

# Religious Tradition and Workplace Religious Discrimination: The Moderating Effects of Regional Context

Social Currents  
2018, Vol. 5(3) 283–300  
© The Southern Sociological Society 2017  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/2329496517734571  
journals.sagepub.com/home/scu



Christopher P. Scheitle<sup>1</sup> and Katie E. Corcoran<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

A nascent but growing literature on religious discrimination in U.S. workplaces has shown that some religious identities, especially non-Christian and nonreligious identities, are more likely to experience and/or perceive such discrimination. While Christianity might represent the majority of the U.S. population, the religious composition of the United States is not monolithic. Regional differences in religious demography and culture could shape the discrimination experiences of individuals belonging to particular religious traditions. This research examines this question using data from a nationally representative survey that asked respondents how often they have experienced religious discrimination in their place of work. We find that atheists are more likely to perceive discrimination in the South than in the West and Northeast. Non-Christians are more likely to perceive discrimination in the South and Northeast than in the West. Finally, evangelical Protestants are more likely to perceive discrimination in the West than in the South.

## Keywords

religion, discrimination, workplaces, employment, region, regional cultures

The issue of religious discrimination in workplaces has received increasing attention from social scientists (Ghumman et al. 2013), employers (Meinert 2013), advocacy groups (Anti-defamation League 2012), and the government (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission 2008). This attention is in part a function of an increase in the number and the proportion of discrimination charges filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission that claims a religious bias (“Charge Statistics”). Religion-related complaints totaled 1,709 in 1997, which represented 2.1 percent of all complaints. By 2015, these numbers had increased to 3,502 complaints, or 3.9 percent of all complaints.

In a recent review of research on religious discrimination in the workplace, Ghumman et al. (2013) argued that this trend is likely a function of different factors, including the growing religious diversity of the U.S. population, a growing interest of employees and some employers to express religion in the workplace, and legal ambiguities regarding religious accommodation in workplaces. In

---

<sup>1</sup>West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Christopher P. Scheitle, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, West Virginia University, 307 Knapp Hall, P.O. Box 6326, Morgantown, WV 26506, USA.  
Email: cpscheitle@mail.wvu.edu

outlining future research needs, Ghumman et al. (2013) noted that there is “little research as to the contextual and individual factors that influence disparate treatment” (p. 444).

In this article, we examine the interplay between individual and contextual factors in shaping perceptions of religious discrimination. Specifically, we ask whether the relationship between an individual’s religious tradition and his or her perception of religious discrimination is affected by the region of the United States in which the individual lives. Given past research, we focus much of our attention on the South and the West regions, although we consider all of the regions. For instance, are non-Christians living in the evangelical Protestant-dominated South more likely to perceive religious discrimination than non-Christians living in the West, which on the whole is less religious and more religiously diverse than the South (Grammich et al. 2012)? In turn, are evangelical Protestants living in the West more likely to perceive religious discrimination compared with evangelical Protestants living in the South?

We draw on a theory of religious commitment and regional religious cultures to hypothesize the effect of residing in the South and the West on the likelihood that a person in a given religious tradition will experience religious discrimination. We examine such questions using a survey of U.S. adults that included a question measuring respondents’ perceptions of religious discrimination in their workplace along with respondents’ religious tradition, behaviors, and other social characteristics.

### **Contextual Influences on Religious Discrimination in Workplaces**

Much of the past research on religious discrimination in workplaces has focused on the varying risk of experiencing discrimination across religious traditions or identities. Overall, this work has found that Muslims are particularly at risk for being discriminated against in U.S. workplaces, although some other groups, such as atheists, have also been shown to have higher discrimination risks (Acquisti and Fong

2015; Wallace, Wright, and Hyde 2014; Wright et al. 2013). This literature has also highlighted how context could shape discrimination risks.

For instance, Wright et al. (2013) reported the results of a resume-based field experiment in the New England region of the United States. The authors randomly indicated one of eight religious identities on resumes, including one treatment in which no religious identity was indicated on the resume. The findings of the experiment showed that employers tended to be more likely to respond to resumes that did not indicate a religious identity compared with those that did. Among the religious identities, however, Muslim resumes were the least likely to receive an employer response.

Wallace et al. (2014) replicated this field experiment in the South. This study also showed that Muslims were the least preferred resumes. However, in the South, employers were also significantly more averse to atheist, pagan, Catholic, and a fictitious Wallonian tradition. These are identities that were not penalized among the employers in the New England study, which emphasizes that religious discrimination in the workplace could be shaped by regional context.

Acquisti and Fong (2015) conducted a similar field experiment. As with the previous two studies, the authors found that Muslim candidates were significantly less likely to receive a callback than a Christian candidate. This effect was larger, however, in locations where the population was more Republican. This finding, again, highlights the likelihood that patterns of religious discrimination in workplaces are conditioned by the larger context of the workplaces.

While these studies allude to regional context influencing the likelihood of experiencing religious discrimination, no study has been conducted that systematically compares the religious discrimination experiences of individuals across regions. Moreover, these studies do not connect to broader theoretical arguments that would allow for predictions regarding which regions should affect the likelihood of religious discrimination for individuals belonging to particular religious traditions.

## Regional Differences in Religious Demography and Culture

Contextualizing religion within “place” is increasingly being recognized by social scientists as vital for understanding religious experience (Ferguson and Tamburello 2015; Neitz 2005; Wellman and Corcoran 2013; Williams 2011). Smith et al.’s (1998) subcultural theory of religious commitment proposes that commitment is heightened by the conflict a religious group experiences with its environment. This theory argues that certain religious identities are considered a cultural threat by the environment, and certain religious groups view themselves as in conflict with the broader culture/environment due to their beliefs, norms, and behaviors (i.e., their subculture). However, the environment is typically assumed to be liberal and national in scope. That is, this theory and subsequent empirical analyses tend to treat the United States as one monolithic environment and culture. As a result, they tend to assume that theologically conservative groups are in conflict with their environments.

Yet, as Wellman and Corcoran (2013) noted, not all environments are liberal; some are conservative, churched/unchurched, secular, irreligious, or antireligious. They argue that “generalizations based on religious tradition [are] nearly useless in predicting how religious groups will experience their environments” because affiliates of a religious tradition may experience tension in one local environment and none in another (p. 449). Their study found that both evangelical and liberal Protestants perceived themselves as in conflict with the regional secular culture of the Pacific. Manning’s (2015) book on nonreligious parenting identified similar findings with nonreligious parents experiencing more cultural conflict in cities that were dominated by evangelical Protestants.

Extending this work, we propose that regional culture will affect the likelihood that an individual will experience religious discrimination in the workplace. Both Silk and Walsh (2008) and Wellman and Corcoran (2013) provided evidence that religious groups

may mirror other groups in their region more so than their denominational counterparts in other regions. This suggests that regional culture may affect religious discrimination experiences. Here we focus on two particularly distinctive regions: the South and the West.

### *The South*

The South has long been seen as offering unique social characteristics and dynamics within social science research, with many studies including a “South” indicator to represent these characteristics (e.g., Ellison, Burr, and McCall 2003; Layman 1997; Moore and Ovadia 2006). Part of the South’s uniqueness is tied to religion. The Southern states have the least non-Christian religious diversity of any region in the United States (Lindsey 2005; Silk and Walsh 2008). This region is dominated by evangelical Protestantism (Silk and Walsh 2008). Fifty-two percent of religious adherents in the South are evangelical Protestants and another five percent are a part of historic African American denominations (Grammich et al. 2012). Even adherents of denominations that would traditionally be considered main-line Protestant (15 percent of religious adherents in the Southern states) have beliefs that put them more on par with evangelicals (Silk and Walsh 2008).

Given these religious demographics, it is not surprising that evangelical Protestantism has a strong influence on public life in the region. As Silk and Walsh (2008) argued,

If the central theme of Southern evangelicalism has been an imperative drive toward personal conversion and the moral life afterward, it is also bound up with the hope that the faithful will be at ease not only inside the churches but also out in the community at large. (P. 64)

Leonard (2005) indicated that in many areas of the South, “Baptists of various types represent an almost de facto religious establishment—an unofficial ‘official’ religion so intricately related to the culture that it sets religious, moral, and even political agendas implicitly and explicitly” (p. 36). Lindsey (2005) concurred and argued

that “evangelical Protestantism—especially the Southern Baptist church—tends to exercise, virtually unchallenged, not merely religious but also sociopolitical dominance in much of the region” (p. 18). Thus, we expect that evangelical Protestants should perceive less workplace religious discrimination in the South.

**Hypothesis 1:** Evangelical Protestants will be less likely to perceive workplace religious discrimination in the South than in other regions.

Evangelical Protestants in the Southern states are cultural warriors, which they consider spiritual warfare, fighting against what they perceive as a culture of immorality and godlessness (Manis 2005; Silk and Walsh 2008). A consequence of this is conflict and hostility toward those who do not share their values and beliefs. The dominance of evangelical Protestantism in the public culture of the South makes the region inhospitable, and occasionally outright hostile, to other religious groups, particularly those that would seek a public presence (Libby 2005). Manning (2015) found that nonreligious parents in Jacksonville, Florida<sup>1</sup> felt like “outsiders,” who were “frowned upon” by an “intolerant,” “oppressively religious culture” that made them feel like they needed to keep their worldviews to themselves in order to “fit in” (pp. 79, 81). This is consistent with Moore and Ovadia’s (2006) study, which found that Southerners are more intolerant than individuals from other regions and that this effect is completely explained by the percent of evangelical Protestants in the area (Moore and Ovadia 2006). Given the more evangelical Protestant public culture of the Southern states, we predict as follows:

**Hypothesis 2:** Atheists, agnostics, and the nonreligious will be more likely to perceive workplace religious discrimination in the South than in other regions.

**Hypothesis 3:** Non-Christians will be more likely to perceive workplace religious discrimination in the South than in other regions.

## The West

Although it might not receive quite the same attention as the South, the West has also been highlighted as offering a distinctive context, particularly in regards to religion. The West is often divided between the Pacific coast states and the Mountain states. Although there are some differences within this group,<sup>2</sup> on the whole, they share some common features. One such feature is their status as some of the least churched states in the nation (Killen 2004).<sup>3</sup> Six states in the West are among the lowest 10 in congregational adherence rates, and 11 states in the West are in the bottom half of adherence rates (Grammich et al. 2012).<sup>4</sup>

As large portions of the Mountain West are unpopulated (Nugent 2004), the religious character of the Pacific is the most influential for the region. There is a secular and libertarian ethos in this region characterized by the philosophy of “I don’t bother you, you don’t bother me [. . .] ‘don’t anybody tell me what to think’ [mentality]” that can make it difficult for individuals to discuss their religious faith with others (Wellman 2008; Wellman and Corcoran 2013:509). Organized religion is often met with “indifference,” but tolerated as long as it remains privatized and is not pushed into the public square, especially through proselytizing (Silk and Walsh 2008:111, 124). This might explain why Wellman and Corcoran (2013:506) found that evangelical Protestants felt like an embattled “minority” in the West and indicated that there is a clash of cultures between the evangelical church and the regional culture. These respondents described being “spat upon, looked down upon, dismissed, [and] thought of in all kinds of unflattering terms” due to their beliefs and values (Wellman and Corcoran 2013:506). This suggests that evangelical Protestants are viewed as a threat to the largely secular and libertarian culture of the West.

**Hypothesis 4:** Evangelical Protestants will be more likely to perceive workplace religious discrimination in the West than in other regions.

The West's religious culture has been described in many ways: "privatized religion, invisible religion, spiritual seeking, religion a la carte, hybridity, mixing of the codes, and of course the frequently cited saying that one is 'spiritual but not religious'" (Silk and Walsh 2008:133). The Pacific features an "open spiritual marketplace" that "invites a high degree of experimentation with 'alternative spiritualities'" (Laird 2004:7; see also Shibley 2004). It is not uncommon to hear people identify themselves by a mix of traditions, such as "Jewish but practicing Zen" (Laird 2004). Because of this ethos, there is also a more positive perception of non-Christian religions in the region. Even Muslims in the West have overall been "very successful in negotiating a positive public identity" by focusing on philanthropy and service to the community, rather than evangelizing (Silk and Walsh 2008).

**Hypothesis 5:** Non-Christians will be less likely to perceive workplace religious discrimination in the West than in other regions.

Given the more secular, unchurched culture of the West, we predict as follows:

**Hypothesis 6:** Atheists, agnostics, and the nonreligious will be less likely to perceive workplace religious discrimination in the West than in other regions.

## Data

The data used for this research come from a survey of individuals belonging to the GfK KnowledgePanel that was fielded in December of 2013 and January of 2014. The KnowledgePanel is a probability-based panel of over 50,000 U.S. adults who complete surveys online. Individuals are first selected through address-based sampling and then invited to join the panel. A computer and Internet access is provided to individuals who do not have them. Panelists complete surveys for incentive points that can then be converted to cash, gift cards, or merchandise. For more

information on the panel's methodology, see GfK (2013).

The survey was sent to 16,746 KnowledgePanel panelists. This was the number required to arrive at the target of 10,000 completed surveys. In the end, 10,241 completed surveys were received. Given our interest in perceptions of religious discrimination in workplace settings, we limit our analysis to those respondents who stated on the survey that they are currently working or looking for work. More specifically, we include respondents who stated that they are working as a paid employee ( $n = 5,084$ ), self-employed ( $n = 760$ ), not working/on temporary layoff from work ( $n = 68$ ), and not working/looking for work ( $n = 709$ ). We excluded respondents who stated that they are not working/retired ( $n = 2,128$ ), not working/disabled ( $n = 704$ ), or not working/other ( $n = 788$ ). After filtering these categories and eliminating cases with missing data on other variables used in the analysis, our final analytical sample consists of 6,396 cases. The data are weighted to account for patterns of nonresponse and noncoverage bias in the overall panel membership. The 2012 Current Population Survey, the most recent at the time of the survey, was used by GfK to determine the demographic benchmarks for computing these weights. The weights also account for a small study-specific oversample of panelists ( $n = 341$  of the 10,241) who were employed in science-related occupations.

To our knowledge, this is the only example of a general population survey to ask specifically about religious discrimination in the workplace.<sup>5</sup> While resume-based field experiments, like those reviewed above, are powerful in some respects, they are also limited to one aspect of the workplace experience (i.e., interview or hiring discrimination) and are often limited geographically or by the types of jobs they involve. A survey-based item like the one in our data can assess perceptions of workplace religious discrimination more broadly. This by no means implies that such a survey measure is categorically better, but simply that it allows us to examine this phenomenon in a substantively different way.

## Outcome

The primary focus of the research project that produced the survey was in relation to individuals' attitudes and behaviors regarding religion, science, and ethics. However, the survey included a question asking respondents, "How often have you felt discriminated against at your place of work because of your religious beliefs?" Possible responses were (1) very often, (2) sometimes, (3) rarely, (4) never.

The large majority of respondents, specifically 82 percent of respondents, reported that they have never experienced religious discrimination in the workplace. Another 11 percent reported rarely being discriminated against, 6 percent reported sometimes being discriminated against, and 1 percent reported being discriminated against very often. While individuals reporting religious discrimination in the workplace are a relatively small minority, and most of this minority report that such discrimination has occurred "rarely," we do not believe that this phenomenon should be discounted as irrelevant or unimportant.<sup>6</sup> In the primary analysis below, we utilize logistic regression models in which we code this outcome measure so that 0 represents "never" and 1 represents "more than never" (i.e., rarely, sometimes, very often).

## Religious Tradition

Given our research question, the key predictors for our analysis represent the respondent's religious tradition and region of residence. The former comes from a series of questions in the survey that began with a broad religious affiliation question and then continued with more specific probes in an attempt to narrow the respondent's religious affiliation to a specific denominational affiliation, if such an affiliation existed. The first question asked respondents,

Religiously, do you consider yourself to be Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Mormon, Muslim, not religious, or something else? If more than one, click the one that best describes you: (1) Protestant, (2) Catholic, (3) Just a Christian, (4)

Jewish, (5) Mormon, (6) Muslim, (7) Eastern Orthodox, (8) Buddhist, (9) Hindu, (10) Sikh, (11) Baha'i, (12) Jain, (13) Not religious, (14) Agnostic, (15) Atheist, (16) Something else.

A series of follow-up questions then asked about the respondent's specific tradition or denominational affiliation.

Based on responses to these questions, we coded respondents as being in one of nine religious traditions: (1) Evangelical Protestant, (2) Mainline Protestant, (3) Black Protestant, (4) Catholic, (5) non-Christian, (6) other/indeterminate, (7) not religious, (8) agnostic, and (9) atheist. In defining the three Protestant categories, we utilized an existing denominational coding system (Steensland et al. 2000). The non-Christian category includes Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, Baha'i, Sikh, and Jain respondents. Jewish respondents represent the largest subgroup in this category ( $n = 145$ ) followed by Buddhists ( $n = 64$ ), Hindus ( $n = 29$ ), Muslims ( $n = 23$ ), Sikhs and Baha'is (each  $n = 3$ ), and Jain ( $n = 2$ ). The Other/Indeterminate category consists of a diverse range of other traditions (e.g., Mormon, Unitarian Universalist) as well as individuals who could not be clearly classified in the other traditions.<sup>7</sup> The not religious, agnostic, and atheist categories were chosen by respondents in the survey's first religious affiliation question. Many analyses might combine the nonreligious categories into a single "unaffiliated" or "none" group. However, it seemed important to keep these separate given past research (Cragun et al. 2012; Hammer et al. 2012) showing that perceived discrimination within the nonreligious population varies substantially across nonreligious identities, with atheists in particular being more likely to perceive discrimination.

## Region

The measure of the respondent's region of residence comes from GfK's background data on panelists. That is, the survey did not include a question about region of residence. Instead, the survey firm supplied this measure. This measure consists of nine categories corresponding

to the official U.S. Census Bureau's nine divisions, which themselves represent the four U.S. Census Bureau regions. Obviously, designations like the Census divisions and regions are not ideal given that they are relatively broad, are limited to state boundaries, and were not designed with religion specifically in mind. However, despite their limitations, these designations do provide some ability to distinguish geographical context.

In the analysis below, we begin by examining patterns by the four regional categories. To supplement this four-category analysis, we also examine the nine-category divisions. However, despite our relatively large overall sample size, it must be kept in mind that the sample size for some religious traditions will become comparatively small across these nine divisional categories, which will result in reduced statistical power.

### **Control Measures**

We include several measures meant to account for other factors that could influence respondents' perceptions of religious discrimination in the workplace beyond religious tradition, region, and the interaction between the two. We include four religion control variables: talking to others about religion, how often religion comes up at work, religious person, and religious attendance. Several studies have shown that religious expression, whether verbal or symbolic, can increase the risk of experiencing and/or perceiving religious discrimination. For instance, E. B. King and Ahmad (2010) conducted a field experiment in which a researcher would inquire about job openings either dressed in Muslim-identified clothing, such as a hijab, or without the religious clothing. The study found that the interactions between the researcher and the employer were shorter and more negative when wearing the religious clothing. We include one measure that gets directly at the frequency of religious expression by respondents. This measure comes from a question that asked respondents, "In the past month, about how often have you talked with people of a different religion about your religious

views, whatever they may be?" Possible responses were (1) not at all, (2) one or two times, (3) three or four times, and (4) five or more times. We would expect this measure to be positively associated with perceptions of religious discrimination in the workplace. Note that this question would seemingly be applicable to those who do not have a religious affiliation.

We also include a question that assesses the frequency with which religion is seen by the respondent as coming up in his or her workplace. Specifically, the survey question asked, "How often has the topic of religion come up at your place of work?" Note that the question does not ask how often the respondent brings up religion, although the respondent may also be the source. Hence, this question gets more broadly at exposure to religion in the workplace. Possible responses were (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, and (4) very often. We would expect for this measure to be positively associated with perceptions of workplace religious discrimination.

We include two measures of respondents' religiosity beyond their religious tradition.<sup>8</sup> The first measure asked, "To what extent do you consider yourself a religious person?" Responses were coded (1) not religious at all, (2) slightly religious, (3) moderately religious, and (4) very religious. The second measure asked, "How often do you attend religious services?" Responses ranged from (1) never to (9) several times a week. We would expect both of these to be positively related to perceptions of workplace religious discrimination. Ghaffari and Çiftçi (2010), for example, found that measures of religiosity were associated with an increased likelihood of perceiving discrimination among Muslims.

Finally, we include measures of respondents' education, age, sex, and race. These measures are meant to control for the influence of other forms of discrimination (e.g., sex-based, race-based) on the perception of workplace religious discrimination. The inclusion of the education measure also helps control for potential differences in the type of workplace environments. Education is measured as (1) less than high school, (2) high school, (3) some

college, and (4) bachelor's degree or higher. Age is measured with seven categories: (1) 18–24, (2) 25–34, (3) 35–44, (4) 45–54, (5) 55–64, (6) 65–74, and (7) 75 years or above. Race is measured with dichotomous indicators representing white non-Hispanic, black non-Hispanic, other non-Hispanic, and Hispanic. The white non-Hispanic category serves as the reference group in the analysis.

Descriptive statistics for all measures are shown in Table 1.

## Results

Table 2 shows the rate of experiencing workplace religious discrimination “more than never” (i.e., the combined rarely, sometimes, and very often responses) for the United States overall, the four regions, and the nine divisions. These percentages are before adjusting for any other differences between respondents. Looking at the percentages for the United States overall, we see that perceptions of workplace religious discrimination appear to be most common among non-Christians (28.39 percent), atheists (26.44 percent), and evangelical Protestants (23.05 percent). These perceptions are lowest among mainline Protestants (10.52 percent), agnostic (13.89 percent), and not religious (13.99 percent) individuals. Catholics (14.87 percent), black Protestants (16.68 percent), and those of an other religion (20.56 percent) fall in the middle. The higher percentages for non-Christians and atheists correspond to past research showing higher discrimination risks (Wallace et al. 2014; Wright et al. 2013) or more negative public attitudes toward these groups (Edgell, Gerteis, and Hartmann 2006; Putnam and Campbell 2010).

Below the overall U.S. percentages in Table 2 are the percentages for the four regions. The superscript letters indicate whether a particular percentage is significantly different from other percentages. If two percentages do not share a superscript letter, then they are significantly different from each other. For example, we see that the percentage of evangelical Protestants perceiving at least some workplace religious discrimination in the West (29.57 percent) is

significantly greater than the percentage in the South (20.36 percent).

We do not see any significant regional differences for mainline Protestants, black Protestants, those belonging to an other religion, agnostic, and not religious individuals. However, we do find that Catholic perceptions of religious discrimination are significantly greater in the West (18.18 percent) than in the Northeast (10.87 percent). Also, non-Christian perceptions of religious discrimination in the Northeast (37.71 percent) and South (34.31 percent) are both significantly greater than in the West (17.14 percent). Finally, atheists in the South (42.34 percent) report more religious discrimination than atheists in the Northeast (21.37 percent) and West (16.70 percent). Overall, these patterns appear to provide initial support for the hypotheses, particularly in regards to evangelical Protestants and atheists in the South and West.

Below the four regional percentages are the unadjusted percentages for the nine division categories. These percentages provide a bit more nuance to the patterns we just examined. For example, we see that the higher rate of religious discrimination perceptions among atheists in the South appears to be driven more by atheists in the East and West South Central divisions than atheists in the South Atlantic division. Similarly, we see that differences in perceptions of religious discrimination between evangelical Protestants in the South region as compared with the West region appears to be due largely to the lower perceptions of discrimination among evangelical Protestants living in the East South Central division.

The regional and divisional differences shown in Table 2 could be shaped by other factors that vary between the regions and divisions, such as differences in how often religion comes up in the respondent's workplace. To account for these other factors, we conducted a logistic regression analysis predicting whether a respondent reports experiencing religious discrimination in his or her place of work more than never. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 3, which presents the odds ratios for each predictor.

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics for Sample.

Measure	%	Mean	Standard error	Minimum	Maximum
Frequency of religious discrimination in workplace					
Never	81.91	—	—	—	—
More than never	18.01	—	—	—	—
Rarely	11.21	—	—	—	—
Sometimes	5.85	—	—	—	—
Very often	1.03	—	—	—	—
Religious tradition					
Evangelical Protestant	25.08	—	—	—	—
Mainline Protestant	13.67	—	—	—	—
Black Protestant	3.82	—	—	—	—
Catholic	23.99	—	—	—	—
Non-Christian	4.50	—	—	—	—
Other/indeterminate	10.88	—	—	—	—
Not religious	8.32	—	—	—	—
Agnostic	4.65	—	—	—	—
Atheist	5.10	—	—	—	—
Region					
Northeast	18.79	—	—	—	—
Midwest	22.26	—	—	—	—
South	34.61	—	—	—	—
West	24.34	—	—	—	—
Division					
New England	5.16	—	—	—	—
Mid-Atlantic	13.63	—	—	—	—
East North Central	14.52	—	—	—	—
West North Central	7.74	—	—	—	—
South Atlantic	19.16	—	—	—	—
East South Central	5.09	—	—	—	—
West South Central	10.37	—	—	—	—
Mountain	7.36	—	—	—	—
Pacific	16.98	—	—	—	—
Religious person	—	2.45	.016	1	4
Religious service attendance	—	4.01	.043	1	9
Talking to others about religion	—	1.43	.011	1	4
How often religion comes up at work	—	2.10	.015	1	4
Work status					
Working as employee	77.07	—	—	—	—
Self-employed	9.92	—	—	—	—
Temporarily laid off	1.00	—	—	—	—
Looking for work	12.02	—	—	—	—
Education	—	2.94	.016	1	4
Age	—	41.95	.235	18	93
Female	46.91	—	—	—	—
Race					
White	67.96	—	—	—	—
Black	9.38	—	—	—	—
Other	8.15	—	—	—	—
Hispanic	14.51	—	—	—	—

Note. Data: 2013 Religious Understandings of Science Survey,  $N = 6,396$  (those not working and not looking for work excluded from analysis); analysis is weighted.

**Table 2.** Percentage of Respondents Perceiving Workplace Religious Discrimination “More than Never” by Religious Group, Region, and Division.

Region	Evangelical Protestant	Mainline Protestant	Black Protestant	Catholic	Non-Christian	Other	Not religious	Agnostic	Atheist
United States overall	23.04	10.52	16.68	14.87	28.39	20.56	13.99	13.89	26.44
Four-category regions									
Northeast	20.72 <sup>xy</sup>	8.15 <sup>x</sup>	23.82 <sup>x</sup>	10.87 <sup>x</sup>	37.71 <sup>z</sup>	23.45 <sup>x</sup>	13.30 <sup>x</sup>	13.72 <sup>x</sup>	21.37 <sup>x</sup>
Midwest	24.25 <sup>xy</sup>	10.68 <sup>x</sup>	16.22 <sup>x</sup>	14.38 <sup>xy</sup>	17.98 <sup>xy</sup>	14.67 <sup>x</sup>	14.85 <sup>x</sup>	11.00 <sup>x</sup>	26.58 <sup>xy</sup>
South	20.36 <sup>x</sup>	12.98 <sup>x</sup>	16.08 <sup>x</sup>	16.89 <sup>xy</sup>	34.31 <sup>yz</sup>	20.38 <sup>x</sup>	15.22 <sup>x</sup>	18.55 <sup>x</sup>	42.34 <sup>y</sup>
West	29.57 <sup>y</sup>	7.44 <sup>x</sup>	10.63 <sup>x</sup>	18.18 <sup>y</sup>	17.14 <sup>x</sup>	23.13 <sup>x</sup>	12.78 <sup>x</sup>	11.37 <sup>x</sup>	16.70 <sup>x</sup>
Nine-category divisions									
Northeast									
New England	22.88 <sup>ab</sup>	5.97 <sup>a</sup>	0.00 <sup>l</sup>	11.82 <sup>ab</sup>	30.05 <sup>ab</sup>	11.87 <sup>ab</sup>	21.88 <sup>a</sup>	2.72 <sup>a</sup>	16.36 <sup>a</sup>
Mid-Atlantic	20.23 <sup>ab</sup>	9.00 <sup>a</sup>	25.48 <sup>a</sup>	10.48 <sup>a</sup>	41.79 <sup>b</sup>	29.17 <sup>bc</sup>	9.06 <sup>a</sup>	16.94 <sup>ab</sup>	23.71 <sup>a</sup>
Midwest									
East North Central	25.59 <sup>b</sup>	13.06 <sup>a</sup>	15.54 <sup>a</sup>	14.83 <sup>ab</sup>	14.91 <sup>a</sup>	10.29 <sup>a</sup>	13.15 <sup>a</sup>	14.07 <sup>ab</sup>	23.42 <sup>a</sup>
West North Central	21.67 <sup>ab</sup>	8.16 <sup>a</sup>	18.04 <sup>a</sup>	13.44 <sup>ab</sup>	29.97 <sup>ab</sup>	23.75 <sup>abc</sup>	19.49 <sup>a</sup>	5.33 <sup>ab</sup>	34.49 <sup>ab</sup>
South									
South Atlantic	20.87 <sup>ab</sup>	14.77 <sup>a</sup>	15.62 <sup>a</sup>	15.58 <sup>ab</sup>	25.02 <sup>ab</sup>	20.40 <sup>abc</sup>	15.31 <sup>a</sup>	16.62 <sup>b</sup>	34.81 <sup>ab</sup>
East South Central	14.12 <sup>a</sup>	6.82 <sup>a</sup>	11.79 <sup>a</sup>	9.53 <sup>ab</sup>	48.81 <sup>ab</sup>	23.65 <sup>abc</sup>	10.07 <sup>a</sup>	33.05 <sup>ab</sup>	51.67 <sup>ab</sup>
West South Central	23.73 <sup>ab</sup>	12.57 <sup>a</sup>	23.46 <sup>a</sup>	19.43 <sup>b</sup>	51.34 <sup>ab</sup>	18.01 <sup>abc</sup>	16.71 <sup>a</sup>	19.16 <sup>ab</sup>	60.18 <sup>b</sup>
West									
Mountain	29.79 <sup>b</sup>	8.92 <sup>a</sup>	0.00 <sup>l</sup>	14.27 <sup>ab</sup>	22.93 <sup>ab</sup>	28.15 <sup>c</sup>	23.74 <sup>a</sup>	14.19 <sup>ab</sup>	19.06 <sup>a</sup>
Pacific	29.48 <sup>b</sup>	6.74 <sup>a</sup>	15.22 <sup>a</sup>	19.71 <sup>b</sup>	16.17 <sup>a</sup>	19.33 <sup>abc</sup>	9.57 <sup>a</sup>	10.18 <sup>ab</sup>	15.67 <sup>a</sup>

abc: Percentages sharing a letter in the group label are not significantly different at the 5% level.

xyz: Percentages sharing a letter in the group label are not significantly different at the 5% level.

l. Because these percentages are zero and the cells are small, statistical tests are not computed for these cells.

The first model includes only our measures of religious tradition, region, and the interactions between tradition and region. Looking at the religious tradition effects, which because of the interaction terms represent the differences among traditions in the Northeast, we find that mainline Protestants and Catholics in the Northeast have lower odds of perceiving religious discrimination in the workplace compared to evangelical Protestants. However, non-Christians in the Northeast have higher odds of perceiving religious discrimination than evangelical Protestants.

Because of the interaction terms, the region effects represent the differences among evangelical Protestants. We see that evangelical Protestants in the Midwest, South, and West regions do not significantly differ from those in the Northeast. Keep in mind that the difference between evangelical Protestants in the South and in the West, for example, could be significant. We will conduct those comparisons shortly. Finally, looking at the interaction terms, we find that the difference between evangelical Protestants and non-Christians in

the Northeast, with the latter reporting more religious discrimination, is significantly smaller in the West and Midwest.

The second model adds our measures of respondents' demographics to the analysis. We find that age is associated with lower odds of perceiving religious discrimination in the workplace. All of the race categories are associated with higher odds of perceiving religious discrimination compared with white respondents. This is not entirely surprising given the overlapping boundaries between race and religion.

The third and final model adds our measures of respondents' religious behaviors and strength of identity to the analysis, which we would expect to be positively associated with perceiving workplace religious discrimination. We find that frequency of religious service attendance is associated with higher odds of perceiving workplace religious discrimination. Self-reported religiosity, though, is not significantly associated with perceiving religious discrimination. The measure of how often the respondent says he or she talks to

**Table 3.** Results from Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Respondents Perceiving at Least Some Workplace Religious Discrimination (Odds Ratios Shown).

Predictor	Religious tradition & region	+ Demographics	Full model
Religious tradition (represents difference in Northeast)			
Evangelical Protestant (ref.)	—	—	—
Mainline Protestant	0.33**	0.35**	0.47
Black Protestant	1.19	0.92	0.81
Catholic	0.46*	0.48*	0.62
Non-Christian	2.31*	2.02	2.51*
Other	1.17	1.15	1.41
Not religious	0.58	0.56	1.17
Agnostic	0.60	0.59	1.31
Atheist	1.03	1.00	1.65
Region (represents differences for Evangelical Protestants)			
Northeast (ref.)	—	—	—
Midwest	1.22	1.27	1.10
South	0.97	0.99	0.74
West	1.60	1.51	1.32
Tradition × Region (ref. = difference from Evangelical Protestants in Northeast)			
Mainline Protestant × Midwest	1.09	1.07	1.23
Mainline Protestant × South	1.71	1.58	1.76
Mainline Protestant × West	0.56	0.54	0.59
Black Protestant × Midwest	0.50	0.50	0.65
Black Protestant × South	0.62	0.60	0.90
Black Protestant × West	0.23	0.25	0.59
Catholic × Midwest	1.12	1.09	1.35
Catholic × South	1.70	1.46	1.76
Catholic × West	1.13	0.98	1.01
Non-Christian × Midwest	0.29*	0.28*	0.38
Non-Christian × South	0.88	0.83	1.18
Non-Christian × West	0.21**	0.20**	0.25*
Other × Midwest	0.45	0.46	0.53
Other × South	0.85	0.79	0.85
Other × West	0.61	0.63	0.59
Not Religious × Midwest	0.92	0.98	1.14
Not Religious × South	1.19	1.16	1.93
Not Religious × West	0.59	0.60	0.89
Agnostic × Midwest	0.63	0.63	0.66
Agnostic × South	1.46	1.38	1.54
Agnostic × West	0.50	0.45	0.49
Atheist × Midwest	1.08	1.07	1.39
Atheist × South	2.76	2.63	3.89*
Atheist × West	0.45	0.47	0.69
Religious person	—	—	1.10
Religious service attendance	—	—	1.11**
Talking to others about religion	—	—	1.41**
How often religion comes up at work	—	—	1.85**
Work status			
Working as employee (ref.)	—	—	—
Self-employed	—	1.01	0.91

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Predictor	Religious tradition & region	+ Demographics	Full model
Temporarily laid off	—	1.18	1.42
Looking for work	—	0.94	1.11
Education	—	1.09	1.05
Age	—	0.93*	0.90**
Female	—	1.03	0.86
Race			
White (ref.)	—	—	—
Black	—	1.50*	1.26
Other	—	1.47*	1.67**
Hispanic	—	1.51**	1.41*

Note. Data: 2013 Religious Understandings of Science Survey,  $N = 6,396$  (those not working and not looking for work excluded from analysis); Analysis is weighted. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ .

others about religion is significantly associated with higher odds of perceiving workplace religious discrimination. The reported frequency with which religion comes up at work is also significantly associated with higher odds of perceiving religious discrimination in the workplace.

On the whole, these findings confirm our expectations that religiosity and exposure to religion in the workplace will increase perceptions of religious discrimination. Including these measures alters some of the religious tradition effects we saw in previous models. For instance, in the first two models, both mainline Protestants and Catholics showed lower odds of perceiving religious discrimination in the Northeast as compared with evangelical Protestants. After accounting for the religion measures, though, these differences become nonsignificant. This means that it is evangelical Protestants' higher scores on these religion measures that contributed to the initial difference.

Table 3 is not immediately useful for examining our hypotheses, as the interaction terms are in reference to the gap between the respective religious group and evangelical Protestants in the Northeast. Our research question concerns differences *within* each religious group across the regions. We can use the analysis presented in this table, though, to compute predicted probabilities for each religion-region combination. These predicted probabilities are shown in Table 4.

These probabilities are based on the Full Model in Table 3 with all other measures set to their respective means. In other words, these probabilities reflect the effects for region and religion while holding all of the other factors constant across those regions and religions. This obviously will affect the overall estimates. For example, we see that the overall predicted probability of reporting workplace religious discrimination for evangelical Protestants (14.57 percent) is lower than the percentage observed in Table 2 (23.04 percent). This is because we are assigning everyone the mean on measures like religious service attendance and frequency of talking to others about religion. Since evangelical Protestants will tend have higher scores on such measures, which themselves are significant positive predictors of reporting religious discrimination, their probabilities will be reduced by giving them the average on these measures.

Looking at the results presented in Table 4, we see that evangelical Protestants in the South are still significantly less likely than evangelical Protestants in the West to report workplace religious discrimination. Non-Christians are still significantly more likely to perceive workplace religious discrimination in the Northeast compared with the West, although the difference between non-Christians in the South and West has become nonsignificant. Atheists, on the contrary, are still significantly more likely

**Table 4.** Predicted Probability of Perceiving Workplace Religious Discrimination More than Never by Religious Tradition and Region While Controlling for Religiosity, Religious Service Attendance, How Often Religion Comes Up at Work, How Often Talking to Others about Religion, Education, Sex, Age, Race, Work Status (Based on Final Model in Table 3).

Region	Evangelical Protestant	Mainline Protestant	Black Protestant	Catholic	Non-Christian	Other	Not religious	Agnostic	Atheist
United States overall	14.57%	9.16%	9.93%	12.43%	26.66%	15.57%	20.94%	17.51%	31.09%
Four-category regions									
Northeast	15.27% <sup>xy</sup>	7.90% <sup>x</sup>	12.84% <sup>x</sup>	10.16% <sup>x</sup>	31.18% <sup>x</sup>	20.35% <sup>x</sup>	17.42% <sup>x</sup>	19.15% <sup>x</sup>	22.94% <sup>x</sup>
Midwest	16.67% <sup>xy</sup>	10.55% <sup>x</sup>	9.68% <sup>x</sup>	14.51% <sup>x</sup>	16.29% <sup>xy</sup>	13.10% <sup>x</sup>	21.11% <sup>x</sup>	14.95% <sup>x</sup>	31.51% <sup>xy</sup>
South	11.80% <sup>x</sup>	10.10% <sup>x</sup>	8.99% <sup>x</sup>	12.90% <sup>x</sup>	28.55% <sup>xy</sup>	13.92% <sup>x</sup>	23.26% <sup>x</sup>	21.37% <sup>x</sup>	46.27% <sup>y</sup>
West	19.26% <sup>y</sup>	6.36% <sup>x</sup>	10.34% <sup>x</sup>	13.17% <sup>x</sup>	13.48% <sup>y</sup>	16.82% <sup>x</sup>	19.96% <sup>x</sup>	13.45% <sup>x</sup>	21.57% <sup>x</sup>
Nine-category divisions									
Northeast									
New England	17.53% <sup>ab</sup>	7.06% <sup>a</sup>	— <sup>l</sup>	11.84% <sup>ab</sup>	22.28% <sup>a</sup>	10.30% <sup>ab</sup>	27.83% <sup>ab</sup>	4.40% <sup>a</sup>	20.64% <sup>a</sup>
Mid-Atlantic	14.70% <sup>b</sup>	8.07% <sup>a</sup>	13.24% <sup>a</sup>	9.44% <sup>ab</sup>	35.88% <sup>a</sup>	24.75% <sup>b</sup>	11.82% <sup>a</sup>	22.68% <sup>abc</sup>	23.37% <sup>a</sup>
Midwest									
East North Central	17.68% <sup>b</sup>	13.02% <sup>a</sup>	9.91% <sup>a</sup>	15.66% <sup>b</sup>	12.47% <sup>a</sup>	9.12% <sup>a</sup>	19.82% <sup>ab</sup>	19.03% <sup>abc</sup>	30.35% <sup>ab</sup>
West North Central	14.42% <sup>ab</sup>	7.83% <sup>a</sup>	9.49% <sup>a</sup>	12.20% <sup>ab</sup>	34.67% <sup>a</sup>	20.52% <sup>ab</sup>	23.76% <sup>ab</sup>	7.13% <sup>ab</sup>	33.01% <sup>ab</sup>
South									
South Atlantic	12.89% <sup>b</sup>	10.71% <sup>a</sup>	8.92% <sup>a</sup>	13.32% <sup>ab</sup>	21.06% <sup>a</sup>	13.62% <sup>ab</sup>	22.28% <sup>ab</sup>	18.40% <sup>bc</sup>	39.86% <sup>ab</sup>
East South Central	6.33% <sup>a</sup>	6.16% <sup>a</sup>	5.44% <sup>a</sup>	5.59% <sup>a</sup>	38.04% <sup>a</sup>	21.44% <sup>ab</sup>	12.50% <sup>ab</sup>	47.79% <sup>c</sup>	54.72% <sup>ab</sup>
West South Central	14.29% <sup>b</sup>	10.49% <sup>a</sup>	15.85% <sup>a</sup>	13.64% <sup>ab</sup>	43.25% <sup>a</sup>	10.23% <sup>ab</sup>	29.73% <sup>ab</sup>	21.93% <sup>abc</sup>	59.51% <sup>b</sup>
West									
Mountain	21.31% <sup>b</sup>	7.41% <sup>a</sup>	— <sup>l</sup>	9.73% <sup>ab</sup>	14.02% <sup>a</sup>	19.47% <sup>ab</sup>	36.47% <sup>b</sup>	14.44% <sup>abc</sup>	21.55% <sup>a</sup>
Pacific	18.46% <sup>b</sup>	5.83% <sup>a</sup>	15.29% <sup>a</sup>	14.69% <sup>b</sup>	13.56% <sup>a</sup>	14.61% <sup>ab</sup>	15.08% <sup>ab</sup>	12.74% <sup>ab</sup>	21.37% <sup>a</sup>

abc: Percentages sharing a letter in the group label are not significantly different at the 5% level.

xyz: Percentages sharing a letter in the group label are not significantly different at the 5% level.

l. Four-category regional analysis includes 6,396 cases. The nine-category divisional analysis was not able to estimate two Black Protestant percentages due to empty cells. These cases were excluded, resulting in 6,391 cases for this analysis.

to perceive religious discrimination in the South than both in the Northeast or West. We do not see any significant regional differences for mainline Protestants, black Protestants, Catholics, those belonging to an other religion, not religious, and agnostic individuals.

Also shown in Table 4 are the predicted probabilities from a parallel analysis to that shown in Table 3 that uses the nine division categories instead of the four region categories. Note that we do not present the results from the full regression models for this analysis due to space limitations, although we offer these results in Supplemental Table 1 that can be found online. These results are largely consistent with the results from the four Census regions. Evangelical Protestants report experiencing significantly less religious workplace discrimination in East South Central compared with nearly all of the other divisions (except New England and West North Central). Atheists report experiencing significantly more religious workplace discrimination in

West South Central compared with New England, the Mid-Atlantic, the Mountain West, and the Pacific West. In these analyses, agnostics experience significantly more religious workplace discrimination in East South Central compared with the Pacific and New England. There are also some scattered findings for certain other divisions. Catholics report experiencing significantly less religious workplace discrimination in East South Central compared with the Pacific and East North Central. Other religions report significantly less religious workplace discrimination in East North Central compared with the Mid-Atlantic and the not religious report significantly less religious workplace discrimination in the Mid-Atlantic compared with the Mountain West.

To assess the sensitivity of these results to the coding of the outcome measure, we replicated this analysis with the dependent measure coded as (0) never or rarely and (1) more than rarely (sometimes, very often). The results of this more restrictive coding showed that atheists

are still more likely to perceive discrimination in the South as compared with the Northeast, although the South-West difference was not significant. However, the regional differences for evangelical Protestants and non-Christians fade away with this more restrictive coding. This indicates that most of the differences for evangelical Protestants across the regions comes from the rarely response. The same is true for non-Christians. Atheists in the South, however, have more movement into the higher level responses. The adjusted percentages for this analysis are offered in Supplemental Table 2 available online.

## Discussion

Too often the American religious landscape is presented as undifferentiated. As an example, much has been made in the media about the so-called “end of white Christian America” (Jones 2016) or “the decline of evangelical America” (Dickerson 2012). While there have clearly been significant changes in American religion in the past 30 years, a focus on overall population percentages overlooks variations within the nation. As Silk (2005) wrote, “the religions [Americans] practice, and the way and extent to which they practice them, differ substantially from region to region.” These religious differences create “regional religious realities” (p. 265).

One consequence of these regional realities, unfortunately, is that individuals belonging to particular religious traditions may face more hostility in some regions than in others. The research we presented here examined this premise in the context of self-reported experiences with religious discrimination in the workplace. Our expectations were largely supported by the analysis. Evangelical Protestants are significantly less likely to report religious discrimination in the workplace in the South than in the West (Hypotheses 1 and 4). However, atheists are more likely to report religious discrimination in the workplace in the South than in the West (Hypotheses 2 and 6). Atheists are also less likely to report religious workplace discrimination in the Northeast compared with the South, which

could be due to the large population of unaffiliated individuals in northern New England (Silk and Walsh 2008).<sup>9</sup> While we did not find any significant differences in reporting religious discrimination in the workplace between non-Christians in the West compared with the South, we did find that non-Christians in the Northeast report religious workplace discrimination at significantly higher rates than non-Christians in the West. This may be due to the larger population of Jews in the region. Past research suggests that as the size of a minority group increases, it poses more of a threat to the dominant group, which tends to increase prejudice toward the minority group (Blalock 1967; R. D. King and Weiner 2007). Breaking up the Census regions into divisions produced largely similar results for evangelical Protestants and atheists. There were also some miscellaneous findings for Catholics, other religions, and the not religious for particular divisions that should be investigated further in future research.

When predicting the *prevalence* of perceived religious discrimination in the workplace, only atheists differ in their reports of it across regions. This is primarily because evangelical Protestants and non-Christians differ across regions in their reporting that they experience religious discrimination in the workplace “rarely.” Discrimination in the workplace, regardless of its prevalence, should always be taken seriously as the difference between never and rarely experiencing it likely has meaningful effects on individuals. Overall, these results highlight how religious experience and the experiences of the nonreligious are contextual and embedded within place. Individuals within the same religious tradition may have completely different experiences depending on their local environment. While this study focused on one type of context—region—other contexts may also affect religious discrimination and religious experiences more broadly. Future research should consider how perceptions of religious discrimination may be shaped by urban/suburban locale, state, and national cultures.

The findings also have implications for Smith and colleagues’ (1998) theory of religious

commitment. This theory and subsequent studies drawing on it generally view evangelical Protestants as necessarily in conflict with their environment. To the extent that religious discrimination can be treated as one potential by-product of conflict/tension, our results suggest that evangelical Protestants in the South perceive themselves as in less conflict with their surroundings than their counterparts in other regions. Atheists are also often treated as being in conflict with their surroundings. Cimino and Smith (2007) described how atheists “have assumed a position in America [sp] society that stresses maintaining boundaries and reinforcing group identity in the face of a larger external threat” that they “feel ‘embattled’ by a persistently religious society” (p. 411). Yet the degree to which the United States is religious varies across regions. The results of this article suggest that atheists may actually perceive less conflict in the West and Northeast than they do in the South. As agnostics and the nonreligious generally do not have strong group identities, this could explain why we do not find any significant differences in their likelihood of perceiving religious discrimination in the regional analyses and only found a few differences in the divisional results.

This is not to say that evangelical Protestants in the South and atheists in the West do not experience conflict or tension with their environment. In fact, we know that evangelical Protestants in the South consider themselves “spiritual warriors” fighting against what they perceive as an immoral dominant American culture (Manis 2005; Silk and Walsh 2008). Rather, what we are suggesting is that conflict and tension can be experienced on multiple contextual levels and that work drawing on theories of religious conflict and tension would do well to consider not only national contexts, but regional and more local contexts as well. While we can only speculate regarding the relationship between tension, religious discrimination, and region, this represents a fruitful avenue for future research.

Our analysis does have limitations, of course. One limitation is that our measure of perceived religious workplace discrimination does not provide details regarding what the

respondent actually experienced. We cannot know whether what they reported is in relation to being denied promotions, explicit harassment, a more subtle workplace culture that feels hostile to the individual’s religious identity or beliefs, or some other stimulus. Indeed, it could be that our analysis is overlooking variations in the nature or experience of religious workplace discrimination across regions and religious traditions. It would be beneficial to conduct a similar region-focused analysis using data with more diverse measures of religious discrimination, both formal and informal. Such an analysis, however, would require a new survey that included such measures. A second limitation is that our regional measures were drawn from U.S. census divisions. Future research would benefit from constructing regional measures from state-level data and also controlling for state-level variables to identify what factors might account for the regional variations in religious workplace discrimination.

The current study utilized data from the only nationally representative survey that we are aware of that has asked specifically about perceived religious discrimination in the workplace. Our data allowed us to examine self-reported workplace religious discrimination across a variety of religious (and nonreligious) traditions. This study is the first to demonstrate using nationally representative data that region influences the self-reported rates of workplace religious discrimination for certain religious traditions.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: The data used for this article were produced by the Religious Understandings of Science Study, funded by the John Templeton Foundation (Grant 38817, Elaine Howard Ecklund, principal investigator).

## Supplemental Material

The supplementary material for this article is available online.

## Notes

1. Manning (2015) identified the same findings for nonreligious parents in Colorado Springs, Colorado, which, while not in the South, is a city dominated by a strong public Evangelical Protestant presence.
2. Some observers have distinguished between the Pacific (California and Hawaii), the Pacific Northwest states (Alaska, Oregon, and Washington), and the Mountain West (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming) (Silk and Walsh 2008). For our purposes, it is the similarities between these states that lead to our hypotheses. In our analyses, we also separate the Mountain West from the Pacific West.
3. Like the Pacific states, in the Mountain West, "religion operates on a playing field populated with a substantial cohort of 'Nones,' of individuals with no connection to religious institutions" (Shippo 2004:13).
4. The exceptions are Utah and Idaho.
5. The 2003 *American Mosaic Project* survey (Hartmann, Edgell, and Gerteis 2003) did ask a national sample of respondents more generally, "Have you ever experienced any discrimination because of your religion?" Note that this question is not specifically about workplace discrimination. Hammer et al. (2012) did ask a volunteer sample of self-identified atheists specifically about experiences with being "denied employment, promotion, or educational opportunities because of my Atheism." Similarly, Cragun et al. (2012) asked a sample of individuals identifying as nonreligious in the American Religious Identification Survey whether, "In the past 5 years, have you personally experienced discrimination because of your lack of religious identification or affiliation in any of the following situations: in your workplace."
6. Any perceived experiences of discrimination, even if they occur infrequently, are likely to be meaningful for and impactful on an individual. The individuals in the "rarely" category must have experienced or perceived something that was significant enough to move their response beyond the "never" category, and we believe this should be taken seriously.

7. This is mainly because the respondent gave responses like "Christian," "Just a Protestant," or "other" without providing any other detail on the follow-up questions.
8. We examined correlations between the measures of self-assessed religiosity, religious service attendance, talking to others about religion, and religion coming up at work. The attendance and religiosity measures had the highest correlation at .68. Although this is relatively high, it would not seem high enough to lead to multicollinearity problems. All of the other correlations were below .35. We also examined the variance inflation factors (VIF) for all the measures in the model. These VIFs averaged 1.86. The VIF for the attendance measure was 2.12 and for the religiosity measure was 2.64. All of the religious tradition VIFs were below 1.70. This suggests that multicollinearity is not a major problem.
9. The majority of residents in New Hampshire (50.6 percent), Vermont (57.2 percent), and Maine (62.1 percent) are unaffiliated (Silk and Walsh 2008).

## References

- Acquisti, Alessandro and Christina M. Fong. 2015. "An Experiment in Hiring Discrimination via Online Social Networks." *Social Science Research Network*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2031979.
- Anti-defamation League. 2012. *Religious Accommodation in the Workplace: Your Rights and Obligations*. New York: Anti-defamation League. Retrieved September 19, 2017 ([www.adl.org](http://www.adl.org)).
- Blalock, Hubert M. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority Group Relations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cimino, Richard and Christopher Smith. 2007. "Secular Humanism and Atheism beyond Progressive Secularism." *Sociology of Religion* 68(4):407-24.
- Cragun, Ryan T., Barry Kosmin, Ariela Keysar, Joseph H. Hammer, and Michael Nielsen. 2012. "On the Receiving End: Discrimination toward the Nonreligious in the United States." *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 27(1):105-27.
- Dickerson, John S. 2012. "The Decline of Christian America." *The New York Times*, December 15. Retrieved September 19, 2017 ([www.nytimes.com](http://www.nytimes.com)).
- Edgell, Penny, Joseph Gerteis, and Douglas Hartmann. 2006. "Atheists as 'Other': Moral

- Boundaries and Cultural Membership in American Society.” *American Sociological Review* 71(2):211–34.
- Ellison, Christopher G., Jeffrey A. Burr, and Patricia L. McCall. 2003. “The Enduring Puzzle of Southern Homicide: Is Regional Religious Culture the Missing Piece?” *Homicide Studies* 7(4):326–52.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 2008. “Best Practices for Eradicating Religious Discrimination in the Workplace.” Retrieved September 19, 2017 ([www.eeoc.gov](http://www.eeoc.gov)).
- Ferguson, Todd W. and Jeffrey A. Tamburello. 2015. “The Natural Environment as a Spiritual Resource: A Theory of Regional Variation in Religious Adherence.” *Sociology of Religion* 76(3):295–314.
- GfK. 2013. “KnowledgePanel Recruitment and Sample Survey Methodologies.” Retrieved September 19, 2017 (<http://www.gfk.com/products-a-z/us/knowledgepanel-united-states/>).
- Ghaffari, Azadeh and Ayşe Çiftçi. 2010. “Religiosity and Self-esteem of Muslim Immigrants to the United States: The Moderating Role of Perceived Discrimination.” *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 20(1):14–25.
- Ghumman, Sonia, Ann Marie Ryan, Lizabeth A. Barclay, and Karen S. Markel. 2013. “Religious Discrimination in the Workplace: A Review and Examination of Current and Future Trends.” *Journal of Business and Psychology* 28(4):439–54.
- Grammich, Clifford, Kirk Hadaway, Richard Houseal, Dale E. Jones, Alexei Krindatch, Richie Stanley, and Richard H. Taylor. 2012. *2010 U.S. Religion Census: Religious Congregations & Membership Study*. Kansas City, MO: Association of Statisticians of American Religious Bodies, Nazarene Publishing House.
- Hammer, Joseph H., Ryan T. Cragun, Jesse M. Smith, and Karen Hwang. 2012. “Forms, Frequency, and Correlates of Perceived Anti-atheist Discrimination.” *Secularism and Nonreligion* 1:43–58.
- Hartmann, Doug, Penny Edgell, and Joseph Gerteis. 2003. *American Mosaic Project: A National Survey on Diversity*. Data file and codebook. Retrieved September 19, 2017 ([www.thearda.com](http://www.thearda.com)).
- Jones, Robert P. 2016. “The Eclipse of White Christian America.” *The Atlantic*, July 16. Retrieved September 19, 2017 ([www.theatlantic.com](http://www.theatlantic.com)).
- Killen, Patricia O’Connell. 2004. “Patterns of the Past, Prospects for the Future: Religion in the None Zone.” Pp. 9–20 in *Religion and Public Life in the Pacific Northwest: The None Zone*, edited by Patricia O’Connell Killen and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- King, Eden B. and Afra S. Ahmad. 2010. “An Experimental Field Study of Interpersonal Discrimination toward Muslim Job Applicants.” *Personnel Psychology* 63(4):881–806.
- King, Ryan D. and Melissa F. Weiner. 2007. “Group Position, Collective Threat, and American Anti-Semitism.” *Social Problems* 54(1):47–77.
- Laird, Lance D. 2004. “Religions of the Pacific Rim in the Pacific Northwest.” Pp. 107–37 in *Religion and Public Life in the Pacific Northwest: The None Zone*, edited by Patricia O’Connell Killen and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Layman, Geoffrey C. 1997. “Religion and Political Behavior in the United States: The Impact of Beliefs, Affiliations, and Commitment from 1980 to 1994.” *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(2):288–316.
- Leonard, Bill. 2005. “The Southern Crossroads: Religion and Demography.” Pp. 27–53 in *Religion and Public Life in the Southern Crossroads: Showdown States*, edited by Charles William Lindsey and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Libby, Charles H. 2005. “Tactics for Survival: Religious Minorities.” Pp. 125–40 in *Religion and Public Life in the South: In the Evangelical Mode*, edited by Charles Regan Wilson and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Lindsey, William. 2005. “Religious Affiliation in the Southern Crossroads and the Nation—Religious Self-identification and Adherents Claimed by Religious Groups, National and Regional Comparisons.” Pp. 23–26 in *Religion and Public Life in the Southern Crossroads: Showdown States*, edited by Charles William Lindsey and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Manis, Andrew M. 2005. “Protestants: From Denominational Controversialists to Culture Warriors.” Pp. 55–77 in *Religion and Public Life in the Southern Crossroads: Showdown States*, edited by Charles William Lindsey and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Manning, Christel. 2015. *Losing Our Religion: How Unaffiliated Parents Are Raising Their*

- Children*. New York: New York University Press.
- Meinert, Dori. 2013. "Matters of Faith." *HR Magazine* 58(12):18–24.
- Moore, Laura M. and Seth Ovadia. 2006. "Accounting for Spatial Variation in Tolerance: The Effects of Education and Religion." *Social Forces* 84(4):2205–22.
- Neitz, Mary Jo. 2005. "Reflections on Religion and Place: Rural Churches and American Religion." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 44(3):243–47.
- Nugent, Walter. 2004. "The Religious Demography of an Oasis Culture." Pp. 19–48 in *Religion and Public Life in the Mountain West: Sacred Landscapes in Transition*, edited by Jan Shipps and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. and David E. Campbell. 2010. *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Shibley, Mark A. 2004. "Secular but Spiritual in the Pacific Northwest." Pp. 139–68 in *Religion and Public Life in the Pacific Northwest: The None Zone*, edited by Patricia O'Connell Killen and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Shipps, Jan. 2004. "Introduction: Religion in the Mountain West: Geography as Destiny." Pp. 9–14 in *Religion and Public Life in the Mountain West: Sacred Landscapes in Transition*, edited by Jan Shipps and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Silk, Mark. 2005. "Religion and Region in American Public Life." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 44(3):265–70.
- Silk, Mark and Andrew Walsh. 2008. *One Nation, Divisible: How Regional Religious Differences Shape American Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Smith, Christian, Michael Emerson, Sally Gallagher, Paul Kennedy, and David Sikkink. 1998. *American Evangelicalism: Embattled and Thriving*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Steenland, Brian, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79(1):291–318.
- Wallace, Michael, Bradley R. E. Wright, and Allen Hyde. 2014. "Religious Affiliation and Hiring Discrimination in the American South: A Field Experiment." *Social Currents* 1(2):189–207.
- Wellman, James K., Jr. 2008. *Evangelical vs. Liberal: The Clash of Christian Cultures in the Pacific Northwest*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wellman, James K., Jr. and Katie E. Corcoran. 2013. "Religion and Regional Culture: Embedding Religious Commitment within Place." *Sociology of Religion* 74(4):496–520.
- Williams, Rhys H. 2011. "2010 Association for the Sociology of Religion Presidential Address; Creating an American Islam: Thoughts on Religious Identity and Place." *Sociology of Religion* 72(2):127–53.
- Wright, Bradley R. E., Michael Wallace, John Bailey, and Allen Hyde. 2013. "Religious Affiliation and Hiring Discrimination in New England: A Field Experiment." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 34:111–26.