Case Analysis: Target's DEI Reversal and Pride Month Backlash

Sierra Ashworth

Drexel University

COM 613: Ethics for Professional Communication

Professor Nakho Kim

April 25, 2025

The Incident

Target Corporation, a national retail chain known for progressive branding and inclusive marketing, faced a multifaceted public relations crisis beginning in 2023 that has only intensified through 2025. The crisis centers on two major developments; the company's response to backlash over its LGBTQ+ Pride Month merchandise and its decision to eradicate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) initiatives.

In May 2023, Target launched its annual Pride collection but quickly faced an organized campaign of misinformation and harassment. Some customers posted videos confronting store employees and toppling product displays. In certain markets, Pride merchandise was relocated to less visible parts of the store. Under further pressure, Target removed select items entirely, citing employee safety concerns. (D'Innocenzio, 2023)

By January 2025, the retailer made another controversial move: it formally announced the discontinuation of its DEI goals, which had previously included supplier diversity, leadership recruitment targets, and support for employee advancement programs, particularly those designed for Black and LGBTQ+ staff. (D'Innocenzio, 2025) While Target cited "an evolving external landscape" and legal uncertainty as justifications, the decision ignited a new wave of backlash from civil rights leaders, customers, and faith-based communities who had long viewed Target as a corporate ally. (Battle, 2025) (Brew, 2025)

A national Lent boycott, led by prominent Black clergy and supported by over 150,000 participants, targeted Target during its critical Easter sales season. Protestors framed the rollback as a betrayal of loyalty from a brand that once championed justice following the murder of George Floyd in Target's hometown of Minneapolis. The company's refusal to issue a timely statement or directly engage critics deepened reputational damage and contributed to ongoing sales volatility. (Brew, 2025)

Ethics

Target put itself at the center of conflicting moral and strategic pressures. On one hand, the company faced credible threats against its employees and political pressure from conservative groups and lawmakers, including a presidential administration actively dismantling DEI infrastructure. On the other hand, its decisions appeared to abandon the very communities it once uplifted. This contradiction damaged its credibility among core consumers and long-standing social justice allies.

Stakeholders and their interests include:

- LGBTQ+ individuals and advocates, who expected Target to uphold its inclusive values and stand firm in the face of hate.

- Black consumers and community leaders, who were among Target's most loyal shoppers and felt blindsided by the quiet dismantling of racial justice initiatives.

- Conservative customers and politicians, who opposed visible LGBTQ+ content and corporate DEI programs, often citing cultural or religious objections.

- Employees, who were caught in the crossfire, enduring threats, hostile customers, and confusion over the company's position.

- Investors, who seek financial growth, risk mitigation, and often prefer neutrality in politically divisive issues.

These interests collided with growing societal polarization, which tested the limits of "middle-ground" brand positioning. Target's decision making, its silence and avoidance, created an ethical dilemma rooted in what actions it took, and how it communicated those actions.

Young's TTR framework (Transparency, Two-Way Symmetrical Communication, Right Time) provides a clear lens to evaluate the ethics and effectiveness of Target's crisis communication. (Kim, 2015)

Transparency:

Target failed to provide clear, direct communication to its stakeholders. The decision to scale back DEI programs was quietly announced with internal memos and vague external language about an "evolving external landscape." The Pride merchandise removals were explained primarily through concerns for "employee safety," without clarifying which items were removed or how decisions were made. (D'Innocenzio, 2023) (D'Innocenzio, 2025) This lack of specificity contributed to the information vacuum filled by speculation, misinformation, and disappointment. Target's silence allowed external groups to shape the narrative in their favor, weakening trust on all sides.

Two-Way Communication:

Target did not create forums for meaningful stakeholder input. There is no evidence that the company consulted employee resource groups, Black community leaders, or LGBTQ+ advocacy organizations before making high-impact changes. The company's only comment to the press during the Lent boycott was to say it had "nothing new to share." (Brew, 2025) This one-directional communication strategy eroded the perception of authenticity and reinforced the belief that Target was abandoning ethical commitments for expediency.

Right Time:

Timing was a critical failure. Target's DEI reversal came just before Black History Month and Pride planning season. The Lent boycott began just as the company was publicly relying on Easter-related sales to revive a sluggish quarter. (Brew, 2025) Rather than anticipating backlash or proactively engaging, Target allowed events to unfold with no coordinated or visible strategy, giving the impression of being reactive rather than responsible.

What-If Scenarios

Scenario One: Target Maintains DEI Framework but Repositions Communication

If Target had chosen to maintain its DEI framework but rebranded its initiatives with stronger ties to business outcomes, such as innovation, market competitiveness, and consumer loyalty, it might have retained progressive support while insulating itself from political attack. Instead of a retreat, Target could have reframed the strategy as a values aligned evolution focused on long-term growth and inclusion. A move like this, accompanied by proactive communication from leadership and a stakeholder engagement tour, might have defused criticism and re-established trust.

Scenario Two: Target Suspends In-Store Pride Displays in High-Risk Areas but Expands Digital Campaigns

Rather than removing Pride merchandise altogether or reducing visibility without explanation, Target could have shifted its marketing investment toward digital spaces, influencer partnerships, and community grants. It could have publicly acknowledged threats and presented the temporary adjustment as a safety-based compromise, not an ideological retreat. By emphasizing support in alternative forms (for example, donations to LGBTQ+ nonprofits or in-store QR codes linking to the full Pride collection), Target might have upheld its values without compromising employee safety.

Potential Solutions

Stakeholder Reconciliation and Partnership Building:

Target should host a series of facilitated conversations with community leaders, including LGBTQ+ organizations, Black clergy, and frontline employees. The goal should be to rebuild trust, gather insight, and co-design future campaigns that reflect a shared commitment to safety and equity. Transparent summaries of these conversations could be shared publicly to demonstrate progress and accountability.

Reinstate DEI Commitments Through a New Framework:

Rather than abandoning DEI outright, Target could adopt a new equity framework that aligns with legal requirements while reinforcing inclusion as a business advantage. This might involve:

- Supplier diversity benchmarks

- Internal equity training focused on inclusion rather than "identity-based" quotas

- Transparent metrics for employee advancement and workplace culture

Crisis Communication Playbook and Proactive Monitoring:

 Target should develop a formal crisis communication protocol, rooted in the TTR model, to ensure it responds to future controversies with clarity and speed. The company should also monitor online discourse actively to address misinformation before it spreads, especially regarding product offerings tied to identity-based inclusion.

Conclusion

 As the public increasingly expects corporations to stand for more than profit, communication professionals must navigate these tensions with strategic empathy and ethical clarity. Target's DEI reversal and Pride Month controversy reveal the high stakes of ethical communication in an era of social polarization. The company attempted to de-escalate conflict by retreating into silence and "compromise" but instead alienated loyal stakeholders while pleasing none. Through the lens of the TTR framework, it becomes clear that the crisis was less about any one decision and more about the absence of transparent, timely, and two-way communication. Target's experience offers a cautionary tale and a roadmap for how to do better next time.

References:

Battle, P. (2025, March 5). *Target sounds alarm on unexpected customer behavior – the street*. The Street. https://www.thestreet.com/retail/target-sounds-alarm-on-unexpected-customer-behavior

Brew, R. (2025, March 21). *Target was banking on Easter to help boost sluggish sales. but then came the church-initiated boycotts of the retailer*. Fortune. https://fortune.com/2025/03/21/target-easter-sales-boycotts/

D'Innocenzio, A. (2023, May 24). *Target becomes latest company to suffer backlash for LGBTQ+ support, pulls some pride month clothing*. AP News. https://apnews.com/article/target-pride-lgbtq-4bc9de6339f86748bcb8a453d7b9acf0#:~:text=An%20Associated%20Press%20analysis%20found,kids%20or%20in%20kids'%20sizes.&text=The%20moves%20come%20as%20beer,the%20backlash%20has%20turned%20hostile.&text=D'Innocenzio%20writes%20about%20retail,workers%20for%20The%20Associated%20Press

D'Innocenzio, A. (2025, January 24). *Target says it is ending its dei goals and programs, citing an "evolving external landscape."* PBS. https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/target-says-it-is-ending-its-dei-goals-and-programs-citing-an-evolving-external-landscape#:~:text=Getting%20corporations%20to%20withdraw%20from,Support%20PBS%20News%20Hour%20now

Kim, Y. (2015). Toward an ethical model of effective crisis communication. *Business and Society Review*, *120*(1), 57–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/basr.12048