimination or “yes” to at least one such of these perceived risks of stigma/bias are coded 1; all others are coded 0.

- Hostile Workplace: Indicates whether respondents reported that they felt like their workplace was hostile or negative in the last 12 months. Those indicating “yes” coded 1; “no” are coded 0.
- Flight Risk: Indicates whether respondents reported that they had either thought about quitting their job or searched for another job in the last 12 months. Those indicating “yes” coded 1; “no” are coded 0.
- Productivity Decline: Indicates whether respondents reported that they had been less productive at work in the last 12 months. Those indicating “yes” coded 1; “no” are coded 0.

D. Limitations

Due to the nonprobability design statistics are to be interpreted with caution. Results are not causal.

2. Data Tables

Table 1: Estimated Odds-Ratios of Workplace Outcomes in Sequential Models Among U.S. Adult Workers of Large Employers Age 18+ (September-October 2025; Full Sample)				
	Model 1: Stigma and Bias at Work	Model 2: Hostile Work Environment	Model 3: Flight Risk	Model 4: Productivity Decline
	Odds-Ratio [95% CI]			
<i>Any DEI-related workplaces changes</i>	3.56*** [2.78, 4.56]	1.84*** [1.36, 2.50]	0.91 [.68, 1.21]	0.96 [0.69, 1.32]
<i>Stigma and bias at work</i>	--	9.12*** [6.70, 12.42]	6.37*** [4.65, 8.74]	2.50*** [1.76, 3.54]
<i>Hostile work environment</i>	--	--	8.10*** [5.31, 12.37]	2.38*** [1.69, 3.35]
<i>Flight risk</i>	--	--	--	4.71*** [3.15, 7.04]
<i>SGM worker</i>	1.25* [0.97, 1.61]	2.00*** [1.35, 2.98]	1.42** [1.08, 1.87]	2.56*** [1.84, 3.56]
<i>Private sector worker</i>	0.96 [0.74, 1.25]	0.93 [0.67, 1.29]	0.81 [0.61, 1.09]	0.74* [0.53, 1.02]

Note: N = 3,683. Odds-ratios estimated using sequential logistic regression models among all U.S. adult workers employed by organizations with 100 or more employees. Each model includes prior workplace outcomes in the causal sequence and demographic controls (age, race/ethnicity, education level, and sector). Models are weighted using the national design-based weight (*allwt_scaled*). Brackets indicate 95% confidence intervals. Statistical significance: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 2: Predicted Probabilities of Workplace Outcomes from Sequential Models Among U.S. Adult Workers of Large Employers Age 18+ (September-October 2025; Full Sample)

	All U.S. Adult Workers (18+) Predicted Probability	
	Yes Pr(Y=1)	No Pr(Y=0)
<i>Stigma and Bias at Work</i>	35.3%***	64.7%***
<i>Hostile Work Environment</i>	19.5%***	80.5%***
<i>Flight Risk</i>	56.3%***	43.7%***
<i>Productivity Decline</i>	15.1%***	84.9%***

Note: Predicted probabilities derived from sequential logistic regression models using national design-based weights (*allwt_scaled*). Estimates reflect the probability of each workplace outcome evaluated at the means. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding. Statistical significance: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 3: Predicted Probabilities of Workplace Outcomes in Sequential Models Among U.S. Adults Age 18+ (September-October 2025; Full Sample)

	Model 1: Stigma and Bias at Work	Model 2: Hostile Work Environment	Model 3: Flight Risk	Model 4: Productivity Decline
	All U.S. Adult Workers (18+) Predicted Probability Pr(Y=1)			
<i>Any DEI-related workplaces changes</i>	54.2%***	26.1%***	54.9%***	14.7%***
<i>No DEI-related workplace changes</i>	24.9%***	16.0%***	57.3%***	15.3%***
<i>Stigma and bias at work</i>	--	49.6%***	80.7%***	24.1%***
<i>No stigma and bias at work</i>	--	9.7%***	39.6%***	11.3%***
<i>Hostile work environment</i>	--	--	86.0%***	25.3%***
<i>Not a hostile work environment</i>	--	--	43.1%***	12.5%***
<i>Flight risk</i>	--	--	--	27.4%***
<i>Not a flight risk</i>	--	--	--	7.4%***
<i>SGM worker</i>	40.0%***	31.3%***	63.9%***	29.3%***

<i>Non-SGM worker</i>	34.8%***	18.5%***	55.5%***	14.0%***
<i>Private sector worker</i>	35.0%***	19.2%***	54.7%***	13.9%***
<i>Public sector worker</i>	35.9%***	20.3%***	59.7%***	17.9%***

Note: Predicted probabilities computed at the means to illustrate differences. Estimates are weighted using the national design-based weight (*allwt_scaled*). Asterisks denote statistical significance at conventional thresholds: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 4: Estimated Odds-Ratios of Workplace Outcomes in Sequential Models Among LGBTQ+ Adult Workers of Large Employers Age 18+ (September-October 2025; LGBTQ+ Sample)

	Model 1: Stigma and Bias at Work	Model 2: Hostile Work Environment	Model 3: Flight Risk	Model 4: Productivity Decline
	Odds-Ratio [95% CI]			
<i>Any DEI-related workplaces changes</i>	2.95*** [1.92, 4.55]	1.45 [0.87, 2.43]	0.96 [0.65, 1.41]	1.48* [0.95, 2.30]
<i>Stigma and bias at work</i>	--	5.79*** [3.41, 9.84]	3.40*** [2.72, 5.09]	1.33 [0.77, 2.30]
<i>Hostile work environment</i>	--	--	6.29*** [3.51, 11.28]	2.55*** [1.48, 4.38]
<i>Flight risk</i>	--	--	--	3.01*** [1.97, 4.59]
<i>Private sector worker</i>	1.00 [0.65, 1.52]	0.74 [0.36, 1.49]	1.19 [0.78, 1.81]	1.74** [1.04, 2.91]

Note: N = 2,592. Odds-ratios estimated using sequential logistic regression models among LGBTQ+ adult workers employed by organizations with 100 or more employees. Each model includes prior workplace outcomes and demographic controls. Estimates are weighted using the within-group weight (*allwt*) to preserve subgroup precision. Brackets indicate 95% confidence intervals. Significance: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 5: Predicted Probabilities of Workplace Outcomes in Sequential Models Among LGBTQ+ Adult Workers of Large Employers Age 18+ (September-October 2025; LGBTQ+ Sample)

	Model 1: Stigma and Bias at Work	Model 2: Hostile Work Environment	Model 3: Flight Risk	Model 4: Productivity Decline
	LGBTQ+ Adult Workers (18+) Predicted Probability Pr(Y=1)			

<i>Any DEI-related workplaces changes</i>	57.4%***	39.9%***	71.1%***	44.2%***
<i>No DEI-related workplace changes</i>	31.3%***	31.4%***	72.0%***	34.9%***
<i>Stigma and bias at work</i>	--	59.5%***	83.7%***	42.6%***
<i>No stigma and bias at work</i>		20.3%***	60.1%***	35.8%***
<i>Hostile work environment</i>	--	--	88.8%***	53.0%***
<i>Not a hostile work environment</i>			55.8%***	30.6%***
<i>Flight risk</i>	--	--	--	47.9%***
<i>Not a flight risk</i>				23.4%***
<i>Private sector worker</i>	41.5%***	33.0%***	72.6%***	42.1%***
<i>Public sector worker</i>	41.6%***	40.0%***	69.0%***	29.5%***

Note: Predicted probabilities derived from subgroup models estimated among LGBTQ+ workers using the within-group weight (*allwt*). Values reflect probabilities at means. Statistical significance: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 6: Estimated Odds-Ratios of Workplace Outcomes in Sequential Models Among Non-LGBTQ+ Adult Workers of Large Employers Age 18+ (September-October 2025; Non-LGBTQ+ Sample)

	Model 1: Stigma and Bias at Work	Model 2: Hostile Work Environment	Model 3: Flight Risk	Model 4: Productivity Decline
	Odds-Ratio [95% CI]			
<i>Any DEI-related workplaces changes</i>	3.66*** [2.79, 4.80]	1.92*** [1.36, 2.70]	0.89 [0.64, 1.24]	0.90 [0.62, 1.30]
<i>Stigma and bias at work</i>	--	9.87*** [6.98, 13.95]	6.83*** [4.81, 9.72]	2.79*** [1.86, 4.19]
<i>Hostile work environment</i>	--	--	8.59*** [5.28, 13.99]	2.39*** [1.62, 3.51]
<i>Flight risk</i>	--	--	--	5.06*** [3.10, 8.28]
<i>Private sector worker</i>	0.95 [0.71, 1.27]	0.92 [0.64, 1.31]	0.79 [0.57, 1.10]	0.67** [0.46, 0.96]

Note: N = 1,091. Odds-ratios estimated using sequential logistic regression models among non-LGBTQ+ adult workers employed by organizations with 100 or more employees. Each model includes prior workplace outcomes and demographic controls. Estimates are weighted using the within-group weight (*allwt*) to maximize subgroup precision. Brackets show 95% confidence intervals. Significance: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 7: Predicted Probabilities of Workplace Outcomes in Sequential Models Among Non-LGBTQ+ Adult Workers of Large Employers Age 18+ (September-October 2025; Non-LGBTQ+ Sample)

	Model 1: Stigma and Bias at Work	Model 2: Hostile Work Environment	Model 3: Flight Risk	Model 4: Productivity Decline
--	---	--	---------------------------------	--

	Non-LGBTQ+ Adult Workers (18+) Predicted Probability Pr(Y=1)			
<i>Any DEI-related workplaces changes</i>	53.9%***	24.6%***	52.6%***	12.2%***
<i>No DEI-related workplace changes</i>	24.2%***	14.5%***	55.4%***	13.5%***
<i>Stigma and bias at work</i>	--	48.6%***	80.3%***	22.3%***
<i>No stigma and bias at work</i>	--	8.8%***	37.3%***	9.3%***
<i>Hostile work environment</i>	--	--	85.9%***	22.4%***
<i>Not a hostile work environment</i>	--	--	41.4%***	10.8%***
<i>Flight risk</i>	--	--	--	25.2%***
<i>Not a flight risk</i>	--	--	--	6.2%***
<i>Private sector worker</i>	34.2%***	17.5%***	52.5%***	11.5%***
<i>Public sector worker</i>	35.3%***	18.9%***	58.2%***	16.4%***

Note: Predicted probabilities derived from sequential logistic regression models among non-LGBTQ+ workers using the within-group weight (*allwt*). Estimates reflect the probability of each outcome evaluated at the means. Asterisks indicate statistical significance at * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 8: Unadjusted Proportions Summarizing Specific DEI-Related Workplace Changes Among U.S. Adult Workers of Large Employers Age 18+ (September-October 2025; Full Sample)

	All U.S. Adult Workers (Full Sample)	N
<i>Any DEI-related workplace changes</i>		
YES	39.1%	3,683
NO	60.9%	
<i>Public announcement about DEI/workplace changes</i>		
YES	17.0%	3,509
NO	83.0%	
<i>Notified employees directly of rollback</i>		
YES	21.1%	3,503
NO	79.1%	
<i>Rebranded DEI/Workplace practices</i>		
YES	23.6%	3,248
NO	76.4%	
<i>Stopped offering or requiring DEI-related trainings</i>		
YES	24.2%	3,126
NO	75.8%	
<i>Ended or scaled down ERGs</i>		
YES	20.4%	3,051
NO	79.6%	
<i>Ended or scaled down sponsorships</i>		
YES	24.1%	3,136
NO	76.0%	
<i>Ended or scaled down inclusive benefits</i>		
YES	16.8%	2,990
NO	83.2%	

Note: Table displays unadjusted proportions of respondents reporting each type of DEI-related workplace change among workers employed by organizations with 100 or more employees. Each item is binary and contributes to the composite “any DEI-related workplace change” measure used in regression analyses. Percentages weighted using the national design-based weight (*allwt_scaled*); *N* reflects unweighted sample counts. Results are intended to be summary. Maximum sample size is used for each calculation.