

Research Protocol for Conversion Therapy Laws

Prepared by Heather Walter-McCabe, M. Killian Kinney, Sarah Kiperman

July 2025

State Conversion Therapy Laws

Dates of Protocol: Last Update October 2025

- I. **Scope:** State level statutes, regulations, and executive orders which impact provision of conversion therapy in each state.
- II. **Primary Data Collection**
 - a. **Project Dates: Fall 2022 – Fall 2025**
 - b. **Dates Covered in the Dataset:** The dataset is a longitudinal analysis and includes all relevant laws from January 1, 2013 through July 31, 2025.
 - c. **Data collection methods:** This project used the laws, regulations, and other policies systematically collected by the research team at the Movement Advancement Project (MAP), by permission. For additional information on their methods, please see <https://www.lgbtmap.org/equality-maps>. Researchers used MAP data on laws for the initial dataset which included laws through July 26, 2023. Researchers used state specific sites to collect legal text and consulted Westlaw for amendment date verification and to check laws as needed. Researchers created amendment trackers for each state to create longitudinal data. All legal entries were reviewed by a second researcher to confirm accuracy of record. In fall 2025, MAP provided an updated list of laws through July 31, 2025. During quality checks, researchers added the new laws to the existing dataset and checked all other states for any amendments from July 26, 2023, to July 31, 2025.
- III. **Coding**
 - a. **Development of Coding Scheme:** The project began with a team discussion of conversion therapy in the states with project supervisors who are subject matter experts. Two legal research associates then researched five states of differing political approaches and demographic backgrounds and wrote background memorandums broadly outlining conversion therapy laws across these states. Each memo was reviewed by the three project supervisors who examined the landscape of the policies and made recommendations for potential coding questions. The full research team met to create and review a question development table based on the information. Research questions were reviewed by MAP researchers and Center for Public Health Law Research staff. Once all research was conducted and memoranda were written and reviewed, the team finalized the questions and entered them into the web-based MonQcle software coding platform.
 - b. **Coding Methods:** Coding for the first five states was completed by two coders for each state. The research team held variance meetings on completion of each set of states. The rate of variance was 4.16%. Coding for the rest of the states occurred with 20% redundancy, with checks for rate of divergence to ensure it stayed below 5%.
 - c. **Coding Adjustments:** The research team initially began coding using a different legal

dataset prior to settling on the final dataset using MAP systemic collection. Pin-citing was standardized to support coded answers as well as work through variance (coders were instructed to pin-cite areas of questions when coding to be reviewed in variance meetings). During that process, the team made the following adjustments to the coding questions and to provide standardization of answers:

i. Question 1.2 What populations are covered by the law?

- Rule: If a relevant definition (e.g., sexual orientation, gender identity) was included in the law, then that population was selected as included regardless of title of the law.

ii. Question 1.3 What age groups are covered by the law?

- Process: Added “Minors and Adults with guardians or limited legal capacity” to answer choices to capture some states not covered by the other two answers (“all ages” and “minors only”).
- Rule: Minor was coded when indicated and may reflect different ages based on each state’s definition of minor.

iii. Question 1.4 What providers are covered by the law?

- Process: Expanded “mental health providers” to “mental health providers — generally” and “mental health providers — specifically identified” to distinguish between level of specificity.
- Rule: “mental health providers - specifically identified” was coded when any specific mental health providers (e.g., social workers, school counselors, psychologists) were listed.
- Rule: “mental health providers - generally” was coded when mental health providers were included but when specific providers were not identified.
- Rule: “mental health provider - specifically identified” was coded when a code was referenced that did specify professions, even when the conversion therapy law itself did not specify specific mental health providers.

iv. Question 1.7 What type of enforcement mechanism is described?

- Rule: “license removal or other professional sanction” was coded when licensing board was mentioned as enforcement agency.
- Rule: “civil penalty - injunction” was coded when cease and desist or restraining order was mentioned as a penalty.

v. Question 1.8 What agency is assigned enforcement responsibilities?

- Process: Added “professional or licensing board” to answer choices to better capture information based on state laws under review.
- Process: Added the answer “none” to enforcement agency choices since this was not set up as a dependent question.

d. Quality Control:

- i. Test with Naïve Coder:** A naïve coder was brought on toward the end of the coding process. The coder completed 20% of the total records. The rate of divergence was 3.56%. Each divergence was addressed and resolved.