CMI Community Marketing & Insights
Leaders in LGBTQ Research since 1992
POWERED BY THE HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN FOUNDATION

SLIPPING ACCEPTANCE, OUTNESS, AND VISIBILITY IN THE LGBTQ+ COMMUNITY:
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

Three analytical samples were constructed, including a general population sample (N = 12,333), a non-LGBTQ+ sample (N = 4,378), and a non-LGBTQ+ sample (N = 7,593). The non-LGBTQ+ and LGBTQ+ samples are used for within-group comparisons to retain larger sample sizes. 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. population, 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.

For the general population and non-LGBTQ+ samples, logistic regression and predicted probabilities at means were estimated (Table 1; Table 2). The logistic regressions model acceptance on discrimination and covariates. The non-LGBTQ+ model also includes whether the respondent knows an LGBTQ+ person (was only asked to non-LGBTQ+ respondents). The estimated form is:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\Pr(Y_i = 1)}{1 - \Pr(Y_i = 1)}\right) = \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \beta_j X_{ji} + C_i'\gamma_+\varepsilon_i$$

For the LGBTQ+ sample, 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 discrimination on the basis of sex, sexual orientation, or gender identity/expression contribute to perceptions of declining acceptance of the LGBTQ+ community, declining outness, and declining visibility. Outness and visibility were only measured among the LGBTQ+ sample. 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 policy awareness) 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 discrimination and the probability of experiencing a given outcome (acceptance, outness, and visibility). Predicted probabilities were calculated at the means to illustrate substantive differences across groups. 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 perceived declines in acceptance, reported declines in outness, and reported declines in visibility. The variables are defined as follows and represent a continuum of authenticity and social climate:

- Perceived Decline in Acceptance**:** Perceived acceptance was measured using the question "Compared to 12 months ago, would you say that each of the following are now more accepting, less accepting, or about the same toward LGBTQ+ people?" Responses were coded **1** if the respondent indicated *"somewhat less accepting"* or *"a lot less accepting"* in any setting listed (e.g., workplace, coworkers, supervisors, health care, schools, pharmacies) and **0** otherwise. This binary variable represents perceived decline in LGBTQ+ acceptance — a contextual measure of how respondents believe their immediate environments have changed over the past year. DKs and REFs were set to missing.

- Individual Decline in Outness: Outness was measured among LGBTQ+ respondents using the question "Compared to 12 months ago, are you more or less open about your LGBTQ+ identity in each of the following places?" Responses were coded **1** if the respondent indicated *"somewhat less open"* or *"a lot less open"* in any listed setting (e.g., workplace, with coworkers, supervisors, health care settings, schools, or in public spaces), and **0** otherwise. This variable captures behavioral retreat in self-disclosure — indicating whether respondents have reduced openness about their LGBTQ+ identity compared to a year prior. DKs and REFs were set to missing.

- Individual Decline in Visibility: Visibility was measured among LGBTQ+ respondents using the question "Compared to 12 months ago, are you more comfortable, less comfortable, or about the same with displaying pro-LGBTQ+ symbols (such as wearing a Pride T-shirt/pin or hanging a Pride flag) at each of the following places?" Responses were coded **1** if the respondent indicated *"somewhat less comfortable"* or *"a lot less comfortable"* in any context (e.g., at work, in public spaces, at health care facilities, or at schools), and **0** otherwise. This measure reflects reduction in external expression of LGBTQ+ identity — a behavioral indicator of declining visibility and safety. DKs and REFs were set to missing.

D. Limitations

Due to the nonprobability design, design-based statistics are to be interpreted with caution. The results are not causal.

2. Data Tables

Table 1: Estimated Odds-Ratios and Predicted Probabilities from Models of Declining Perceived Acceptance on LGBTQ+ Acceptance Among U.S. Adults 18+ (September-October 2025; Full Sample)

	All U.S. Adults (Full Sample) Acceptance		
	Odds-Ratio [95% CI]	**Predicted Probabilities**	
		Pr(Y=1)	Pr(Y=0)
No Discrimination	baseline	**19.4%*****	**80.6%*****
Discrimination	**2.92***** [2.33, 3.65]	**41.2%*****	**58.8%*****
Conservative	baseline	**23.2%*****	**76.8%*****
Moderate	**0.81*** [0.68, 0.97]	**19.7%*****	**80.3%*****
Liberal	**0.86** [0.71, 1.04]	**20.6%*****	**79.4%*****
DK/Something else	**0.68*** [0.48, 0.96]	**17.0%*****	**83.0%*****
Not aware of policies	baseline	**18.7%*****	**81.3%*****
Aware of federal policies	**1.31***** [1.13, 1.52]	**23.1%*****	**76.9%*****
Non-SGM	baseline	**21.0%*****	**79.0%*****
SGM	**0.89** [0.72, 1.11]	**19.2%*****	**80.8%*****

Note: N = 12,333. Logistic regression model estimating the likelihood that respondents perceived less acceptance of LGBTQ+ people in the past 12 months. Model is weighted using the national design-based weight (*allwt_scaled*) and controls for sex/gender-based discrimination in the last 12 months, sexual/gender identity, race/ethnicity, age, education level, ideology, and policy awareness. Predicted probabilities are estimated at means. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding. Statistical significance: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 2: Estimated Odds-Ratios and Predicted Probabilities from Models of Declining Perceived Acceptance on LGBTQ+ Acceptance Among Non-LGBTQ+ Adults 18+ (September-October 2025; Non-LGBTQ+ Sample)

	Non-LGBTQ+ Adults (Non-LGBTQ+ Sample) Acceptance

	Odds-Ratio [95% CI]	Predicted Probabilities	
		Pr(Y=1)	Pr(Y=0)
Does not Know LGBTQ+	baseline	**21.8%*****	**78.2%*****
Knows LGBTQ+ Person	**0.87** [0.73, 1.04]	**19.6%*****	**80.4%*****
No Discrimination	baseline	**19.1%*****	**80.9%*****
Discrimination	**2.75***** [2.08, 3.62]	**39.4%*****	**60.6%*****
Conservative	baseline	**22.2%*****	**77.8%*****
Moderate	**0.82**** [0.68. 0.99]	**18.9%*****	**81.2%*****
Liberal	**0.92** [0.75, 1.13]	**20.8%*****	**79.2%*****
DK/Something else	**0.49***** [0.31, 0.77]	**12.3%*****	**87.7%*****
Not aware of policies	baseline	**18.1%*****	**81.9%*****
Aware of federal policies	**1.32***** [1.13, 1.53]	**22.5%*****	**77.5%*****

Note: N = 4,378. Logistic regression model estimating the likelihood that respondents perceived less acceptance of LGBTQ+ people in the past 12 months. Estimates are weighted using the within-group weight (*allwt*) to preserve subgroup precision and controls for knowing an LGBTQ+ person, sex/gender-based discrimination in the last 12 months, sexual/gender identity, race/ethnicity, age, education level, ideology, and policy awareness. Predicted probabilities are estimated at means. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding. Statistical significance: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 3: Estimated Odds-Ratios from Sequential Models of Declining Perceived Acceptance on LGBTQ+ Acceptance Among LGBTQ+ Adults 18+ (September-October 2025; LGBTQ+ Sample)

	Model 1: LGBTQ+ Sample Acceptance	**Model 2: LGBTQ+ Sample Outness**	**Model 3: LGBTQ+ Sample Visibility**
	Odds-Ratio [95% CI]		
Discrimination	**3.47***** [2.49, 4.84]	**1.69***** [1.19, 2.42]	**1.32** [0.92, 1.89]
Decline in acceptance	--	**3.54***** [2.49, 5.03]	**2.16***** [1.48, 3.17]
Decline in outness	--	--	**9.45***** [6.81, 13.10]
Moderate	**0.42** [0.17, 1.05]	**0.64** [0.30, 1.34]	**1.02** [0.47, 2.22]
Liberal	**0.32***** [0.15, 0.67]	**0.86** [0.47, 1.59]	**1.19** [0.61, 2.32]
DK/Something else	**0.67** [0.27, 1.67]	**1.28** [0.55, 2.98]	**1.18** [0.48, 2.86]
Aware of federal policies	**1.21** [0.76, 1.91]	**0.91** [0.63, 1.32]	**1.29** [0.86, 1.93]

Note: N = 7,593. Recursive logistic models estimating the likelihood of declining perceived acceptance, personal outness, and visibility among LGBTQ+ respondents in the past 12 months. The models treat perceived acceptance as an upstream contextual factor, outness as an individual response, and visibility as the behavioral expression of openness. Estimates are weighted using the within-group weight (*allwt*) to preserve subgroup precision and controls for reported declines in acceptance, decline in outness, sex/gender-based discrimination in the last 12 months, sexual/gender identity, race/ethnicity, age,

education level, ideology, and policy awareness. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding. Statistical significance: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 4: Predicted Probabilities from Models of Declining Perceived Acceptance on LGBTQ+ Acceptance Among LGBTQ+ Adults 18+ (September-October 2025; LGBTQ+ Sample)

	Predicted Probability					
	LGBTQ+ Sample Acceptance		LGBTQ+ Sample Outness		LGBTQ+ Sample Visibility	
	Pr(Y=1)	Pr(Y=0)	Pr(Y=1)	Pr(Y=0)	Pr(Y=1)	Pr(Y=0)
No discrimination	**20.3%*** **	**79.7%*** **	**43.8%*** **	**56.2%*** **	**51.8%*** **	**48.2%*** **
Discrimination	**46.8%*** **	**53.2%*** **	**56.9%*** **	**43.1%*** **	**58.7%*** **	**41.3%*** **
No decline in acceptance	--	--	**38.8%*** **	**61.2%*** **	**48.3%*** **	**51.7%*** **
Decline in acceptance			**69.2%*** **	**30.8%*** **	**66.9%*** **	**31.1%*** **
No decline in outness	--	--	--	--	**48.3%*** **	**51.7%*** **
Decline in outness					**66.9%*** **	**33.1%*** **

Note: Predicted probabilities at means calculated from the recursive logistic models in Table 3 and derived from subgroup models using the within-group weight (*allwt*). Statistical significance: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Table 5: Unadjusted Proportions Summarizing Acceptance Among U.S. Adults by Sexual/Gender Identity (September-October 2025)

	All U.S. Adults 18+ Full Sample	Non-LGBTQ+ Sample	LGBTQ+ Sample
	%	%	%
Any decline in acceptance			
YES (Somewhat/a lot less)	**21.6%**	**20.9%**	**29.7%**
NO (otherwise)	**78.4%**	**79.2%**	**70.3%**
Workplace less accepting			
A lot less	**5.5%**	**5.5%**	**6.0%**
Somewhat less	**8.1%**	**7.7%**	**11.5%**
About the same	**57.5%**	**56.7%**	**63.1%**
Somewhat more	**14.3%**	**14.8%**	**9.7%**
A lot more	**14.6%**	**15.2%**	**9.7%**
My boss/supervisor			
A lot less	**5.9%**	**6.0%**	**5.0%**
Somewhat less	**7.0%**	**7.0%**	**6.8%**
About the same	**60.2%**	**59.3%**	**69.3%**
Somewhat more	**13.9%**	**14.4%**	**8.6%**
A lot more	**13.0%**	**13.3%**	**10.3%**

My coworkers			
A lot less	**5.7%**	**5.6%**	**6.2%**
Somewhat less	**8.3%**	**8.3%**	**8.4%**
About the same	**57.6%**	**56.8%**	**64.9%**
Somewhat more	**14.8%**	**15.2%**	**11.0%**
A lot more	**13.6%**	**14.1%**	**9.5%**
My local school district (if applicable)			
A lot less	**7.2%**	**6.7%**	**14.8%**
Somewhat less	**10.2%**	**9.8%**	**15.9%**
About the same	**50.7%**	**50.8%**	**50.1%**
Somewhat more	**17.9%**	**18.4%**	**11.6%**
A lot more	**13.9%**	**14.4%**	**7.8%**
The urgent care/hospital I'd use in an emergency			
A lot less	**3.9%**	**3.8%**	**5.1%**
Somewhat less	**6.0%**	**5.4%**	**11.4%**
About the same	**60.3%**	**59.7%**	**67.0%**
Somewhat more	**14.9%**	**15.7%**	**6.8%**
A lot more	**14.9%**	**15.5%**	**9.7%**
The pharmacy I typically go to for my RX/medications			
A lot less	**3.7%**	**3.7%**	**3.4%**
Somewhat less	**5.6%**	**5.4%**	**7.6%**
About the same	**63.5%**	**62.4%**	**74.1%**
Somewhat more	**13.8%**	**14.5%**	**7.1%**
A lot more	**13.5%**	**14.1%**	**7.8%**

Note: Table displays unadjusted proportions of respondents reporting each type of acceptance indicator at work, in education, and in health care. Each item is collapsed into a binary (1 = a lot/somewhat less; 0 = otherwise) contributes to the composite "any decline in acceptance" measure used in regression analyses. "Any decline in acceptance" refers to any respondent saying there is "a lot" or somewhat" less acceptance in any of the following areas reported in the table. Percentages weighted using the national design-based weight (*allwt_scaled*). Results are intended to be summary. Maximum sample size is used for each calculation. Numbers may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 6: Unadjusted Proportions Summarizing Outness (September-October 2025; LGBTQ+ Sample)

	LGBTQ+ Sample
	%
Any decline in outness	
YES (Somewhat/a lot less)	**47.5%**
NO (otherwise)	**52.5%**
Out in workplace	
A lot less	**12.3%**
Somewhat less	**14.3%**
About the same	**48.4%**
Somewhat more	**12.7%**
A lot more	**12.3%**
Out to boss/supervisor	
A lot less	**16.4%**
Somewhat less	**12.2%**
About the same	**50.6%**
Somewhat more	**9.2%**
A lot more	**11.7%**

Out to coworkers	
A lot less	**10.4%**
Somewhat less	**15.4%**
About the same	**47.2%**
Somewhat more	**13.6%**
A lot more	**13.5%**
Out to local school district	
A lot less	**16.0%**
Somewhat less	**12.0%**
About the same	**48.5%**
Somewhat more	**10.7%**
A lot more	**12.8%**
Out to urgent care/hospital used for an emergency	
A lot less	**9.5%**
Somewhat less	**15.9%**
About the same	**54.1%**
Somewhat more	**9.0%**
A lot more	**11.5%**
Out to the pharmacy typically used for RX/medications	
A lot less	**8.8%**
Somewhat less	**12.0%**
About the same	**59.0%**
Somewhat more	**9.3%**
A lot more	**11.0%**
In public spaces (for example, holding hands with a partner)	
A lot less	**12.4%**
Somewhat less	**15.9%**
About the same	**47.5%**
Somewhat more	**10.7%**
A lot more	**13.6%**

Note: Table displays unadjusted proportions of respondents reporting each type of change in outness indicator at work, in education, in health care, and in public. Each item was collapsed into a binary (1 = a lot/somewhat less; 0 = otherwise) contributes to the composite "any decline in outness" measure used in regression analyses. Percentages weighted using the national design-based weight (*allwt_scaled*). Results are intended to be summary. Maximum sample size is used for each calculation. Numbers may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 7: Unadjusted Proportions Summarizing Visibility (September-October 2025; LGBTQ+ Sample)

	LGBTQ+ Sample
	%
Any decline in visibility	
YES (Somewhat/a lot less)	**51.1%**
NO (otherwise)	**48.9%**
At work or work events	
A lot less	**15.9%**
Somewhat less	**15.4%**
About the same	**50.0%**
Somewhat more	**7.2%**
A lot more	**11.5%**

In public places such as restaurants, grocery stores, or gyms	
A lot less	**17.1%**
Somewhat less	**22.8%**
About the same	**40.4%**
Somewhat more	**10.0%**
A lot more	**9.8%**
At a health care facility	
A lot less	**14.3%**
Somewhat less	**16.5%**
About the same	**52.5%**
Somewhat more	**5.7%**
A lot more	**11.0%**
At my child's school, school events, or school board meetings (if applicable)	
A lot less	**23.8%**
Somewhat less	**16.3%**
About the same	**38.7%**
Somewhat more	**6.8%**
A lot more	**14.4%**

Note: Table displays unadjusted proportions of respondents reporting each type of change in visibility indicator at work, in education, in health care, and in public. Each item was collapsed into a binary (1 = a lot/somewhat less; 0 = otherwise) contributes to the composite "any decline in visibility" measure used in regression analyses. Percentages weighted using the national design-based weight (*allwt_scaled*). Results are intended to be summary. Maximum sample size is used for each calculation. Numbers may not sum to 100 due to rounding.