Target's 2023 Pride Controversy: When Brand Values Meet a Reputation Crisis

An analysis of Target's 2023 Pride controversy, employee safety decisions, misinformation, stakeholder trust, and lessons for crisis communications.

RESEARCH ANALYSIS · MIGUEL RUIZ · NOVEMBER 1, 2026



Target Pride merchandise display, May 2023. Photo: Sarah Stierch, CC BY 4.0; cropped and converted to WebP. Image source · License.

Executive summary

In May 2023, Target faced widespread criticism over its annual Pride merchandise collection. Social media allegations, consumer boycotts, confrontations inside stores, and threats against employees escalated into a national controversy. The retailer responded by removing certain products and relocating displays, citing employee safety.

The decision introduced a second reputational challenge. Organizations and customers who had supported Target's longstanding LGBTQ+ commitments questioned whether the company had retreated from its stated values under public pressure.

Target's experience illustrates a recurring challenge in corporate communications: an operational response to a legitimate safety concern can create additional reputational consequences when stakeholders interpret the decision through competing expectations.

The case offers three principal insights:

- Corporate commitments create expectations of consistency. Publicly expressed values become a standard against which future decisions are evaluated.
- Correcting misinformation does not necessarily end a controversy. Viral allegations can continue influencing public perceptions after factual corrections become available.
- Operational decisions require equally deliberate communication. Protecting employees, explaining the decision, and addressing stakeholder concerns are interconnected responsibilities.

A longstanding commitment enters a national controversy

Target had supported LGBTQ+ initiatives and sold Pride merchandise for years before the 2023 controversy. Its annual collection reflected a broader corporate emphasis on inclusion and customer representation.

That history shaped the expectations surrounding the company's actions.

During May 2023, Target introduced merchandise associated with its upcoming Pride Month campaign. Some customers and advocacy groups objected to the products, while social media commentary amplified allegations about the collection's intended audiences and designs.

Particular attention focused on swimwear described as suitable for transgender adults. Online allegations incorrectly claimed that certain products were intended for children. Target clarified that the disputed swimwear was sold in adult sizes, and independent reporting examined and corrected the allegations (D'Innocenzio, 2023).

Additional criticism concerned a designer associated with Target's Pride collection. Online claims linked unrelated artwork from the designer's independent business to products supposedly sold by Target. Fact checking found that some of those claims misrepresented the retailer's actual merchandise (Marcelo,

2023).

The controversy demonstrates how quickly a brand can lose control of the public narrative when allegations circulate across social media before audiences encounter corrections.

For corporate communications teams, the challenge extends beyond establishing which statements are accurate. Organizations must also consider how misinformation reaches customers, becomes associated with a recognizable brand, and influences behavior.

From online criticism to employee safety concerns

As criticism intensified, Target reported confrontations involving employees and disruptions in stores.

The company's response eventually centered on employee safety.

On May 24, 2023, Target announced adjustments to its Pride merchandise plans, including removing certain items associated with confrontational behavior. The company attributed the decision to threats affecting employees' sense of safety and well being (Target Corporation, 2023).

The action addressed an immediate operational concern. It also created a communications dilemma.

For customers opposed to the collection, the changes could be interpreted as an acknowledgment of their objections. For supporters of Target's LGBTQ+ commitments, the same changes could suggest that intimidation had influenced the company's public position.

Both interpretations emerged while the company was attempting to protect its workforce.

This distinction is central to the case. A decision can have a legitimate operational rationale while still producing reputational consequences because audiences evaluate its meaning differently.

A condensed timeline

DATE	DEVELOPMENT
Early May 2023	Target introduces its Pride collection as social media criticism begins circulating.
Mid May 2023	Online allegations and confrontational videos expand the controversy.
May 24, 2023	Target announces merchandise adjustments, citing employee safety.
Late May 2023	Additional allegations, criticism, and reported threats sustain national attention.
June 2023	LGBTQ+ organizations and advocates challenge Target's response and seek renewed commitments.
August 2023	Target reports weaker quarterly sales and acknowledges that reaction to Pride merchandise affected performance.

Timeline synthesized from the original case research and its cited reporting.

The credibility problem: Competing stakeholder expectations

Target's response illustrates how different stakeholders can apply different standards to the same corporate decision.

Employees needed a safe working environment.

Customers expected the retailer to maintain accessible stores and respond appropriately to disruptions.

LGBTQ+ advocates expected Target to uphold its publicly expressed commitments.

Investors and business leaders needed confidence that the company could manage disruption without allowing the controversy to undermine long term performance.

These expectations were not necessarily incompatible. However, satisfying them required more than an operational announcement.

Following the merchandise changes, LGBTQ+ organizations criticized Target's response and called for stronger public commitments, including continued availability of Pride merchandise and meaningful protection for employees (Human Rights Campaign, 2023).

Criticism also raised questions about rainbow capitalism, a term commonly used to describe the commercialization of LGBTQ+ support when a company's demonstrated commitment is perceived as inconsistent with its public messaging.

Reuters documented concerns from a designer whose products had been withdrawn, illustrating the potential gap between a company's intended response and how affected partners experience it (Reid, 2023).

The broader communications problem was therefore one of credibility.

When an organization promotes inclusion as part of its identity, stakeholders may evaluate its actions according to those established commitments. In a crisis, the reasoning behind a decision must be communicated with enough clarity to distinguish immediate operational necessities from changes in the organization's underlying position.

Target maintained that employee safety was the reason for its merchandise adjustments. Nevertheless, criticism from supportive stakeholders demonstrated that the company's explanation did not resolve every concern about what the decision represented.

What the reputation and business evidence shows

The controversy coincided with a challenging period for Target's public reputation and financial performance. Interpreting those indicators requires separating documented outcomes from assumptions about causation.

Corporate reputation

The original research identified a decline in Target's standing in the Axios Harris Poll 100, from 32nd in 2022 to 53rd in 2023.

That comparison provides evidence of a change in the retailer's reputation rankings across the two surveys.

However, the 2023 rankings were published on May 23, before Target's May 24 decision to modify its merchandise collection. They therefore cannot demonstrate that the merchandise withdrawal caused the decline.

The rankings provide broader reputational context, while reactions following May 24 offer more direct evidence of stakeholder dissatisfaction with the company's crisis response.

Financial performance

Target subsequently reported weaker sales during 2023.

In August, the company acknowledged that the reaction to its Pride merchandise negatively affected sales. Its financial performance also reflected broader consumer spending pressures, particularly in discretionary retail categories (Kaye, 2023).

The original research discusses sales declines, stock price movements, and reduced consumer traffic. These measures are relevant indicators of business conditions, but they cannot be attributed entirely to the Pride controversy.

Inflation, consumer spending patterns, competition, and other operational pressures also affected the retailer.

The defensible conclusion is that the controversy contributed to a difficult business environment and was acknowledged by Target as a factor affecting performance. The available evidence does not establish its precise share of the financial impact.

That distinction matters for any professional assessment of brand reputation.

Three lessons for communications professionals

1. Values must be supported by operational preparation

Corporate values can create meaningful connections with employees, customers, and communities. Those commitments also create expectations.

Organizations communicating positions on potentially contentious issues should anticipate possible operational challenges, including employee safety, stakeholder criticism, and misinformation.

Preparation should include clear responsibilities, escalation procedures, and an understanding of how the organization will explain decisions made under pressure.

2. A factual correction is only one part of crisis communication

Several allegations surrounding Target's merchandise were challenged or disproven through fact checking.

Nevertheless, the controversy continued.

Once an allegation becomes associated with a broader public debate, correcting the underlying claim may not resolve the disagreement.

Communication planning must therefore address both factual accuracy and the concerns motivating different audiences, without treating unsupported allegations as established facts.

3. Explain the decision and reaffirm the commitment

Target's stated justification focused on employee safety.

That rationale addressed an immediate operational concern, but some stakeholders sought additional assurance about the retailer's continued LGBTQ+ commitments.

The case suggests that organizations should communicate the purpose, scope, and intended duration of consequential decisions as clearly as circumstances permit.

When a decision appears to conflict with previously expressed values, explaining how the organization reconciles the two can help stakeholders evaluate the response.

Clear communication cannot eliminate disagreement. It can reduce ambiguity about what the organization has decided and why.

Implications for brands and business leaders

The Target controversy demonstrates the difficulty of maintaining a coherent corporate identity when public pressure, employee safety, and stakeholder expectations converge.

Its most useful lesson is not that companies should avoid taking positions on social issues. Rather, the case illustrates the operational and communications responsibilities that follow when those positions become part of a company's public identity.

Organizations need to anticipate how decisions will be interpreted by different audiences, prepare for misinformation, and communicate consistently when immediate circumstances require changes in implementation.

For marketing and public relations professionals, the central question is whether a company's response can address a legitimate operational problem while preserving a credible explanation of its underlying commitments.

Target's experience offers a documented example of how difficult that balance can become during a rapidly escalating national controversy.

RESEARCH BASIS AND LIMITATIONS

This article is a condensed retrospective analysis of Target's 2023 Pride merchandise controversy, adapted from the original research paper Target on Their Back: When Pride Sparked Controversy and Consequences.

The analysis draws on publicly reported events, corporate statements, fact checking, advocacy organization responses, reputational rankings, and business reporting.

It does not present original survey research, establish causal estimates of financial losses, or claim to measure the effectiveness of Target's response experimentally.

The conclusions are professional interpretations of the documented evidence.

SELECTED REFERENCES

D'Innocenzio, A. (2023, May 24). Target becomes latest company to suffer backlash for LGBTQ+ support, pulls some Pride month clothing. Associated Press. https://apnews.com/article/target-pride-lgbtq-4bc9de6339f86748bcb8a453d7b9acf0

Human Rights Campaign. (2023, June 5). Over 200 LGBTQ+ and allied organizations call on Target, business community to speak out against extremist anti LGBTQ+ attacks. https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/breaking-over-200-lgbtq-and-allied-organizations-call-on-target-business-community-to-speak-out-against-extremist-anti-lgbtq-attacks

Kaye, D. (2023, August 16). Target says backlash against LGBTQ+ Pride merchandise hurt sales. NPR. https://www.npr.org/2023/08/16/1194176045/target-sales-lgbtq-pride-bud-light

Marcelo, P. (2023, June 2). No, Target isn't selling satanic children's clothes. Associated Press. https://apnews.com/article/fact-check-target-pride-lgbtq-satanic-998363252236

Reid, H. (2023, May 31). Target Pride backlash exposes 'rainbow capitalism' problem, designer says. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/business/retail-consumer/target-pride-backlash-exposes-rainbow-capitalism-problem-designer-says-2023-05-31/

Target Corporation. (2023, May 24). Target statement on 2023 Pride collection. https://corporate.target.com/press/statement/2023/05/target-statement-on-2023-pride-collection

The Harris Poll. (2023). Axios Harris Poll 100: 2023 corporate reputation rankings. https://theharrispoll.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/2023-Axios-Harris-Poll-100_WEBSITE-REPORT-2.pdf

The Harris Poll. (2022). Axios Harris Poll 100: 2022 corporate reputation rankings. https://theharrispoll.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/2022-Axios-Harris-Poll-100_final-05232248.pdf

Published by Ruiz Advertising Company · Canonical article: https://www.ruizadvertising.com/articles-white-papers/target-pride-2023-reputation-crisis/