About SHRM

The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) is the world’s largest professional association devoted to human resource management. Our mission is to serve the needs of HR professionals by providing the most current and comprehensive resources and to advance the profession by promoting HR’s essential, strategic role. Founded in 1948, SHRM represents more than 225,000 individual members in over 125 countries and has a network of more than 575 affiliated chapters in the United States, as well as offices in China and India. Visit SHRM at www.shrm.org.

About This Survey Report

In April 2008, the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) conducted the SHRM 2008 Religion/Spirituality in the Workplace (Faith at Work) Survey. The purpose of the survey was to examine what organizations are doing in terms of religion and religious accommodations, and determine the impact of religious accommodation in the workplace. Where applicable, this report discusses and compares results from 1997 and 2001 SHRM surveys on this topic.
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Are Employees Taking Their Faith to Work?

Religion and spirituality have in the past been seen as a private matter with little or no place in corporate America. As companies embrace an expanding global economy and increase their sourcing of global job candidates, religious diversity in the workplace is rising. In addition, a growing number of employees are taking their religion and spirituality to work. Religion and spirituality, for many employees, are no longer a part of their lives that they leave at home. Spirituality for these employees is a way of life—their religion and spirituality define who they are.

Religion can be defined in a myriad of ways and mean different things to different people; however, Title VII of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) includes the following definitions of religion, religious beliefs and religious observances or practices:

- “Religion is not limited to traditional, organized religions, but also includes religious beliefs that are practiced by a small group of people and are not part of a formal church or sect.”
- “Religious observances or practices include, for example, attending worship services, praying, wearing religious garb or symbols, displaying religious objects, adhering to certain dietary rules, proselytizing or other forms of religious expression, or refraining from certain activities.”

According to a 2008 study by the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, 78% of adult Americans belong to various forms of Christianity, about 5% belong to other faiths and 16% are not affiliated with any particular religion.² Another 2008 study by Pew Forum, The U.S. Religious Landscape Survey, shows that the majority (56%) of Americans say that religion is very important in their lives. With a myriad of religions in the United States, many requiring their followers to dress in certain ways, eat certain food and observe holy days, businesses are challenged to find ways to provide employees with options to practice their beliefs. But how far should employers go to accommodate their employees’ religious beliefs and practices? Is making religious workplace accommodation enough? Are organizations including religion and spirituality components in their employee training? Do employees feel that they work in an inclusive environment/culture? What can organizations do to take advantage of this growing diversity? These are among the questions answered in this research.

As companies embrace an expanding global economy and increase their sourcing of global job candidates, religious diversity in the workplace is rising.
Executive Summary: Religion and Corporate America

According to this research, many organizations are supportive of their employees’ needs for special accommodation related to their religious and spiritual beliefs. This is despite data that show that nearly 60% of organizations have leadership that creates and supports a work environment/culture that is more secular (with little or no influence of religion on organization culture) than religious.

In addition, the findings reveal that employee morale and employee retention are most affected by having a workplace that provides religious accommodation for its employees.

The most prevalent types of religious accommodation include the following: taking into account the different religious beliefs of employees when planning holiday-related events; allowing religious decorations of an individual’s workspace; providing flexible scheduling to accommodate employees’ religious practices at work; and taking into account employees’ various religious holidays when planning work-related events.

Additional noteworthy findings include the following:

- Nearly all HR professionals indicate that employees of different religious groups in their organizations work “very cooperatively” or “cooperatively” with each other.

**What do these findings mean for corporate America?**

- **Value Differences:** Religion and spirituality education efforts in the workplace need to shift from minimizing differences to strengthening, respecting and valuing those differences to help drive an organization’s business results. Ongoing religious diversity training will help drive employee engagement and create a work environment that visibly values and leverages religious and spirituality diversity.

- **Inclusion Through Training:** Training managers and supervisors on anti-harassment and discrimination policies should not be limited to race, ethnicity, age and gender, but also include religion. This will help employers create an inclusive culture and a workplace where employees feel respected, valued, comfortable and able to perform at their best. HR professionals are well suited to lead their organizations in their diversity and inclusion strategy.

- **Religious Diversity as Part of Business Sustainability:** Religious and spirituality diversity should not be just about human resource policies and practices. An organization’s ability to recognize, embrace and function in a religious and spiritually diverse world is critical to its sustainability strategy.

Employee morale and employee retention are most affected by having a workplace that provides religious accommodation for its employees.
Religion and Corporate Culture
Accommodating Religious Diversity in the Workplace

Organization Leadership—Promoting a Religious or Secular Culture?
The leadership of an organization influences its culture. According to the SHRM 2007 State of Workplace Diversity Management Survey Report, creating a work environment or culture that allows everyone to contribute all that they can to the organization was reported by diversity practitioners as one of the “extremely important” (91%) outcomes of effective diversity management. This highlights the relevance of an inclusive workforce for organizations. When employees feel that they can truly be a part of an organization and respected for who they are, they are more likely to feel aligned with the organization.

The U.S. model of government, which separates church from the state, serves as a guiding principle for how most U.S. corporations operate. Yet, the corporate culture of any organization is determined by its leadership and the value system organization’s leaders impart on employees. Respondents were asked what type of environment/culture the leadership of their organizations created. An environment/culture that is more secular (with little or no religious influence) was reported by nearly 60% of the respondents, with 32% reporting that their organizations’ culture was somewhere in the middle of secular and religious. These data are shown in Figure 1.

“An outspoken religiously influenced leader can be both a help and a hindrance. As companies expand out of their home geographic area, increased tolerance and acceptance of religious diversity is required. For some faith-based companies (i.e., Chick-fil-A and Off Road Warehouse), with a slant toward varieties of Christianity, this may preclude their ability to recruit staff in an ever-growing and ever-competitive service market. Employees with different religious beliefs feel their convictions of faith are as important as those of their employers and expect the same type of related benefits.”

“These revealing data highlight the fact that our semi-religious U.S. workplaces may be reflective of our nation as a whole,” notes Georgette Bennett, Ph.D., president and founder of the Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding and member of SHRM’s Workplace Diversity Special Expertise Panel. “In contrast to largely secular Europe, the United States is the most religious country in the developed world. However, when it comes to religious inclusivity, it is in the best interest of all companies—whether secular or slightly more religious—to be aware of their employees’ religious diversity and to be sensitive to the needs of both believers and non-believers.”

Several differences emerged based on respondents’ organizations’ industry and sector. As shown in Table 1, publicly owned for-profit and privately

---

**Figure 1** The Continuum of Secular/Religious Corporate Culture Created by Organizations’ Leadership

- Secular 58%
- More religious 10%
- Somewhere in the middle 32%

*(n = 532)*

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)
owned for-profit organizations as well as government agencies tended to perceive their organizations’ culture/environment as more secular. Respondents from nonprofit organizations, compared with those from publicly owned for-profit and privately owned for-profit organizations, were more likely to cite their organizations as more religious/spiritual.

HR professionals in the finance industry were more likely than their counterparts in the health, services (profit) and utilities industries to perceive their organization as more secular. Organizations with operations only in the United States tended to be perceived as more religious.

**Religious Diversity of Employees**

How religiously diverse are organizations? Sixty-four percent reported that their organizations had some degree of religious/spiritual diversity among their employees. Data are shown in Figure 2.

“These data are very surprising, and I have to wonder how employers validated this,” says Chana Anderson, CCP, SPHR-CA, director of human resources at Casa de las Campanas and member of SHRM’s Employee Relations Special Expertise Panel. “Is this simply surmising on behalf of the employers who completed a survey? How do they know this information? This is the common mistake that many corporations and managers within corporations make. We wrongly assume that unless an employee has told us differently, he or she must be just like us. If we reflect upon the diversity of the United States as a whole, the data must surely under-represent the volume of spiritual diversity amongst employees. Spiritual/religious diversity also includes those who do not believe in an established faith or even those who chose not to celebrate birthdays/holidays, yet still may believe in a higher being.”

Not surprisingly, medium and large organizations were more likely to report greater religious/spiritual

When it comes to religious inclusivity, it is in the best interest of all companies—whether secular or slightly more religious—to be aware of their employees’ religious diversity and to be sensitive to the needs of both believers and non-believers.

Georgette Bennett, president and founder, Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding

---

**Table 1 Work Culture Created by Organization Leadership (by Organization Sector)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall (n = 532)</th>
<th>Publicly Owned For-Profit Organization (n = 118)</th>
<th>Privately Owned For-Profit Organization (n = 256)</th>
<th>Nonprofit Organization (n = 106)</th>
<th>Government Agency (n = 58)</th>
<th>Differences Based on Organization Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More secular (little or no influence of religion on organization culture)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Publicly owned for-profit organization, privately owned for-profit organization, government agency &gt; nonprofit organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More religious/spiritual (religious/spiritual beliefs are openly expressed by leaders; prayer has a place in the organization’s culture)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Nonprofit organization &gt; publicly owned for-profit organization, privately owned for-profit organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)
Religion and Corporate Culture

Accommodating Religious Diversity in the Workplace

Some differences also emerged among organizations’ locations. Compared with organizations located in the West (2%), Midwestern organizations (16%) were more likely to report no religious diversity among their employees. Not surprisingly, organizations with multinational operations tended to report a greater degree of religious diversity than organizations based only in the United States (as depicted in Table 3).

“While these findings vary by location and organizational size, changing demographics and globalization are driving the growing focus on religiosity within our workplaces. This is a growing trend that is not likely to abate anytime soon,” remarked Georgette Bennett, Ph.D., member of SHRM’s Workplace Diversity Special Expertise Panel.

Can religious and spiritual diversity play a constructive role in a workplace? Can accommodating spiritual diversity help organizations build high-performing, collaborative teams? Almost all respondents (98%) believe that employees of different religious groups in their organizations work cooperatively (“very cooperatively” and “cooperatively”). These data are shown in Figure 3. Respondents from small organizations, compared with those from large organizations, were more likely to believe that employees of different religious groups in their organizations work cooperatively. According to the *SHRM 2007 State of Workplace Diversity Management Survey Report*, enhancing the ability of people from different backgrounds to work effectively together was reported by diversity practitioners as one of the “extremely important” (91%) outcomes of effective diversity management.¹

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization’s Religious and Spiritual Diversity (by Organization Staff Size)</th>
<th>Overall (n = 537)</th>
<th>Small (1-99 Employees) (n = 154)</th>
<th>Medium (100-499 Employees) (n = 219)</th>
<th>Large (500+ Employees) (n = 164)</th>
<th>Differences Based on Organization Staff Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No religious/spiritual diversity among employees</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Small, medium &gt; large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great degree of religious/spiritual diversity among employees</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Medium, large &gt; small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations Religious and Spiritual Diversity (by Organization Operations Location)</th>
<th>Overall (n = 537)</th>
<th>U.S.-Based Operations Only (n = 345)</th>
<th>Multinational (n = 173)</th>
<th>Differences Based on Organization Operations Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great degree of religious/spiritual diversity among employees</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Multinational &gt; U.S.-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some degree of religious/spiritual diversity among employees</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>U.S.-based &gt; multinational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)

**Faith At Work—are Companies Accommodating?**

According to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which protects employees from religious discrimination, “employers must reasonably accommodate employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs, observances, and practices when requested, unless accommodation would impose an undue hardship on business operations.” These protections apply whether the individual’s religious views are mainstream, non-traditional or non-religious beliefs. A reasonable religious accommodation is any adjustment to the work environment that allows the employee to practice his or her religion.

Religious accommodation, as defined by this study, is any adjustment to the work environment that allows the employee to practice his or her religion.
**Figure 3** Do Religiously Diverse Employees Work Well Together?

- Very uncooperatively: 1%
- Uncooperatively: 47%
- Cooperatively: 51%
- Very cooperatively: 1%

(n = 490)

Note: Excludes respondents who answered "Not sure."

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)

**Figure 4** Religious Accommodations Offered by Organizations

- Take into account the different religious beliefs of employees when planning holiday-related events: 55%
- Allow religious decoration of individual workspace (within one's office/cubicle): 44%
- Allow flexible scheduling to accommodate employees' religious practices at work (e.g., meditating, praying, worshiping, etc.): 43%
- Take into account employees' various religious holidays when planning work-related events (e.g., conferences, meetings, trainings, trips, workshops, etc.): 40%
- Offer variety of food in organization's cafeteria/eatery, meetings, etc. (e.g., halal, kosher, vegetarian, etc.): 27%
- Make dress code and/or personal appearance code exemptions/modifications: 17%
- Create designated area(s) for employees to use for religious practices (e.g., meditation room, prayer room, etc.): 15%
- Allow religious decoration of individual workspace (within one's office/cubicle) during religious holidays only: 12%
- Allow on-site religion-based affinity groups: 9%
- Other: 5%

Note: Percentages do not total to 100% as respondents were allowed multiple choices.

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)
work environment that will allow the employee to practice his or her religion.

HR professionals were asked whether their organizations had offered any type of religious accommodation in the past 12 months. The top three accommodations reported by HR professionals were: taking into account the different religious beliefs of employees when planning holiday-related events; allowing religious decoration of individual workspace; and allowing flexible scheduling to accommodate employees’ religious practices at work (e.g., meditating, praying, worshipping, etc.). These data are illustrated in Figure 4.

“I am not surprised that the top three accommodations reported were as indicated,” notes Michelle Singletary, member of SHRM’s Employee Relations Special Expertise Panel. “These seem to be the most common requests that I’ve seen from employees. Employees are annoyed when holiday-related events tend to favor one group or ignore other groups. Employees tend to want freedom of expression (within reason) of their own work areas, and individuals generally want the freedom, even in scheduling, to express their personal beliefs. It’s HR’s (and supervisors’) responsibility to find a balance—enough balance to allow employees freedom of expression without offending others or creating hostile work environments. I think finding the right balance and providing accommodations where necessary increases employee morale and productivity. It also can help develop an appreciation for diversity.”

“It is important to note a gap between the accommodations most meaningful to employees and those offered by employers,” points out Dr. Georgette Bennett. She notes that in contrast to the current survey, “Tannenbaum’s 1999 survey of employees, Religious Bias in the Workplace, revealed that 89% of employees surveyed said that it was important for companies to provide personal days for religious observance. This includes time off for holidays. However, in the 2008 SHRM survey, only 56% of HR professionals said that their companies offer paid or unpaid time off for the observance of religious holidays. Thus, there is still a major disconnect between the perceptions of employers and employees when it comes to offering religious accommodations.”

Organization staff size affected the type of accommodation offered to employees. While 27% of organizations overall offered food options to accommodate the varying dietary restrictions of employees, large-staff-sized organizations were more likely than medium- or small-staff-sized organizations to offer this accommodation. Likewise, large organizations were more likely than small and medium ones to make dress code and/or personal appearance code exemptions/modifications (17% overall) and allow on-site religion-based affinity groups (9% overall). These data are shown in Table 4.

“I was surprised to see the low percentage of small and medium organizations that reported dress code/appearance accommodations,” remarks Michelle Singletary. “I don’t see any cost factor that would prohibit providing that type of accommodation. I can see cost factors in offering a variety of foods, changing vending machines or designating special areas for prayer, etc., because small organizations may not have the funds to do so.” These data could mean that small and medium organizations receive fewer requests for such accommodations than do large organizations.

I think finding the right balance and providing accommodations where necessary increases employee morale and productivity.

Michelle Singletary, member of SHRM’s Employee Relations Special Expertise Panel

Figure 5: How Organizations Handle Leave for the Observance of Unofficial Religious Holidays

Unpaid leave offered for holidays not regularly covered by organization: 28%
Paid leave offered for holidays not regularly covered by organization: 28%
No leave offered for holidays not regularly covered by organization: 44%

(\(n = 513\))
Note: Excludes respondents whose organizations are open 365 days.
Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)
Also shown in Table 4 are differences in accommodations offered by employers based on their organization’s sector. HR professionals employed by nonprofit organizations were more likely than HR professionals in privately owned for-profit organizations or government agencies to report that their organizations provided their employees with designated area(s) to use for religious practices (e.g., meditation room, prayer room, etc.). Also, nonprofit organizations were more likely to allow on-site religion-based affinity groups than were privately owned for-profit organizations or government agencies. Publicly owned for-profit organizations were more likely to offer a variety of food for different religious groups in their organization’s cafeteria/eatery, meetings, etc., compared with privately owned for-profit organizations.

Few differences in accommodations offered by organizations emerged among industries. HR professionals in the educational services industry indicated that their organizations were more likely to allow on-site religion-based affinity groups than were HR professionals in the services (profit) industry. HR professionals employed in the educational services industry were also more likely to report that their organizations offered a variety of food for different religious groups in their organization’s cafeteria/eatery, meetings, etc., compared with their counterparts employed in the government industry.

The Prevalence of Religious Accommodation in the Workplace

Just as there are many religions across the globe, there are many forms of religious expression tied to a person’s faith that employers may be asked to accommodate in the workplace. Some of these are highlighted in Figure 4. Employees may request time during the day to practice prayer; they may need to avoid contact with members of the opposite sex; they may not be able to work on certain days of the week. Whatever the request, organizations should be prepared to provide employees with a policy and/or procedural path to follow when such requests are made.

Only four out of 10 organizations had a formal avenue for employees to request religious accommodation in the work setting, and of those, large organizations were more likely than small organizations to report having such formal processes in place (Figure 6). Seventy-four percent of companies granted their employees’ requests for religious accommodation in the last 12 months. This suggests that while most

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Religious Accommodations Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong> (n = 372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer variety of food in organization’s cafeteria/eatery, meetings, etc. (e.g., halal, kosher, vegetarian, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make dress code and/or personal appearance code exemptions/modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate area(s) for employees to use for religious practices (e.g., meditation room, prayer room, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow on-site religion-based affinity groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dash “—” indicates that there were no significant differences in this category.  
Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)
employers are attempting to meet the religious needs of their employees, for the most part, these requests are handled informally. Large organizations were more likely than medium-sized organizations to grant religious accommodation request(s) in the last 12 months. These data are illustrated in Figure 7.

In 2008, only 6% of HR professionals reported an increase in the requests for religious accommodation in the last 12 months—compared with 20% in 2001. These data are illustrated in Figure 8. With fewer organizations reporting an increase in religious accommodation requests, it could mean that the 2001 requests have resulted in more satisfactory accommodations. It is also possible that post-9/11, Muslim employees have felt reluctant to make special requests that draw attention to their special needs. Another explanation could be attributed to managers/supervisors informally granting their employees’ religious accommodation requests without formally making HR aware of them. The accommodations requested by employees may be such that managers and supervisors feel they can grant them with relative ease and little or no cost to the employer (e.g., swapping shifts). It could also be that employees may not be aware that they can make such requests. Another reason that fewer organizations might be reporting an increase in religious accommodation requests could be the increase in benefits offered by employers to encourage their employees to achieve a work/life balance. According to SHRM’s 2008 Employee Benefits survey report, 59% of HR professionals indicated their organizations offered flextime, which allowed employees to select their work hours within limits established by the employer. Such ben-

---

One of the reasons that many employers are reluctant to address the issue of religious accommodation is their fear that by granting a few requests, they will open the floodgates to an overwhelming flow of demands.

Georgette Bennett, president and founder, Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding

---

### Figure 6: Percentage of Organizations That Have a Formal Avenue for Employees to Request Religious Accommodations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All organizations (n = 463)</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (1-99 employees) (n = 133)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (100-499 employees) (n = 191)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (500+ employees) (n = 137)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Excludes respondents who answered “Don’t know.” The percentage differences between large organizations and small organizations are statistically significant.

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)

### Figure 7: Percentage of Organizations That Grant Religious Accommodation Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All organizations (n = 231)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (1-99 employees) (n = 54)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (100-499 employees) (n = 96)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (500+ employees) (n = 81)</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Excludes respondents whose organizations have not had such religious accommodation request. The percentage differences between large organizations and medium organizations are statistically significant.

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)
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Benefits may include flexible scheduling, telecommuting, personal days off, compressed work weeks and other scheduling arrangements. These types of arrangements make it easier for employees to practice their religious beliefs. Increased options for flexibility may decrease the necessity to get permission from HR or one’s line manager in order to carry out certain tenets of one’s faith. For example, a practicing Muslim who attends Friday prayer may choose to work a four-day work week (i.e., working four 10-hour days per week) and take every Friday off. While this affords the employee the flexibility to practice his or her faith, the employer may not know that it is accommodating the employee’s religious expression. Lastly, fewer requests may be made by employees simply because they are more reluctant to make special requests in the uncertain economic climate in the United States over the past several years.

Georgette Bennett, Ph.D., member of SHRM’s Workplace Diversity Special Expertise Panel, remarks that “the overwhelming majority of respondents (91% in the past 12 months) reported that the number of religious accommodation requests remained the same. This is an important finding. One of the reasons that many employers are reluctant to address the issue of religious accommodation is their fear that by granting a few requests, they will open the floodgates to an overwhelming flow of demands. Clearly, this is not the case.”

The Impact of Religious Accommodation on Employee Perceptions
To attract and retain the best talent, it is important to provide a work culture and environment that recognize the needs and challenges of employees and also build on employee engagement. HR professionals reported that employee morale and employee retention were most affected by having a workplace that provided religious accommodation for its employees.

It is worth noting that small and medium organizations were more likely than large ones to report employee loyalty as a factor most affected by providing religious accommodations in the workplace. Compared with small organizations, large organizations tended to report that the reputation of an organization is most affected by the provision of religious accommodation in the workplace. This suggests that different organizations may have different reasons for granting accommodations.

“It is striking that employee morale emerges as the indicator most affected by religious accommodation,” says Georgette Bennett, Ph.D., president and founder, Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding, and member of SHRM’s Workplace Diversity Special Expertise Panel. “For this survey question, morale is assigned its own category. Yet, one can easily ar-HR professionals reported that employee morale and employee retention were most affected by having a workplace that provided religious accommodation for its employees.
gue that employee morale is reflected in employee productivity, loyalty and retention rates. (In the 1999 Tanenbaum survey of employees, for example, nearly 50% reported that a perception of bias affected their productivity and 45% of bias victims said that they were considering leaving their current jobs.)"

“In this question, respondents were actually asked to name their top two choices,” continues Dr. Bennett, “and it is interesting that morale still scores significantly higher than the other options. Perhaps these results speak to the importance of companies granting religious accommodations and thereby affirming that employees are welcome to bring their whole selves to work—including their religious identities.”

The Decision-Makers: Who Is Responsible for Granting Religious Accommodation Requests?
HR professionals were primarily responsible for approving accommodation requests, followed by CEOs, immediate manager/supervisors and the senior management team. These data are depicted in Figure 10.

In large organizations, the common avenue for approving accommodation requests was HR, then immediate manager/ supervisor, while CEOs were rarely involved. In small organizations, the CEO/ president of the organization was primarily responsible for approving requests for religious accommodation. Medium organizations were more likely than large organizations to report that their CEO/ president was responsible for approving requests (Table 5).

As shown in Table 5, respondents from publicly owned for-profit organizations were more likely than those from nonprofit organizations to report that HR was primarily responsible for approving religious accommodation requests at their organization. Privately owned for-profit and nonprofit organizations were more inclined than publicly owned for-profits to indicate CEO/president as the responsible party for approving accommodation requests. Privately owned for-profit organizations were also less inclined than nonprofit and government organizations to report immediate manager/supervisor as the main staff person responsible for accommodation approvals.
“I was surprised by the high percentage of organizations that have the HR staff grant religious accommodations, as opposed to having supervisors do so,” notes Michelle Singletary, member of SHRM’s Employee Relations Special Expertise Panel. “I would think that supervisors would be better able to grant an individual employee’s request. These findings suggest that this might be an area where more supervisor training in diversity is needed to empower supervisors to make those decisions. It would be more efficient than having to go through HR for individual accommodation that could be easily resolved.”

**How Religion Is Addressed in Corporate Policies**

Religion is often included as part of an organization’s overall diversity initiative. Nearly one-half of HR professionals responding to the survey indicated that their organization’s formal written policy on religion in the workplace is included in the overall diversity policy. Only 2% of respondents’ organizations have a written policy regarding religion separate from their overall diversity policy. This is an 18% increase from 2001, suggesting that more organizations are realizing the need to address religious expression and accommodation formally—a trend that may be linked to a focus on diversity and inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Primary Responsibility for Approving Religious Accommodations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Differences Based on Organization Staff Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO/president</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate manager/supervisor</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)
on religious discrimination and harassment as a result of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

“It is important to understand what a ‘formal diversity policy’ entails,” says Georgette Bennett, Ph.D., member of SHRM’s Workplace Diversity Special Expertise Panel. “The mere inclusion of religion in a list of protected classes in the boilerplate diversity policy does not address the critical issue of accommodation. Of all the protected classes, religion and disability are the only ones that require accommodation. The best practice is to adopt a distinct religious diversity policy.”

There were differences by organization staff size regarding a formal written religious diversity policy. HR professionals from medium and large organizations were more likely to report that their religious diversity policy was included in their overall diversity policy than were small organizations. Not unexpected, HR professionals from organizations with multinational operations were more likely than their U.S.-based counterparts to report that their religious diversity policy was included in the overall diversity policy.

HR professionals were also asked if their organizations had country/region-specific religious diversity policies for their locations outside of the United States. Only 16% of respondents reported that their organizations had country/region-specific religious diversity policies. HR professionals employed in the publicly owned for-profit sector (37%), compared with HR professionals employed in the privately owned for-profit (10%) and nonprofit (6%) sectors, were more likely to have country/region-specific religious diversity policies for their locations outside of the United States. Privately owned for-profit and nonprofit organizations are less likely to have the resources to establish and manage such a policy outside of the United States.

When asked if religion/spirituality was included as a component in any of their employee training, 37% of HR professionals responded affirmatively. These data are illustrated in Figure 11. There were differences in response to this question by organization sector and organization staff size. HR professionals employed by nonprofit organizations (51%) were more likely to report the inclusion of religion/spirituality in their training than were respondents from privately owned organizations (34%). HR professionals from medium (34%) and small (25%) organizations were less likely than HR professionals from large organizations (52%) to indicate that religion/spirituality was included in employee training at their organizations (Table 7).
HR professionals understand that it is not enough to have policies—training on these policies is very important across the organization. Fifty percent of HR professionals reported that their organizations specifically offered training on religious diversity for their managers/supervisors (Figure 13). Managers and supervisors are responsible for day-to-day implementation of their employer’s policies. Training enables managers and supervisors to understand and apply organization’s policies uniformly and consistently across the organization. Of the respondents whose organizations offered religious diversity as part of their employee training, 58% added it to their employee training in the past five years and 36% in the past 12 months. These data are illustrated in Figure 14.

### Religious Discrimination and Claims: How Common Are They?

As previously mentioned, training enables managers and supervisors to understand and apply organizational policies uniformly and consistently. Uniform application of policies within organizations can help them avoid discrimination claims. Very few respondents (2%) indicated that their organization had been named in the past 12 months as a defendant in a lawsuit related to religion, as shown in Figure 15. This is

---

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall (n = 431)</th>
<th>Differences Based on Organization Sector</th>
<th>Differences Based on Organization Staff Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization includes religion/spirituality in employee training</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Nonprofit organization &gt; privately owned for-profit organization</td>
<td>Large &gt; small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large &gt; medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)

---

**Figure 12**

![Are Religion and Spirituality Included as a Component of Employee Training?](image)

- **Yes**: 37%
- **No**: 63%

(n = 431)

Note: Excludes respondents who answered “not applicable” and “not sure.”

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)

---

**Figure 13**

![Training on Religious Diversity for Managers/Supervisors](image)

- **No**: 50%
- **Yes**: 50%

(n = 151)

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)

---

**Figure 14**

![When Did Employers Add Religion Component to Employee Training?](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12 months (n = 123)</th>
<th>5 years (n = 117)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Excludes respondents whose organizations do not offer employee training, those who responded “not sure” and those respondents whose organizations do not include religion in their employee training.

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM 2008)
SHRM’s 2008 Religion and Corporate Culture survey report reveals that human resource professionals are still grappling with identifying the key religious diversity issues in the workplace and understanding how best to address them. Powerful demographic trends are driving the increased visibility of religion in the workplace. But organizational response has not kept pace. Religious bias complaints to the EEOC have increased 69% over the last 10 years—at a faster rate than race, national origin or sex discrimination claims—and cost businesses $6.4 million in 2007. Much of this bias is driven not by bigotry but by ignorance. According to a Public Agenda/Pew study, only 28% of U.S. respondents profess to have a good understanding of Evangelical Christianity; that number drops to 17% for Judaism and only 7% for Islam.

Thus, in light of a recent Pew Forum’s U.S. Religious Landscape Survey (2008), in which 83% of Americans self-identified as religious, SHRM’s findings show that the workplace mirrors U.S. society. Forty-two percent of respondents indicate some degree of religiosity in their work culture as created by organizational leaders, and 89% report religious/spiritual diversity among its employees. There is also a high level of cooperation (98%) among employees of different religious groups, indicating that employees may be personally invested in creating a work environment that is welcoming to people of many—or no—beliefs or simply that religious differences may not be a factor in employee interactions.

Paying attention to religious diversity is also good for the bottom line. It is no coincidence that employee morale emerged as the factor most affected by companies granting religious accommodations. Morale is intrinsically tied to other areas of concern to HR: recruitment, retention, satisfaction, productivity and employee loyalty.

Although there are countless ways religion becomes a workplace issue, attention to some key areas will help pave the way for a smoother relationship between religious needs and the workplace. Yet the report shows that employers still have work to do in the following critical areas:

- **Holidays/time off:** The HR professionals surveyed revealed that companies are only marginally aware of non-Christian holidays. Only 28% of respondents offer
paid leave for days that are not part of their regular holiday calendar, meaning that for non-Christian employees there is a built-in inequity. Unlike their Christian counterparts, they must use vacation, personal or unpaid days to observe their key holidays. Therefore, flexibility for time off for religious holidays is a major issue.

- Training: Only half of companies are training managers/supervisors in religious diversity issues, while a mere 37% indicate that employees receive any training on religion and spirituality.

- Policies: Of the respondents surveyed, only 2% reported a formal separate policy on religious diversity and nearly half reported no written policy regarding religious diversity. In Tanenbaum’s 1999 Religious Bias in the Workplace survey of employees, about two-thirds of the respondents, regardless of religious background, felt that it was important for companies to have a clear policy on bias and religious discrimination.

- Designated areas for religious practice: A small percentage of the respondents surveyed overall—15%—offered quiet rooms that employees could use for prayer, meditation or reflection during a break in the workday. In large companies (500+ employees), that number rose to 20%, and 31% of nonprofit organizations offered designated space for religious observance. If physical space is not a constraint, many companies are missing out on a relatively easy way to accommodate the religious practices of their employees.

It is also critical to note that this survey reflects the perspective of HR professionals, not employees themselves. An analysis of both Tanenbaum’s 1999 Religious Bias in the Workplace survey of employees and Tanenbaum and SHRM’s 2001 survey on religion in the workplace revealed significant gaps in employer and employee perceptions of religious bias and discrimination in the workplace, and absent data on employee perceptions, there is no reason to assume that the gap has decreased.

Companies can begin to address these issues by weaving religious diversity initiatives into their current policies, training curricula and corporate culture. Recommendations include:

- Offer holiday swapping or floating holiday policies to make it easier for non-Christian employees to take time off to celebrate the holidays that are meaningful to them.

- Provide training and information on religious diversity and inclusivity both at the manager level and in orientation and employee trainings to help all employees understand how they can take steps to create a more inclusive environment at work.

- Develop a formal policy on religion that is distinct from a general diversity policy in order to show employees that their religious beliefs are respected. The mere inclusion of religion in a list of protected classes in the boilerplate diversity policy does not address the critical issue of accommodation.

- Ensure that employees have the flexibility in their schedules and an available space for daily religious practices such as prayer. Quiet rooms that can be used for prayer, meditation or reflection by all employees are widespread in Europe and are becoming increasingly more common in larger U.S. corporations.

In order to be truly effective, religious diversity initiatives must be embedded in the culture of the organization, which includes official policies, employee training and the process of granting accommodations. Beyond these suggested practices, HR professionals must be prepared to address many other religious issues that have already begun to surface at some U.S. companies. For example, HR professionals may be faced with a Sikh employee who wears a turban and grows a beard contrary to the company’s dress policy that excludes headgear and facial hair. Perhaps a conservative Christian employee will raise the issue that the firm’s diversity initiative that’s intended to help LGBT employees feel more included offends him on religious grounds. Or Muslim employees may request that companies add Shariah-compliant retirement options to their 401(k) funds. Possibly, to the discomfort of management, employees will request company funds to start a religious affinity group. Thoughtful reports like SHRM’s 2008 Religion and Corporate Culture report can assist HR professionals in beginning to identify the steps they will need to take in order to fully engage with and address the complex issue of religious diversity in the workplace.

By the Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding www.tanenbaum.org
a slight decrease compared with 2001 (5%) and 1997 (6%). Among the small number of HR professionals who reported that their organization had been named in a lawsuit in the past 12 months (2%), the most recent charge was placed by former employees and the charges were either dismissed (38%), settled outside of court (37%) or still pending (25%).

Although this research shows that only 2% of organizations have been named as a defendant in a lawsuit related to religion, compared with 5% in 2001 and 6% in 1997, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), in fiscal year 2007, reported receiving 2,880 charges of religious discrimination compared with 1,709 charges in 1997. The EEOC reported resolving 2,525 religious discrimination charges and recovered $6.4 million ($2.2 million in 1997) in monetary benefits for charging parties and other aggrieved individuals (not including monetary benefits obtained through litigation). It could be that HR professionals, for whatever reason, are reluctant to report that their organizations have been sued in relation to religion.

With the increase in religious discrimination charges filed with the EEOC significantly up from 1997, HR professionals will serve their organizations well by creating, reviewing and updating their discrimination and harassment policies. Consistently communicating and training their employees will increase awareness and reduce time and resources spent on conflict resolution.

The Section 12 of the 2008 Compliance Manual – Religious Discrimination released by the EEOC is a practical resource on Title VII’s prohibition against religious discrimination. The EEOC Compliance Manual includes detailed guidance, legal citations, case examples and best practices. It is important for HR professionals to become familiar with the contents of this manual. HR professionals are regularly involved with developing their organizations’ policies and serving as a resource for discriminatory issues in the workplace. Other practical resources from the EEOC on religious discrimination are Questions and Answers: Religious Discrimination in the Workplace and Best Practices for Eradicating Religious Discrimination in the Workplace.

The Relationship Between Faith and Work

In trying to understand how inclusive organizations have become in the past 12 months regarding faith in the workplace, the survey inquired about the effects of faith on business and employees. Responses on this...
issue are depicted in Table 8. The majority (93%) of respondents reported no change (responded ‘stayed the same’) in employees objecting to certain duties based on religious/spiritual beliefs (e.g., pharmacist refusing to fill birth control prescriptions, waiter/waitress refusing to serve alcohol, etc.) and complaints from employees concerning other employees’ dress and/or personal appearance related to their religion. Respondents reported a decrease in employees harassing co-workers because of religious/spiritual

Is your organization in compliance? What do businesses need to do to prevent religious discrimination in the workplace?

According to the SHRM Legal Report, employers should attempt to fulfill three basic requirements in order to protect employees against religious discrimination and be in compliance with the EEOC’s Title VII requirements. An excerpt is provided below.

**Adverse Action Based on Religion:** Employers may not take adverse action against employees because of their religious beliefs or practices. Fortunately, we live in a sufficiently tolerant country where blatant cases of religious discrimination are exceedingly rare. However, as is the case with other forms of prohibited discrimination, an employee need not have evidence of explicit animosity toward his or her religious beliefs to recover. All an employee needs to show to establish liability is that he or she was treated differently because of the employee’s religious beliefs.

**Reasonable Accommodation:** An employer has a duty to accommodate an employee’s religious practices or beliefs when an employee makes a request for accommodation. A refusal to accommodate is justified only when the employer can show that the accommodation would result in an undue hardship. However, in sharp contrast to the laws regarding disability discrimination, accommodation of religious practices and beliefs need not be offered if the accommodation would require more than de minimis cost. In other words, “undue hardship” is liberally interpreted in the employer’s favor. Furthermore, the employee is not necessarily entitled to the accommodation that he or she would prefer even if that accommodation could be offered without undue hardship. The Supreme Court has held that all Title VII requires is that the employer offer some form of accommodation, and if that accommodation is in fact sufficient, that ends the employer’s obligation.

**Religious Harassment:** An emerging area of litigation with respect to religious discrimination under Title VII is the issue of religious harassment. There have already been a number of reported cases dealing with the issue of religious harassment. As one might expect, the religious harassment cases that occur most frequently are those in which supervisors or co-workers demean an employee’s religious beliefs or practices through insults, gestures or other belittling conduct. For example, in one recent case, *Turner v. Barr*, an employee alleged that he was subjected to a hostile work environment on the basis of his Jewish faith. The court determined the employer was, in fact, liable for religious harassment when the employee produced evidence at trial that, among other things, one of his supervisors made “humorous” references to the Holocaust, he was subjected to a stream of comments with respect to the supposed skill of Jews in handling and dealing with money, and supervisors and co-workers made various other inappropriate statements or “jokes.” Needless to say, if an employer has notice of such inappropriate behavior, it must take quick remedial action, just as it would in a case of alleged sexual harassment.

beliefs (11%), employees feeling harassed because co-workers express religious/spiritual beliefs (7%) and supervisors trying to convert subordinates to their own doctrine/faith (7%).

Although this question was asked differently in 2001, it is worth noting that compared with 2008, there were decreases in employees trying to convert other employees to their own doctrine/faith, employees objecting to certain duties based on their religious beliefs and complaints from employees concerning other employees’ dress and/or personal appearance related to their religion.

**Are U.S. Businesses Flexible With Religious Holidays?**

Which religious holidays were official holidays for organizations? As shown in Table 9, an overwhelming number of respondents in 2008 indicated Christmas (99%), followed by Christmas Eve (44%) and Good Friday (29%), as the top official religious holidays offered by organizations. Compared with the results of the 2001 survey, these holidays have not changed. Christianity continues to be the leading religion in the United States, and therefore, it is not surprising that almost all of the respondents reported Christian holidays as the top religious holidays offered by their organizations. Georgette Bennett, Ph.D., president and founder, Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding, and member of SHRM’s Workplace Diversity Special Expertise Panel, remarks that “the data on official religious holidays confirms that when it comes to holidays and time off, our workplace calendars are developed from a Christian mindset. It is notable that 4% of respondents in 2008 and 6% in 2001 indicated the “Other” category. We assume that Diwali, the Eid, etc., are included, but the lack of clarity points to the need for innovative HR policies like holiday swapping and floating holidays. There will always be holidays in the “Other” category that are not familiar to HR but significant to some employees.”

As illustrated earlier in Figure 5, almost six out of 10 HR professionals reported that their organizations offered paid/unpaid leave for the observance of religious days or holidays not covered by their organizations’ regular holiday schedule.

“The fact that only 28% of respondents offer paid leave for days that are not part of their regular holiday calendar is a serious accommodation gap that needs to be addressed,” explains Dr. Georgette Bennett. Employers can address this accommodation gap by encouraging their employees to take advantage of their organizations’ flexible work schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
<th>Effects of Religion and Spirituality in the Workplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees feeling harassed because co-workers express religious/spiritual beliefs (n = 357)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees trying to convert other employees to their own doctrine/faith (proselytizing) (n = 323)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees harassing co-workers because of religious/spiritual beliefs (n = 356)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees objecting to certain duties based on religious/spiritual beliefs [e.g., pharmacist refusing to fill birth control prescriptions, waiter/waitress refusing to serve alcohol, etc.] (n = 338)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints from employees concerning other employees’ dress and/or personal appearance related to their religion (n = 368)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors trying to convert subordinates to their own doctrine/faith (proselytizing) (n = 312)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)
Organizations in manufacturing (durable goods), compared with organizations in newspaper publishing/broadcasting, educational services, finance, health and service (profit and nonprofit) industries were less likely to offer paid leave for the observance of religious days or holidays not covered by their organizations’ regular holiday schedules. Compared with small and medium organizations, large organizations were more likely to offer paid leave. Differences also emerged among organizations’ sectors. Privately owned for-profit organizations were less likely than publicly owned for-profit and nonprofit organizations to offer paid leave for the observance of religious days/holidays not covered by their regular holiday schedules. These data are not depicted in a table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Day</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Eve</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Friday</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yom Kippur</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Wednesday</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanukkah</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosh Hashanah</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not total 100% as respondents were allowed multiple choices.
Source: Religion and Corporate Culture Survey Report (SHRM, 2008)

Conclusions

As the focus on diversity and inclusion in the workplace grows, so does the visibility of faith in the workplace. When the organization’s values align with those of its employees, there is positive impact on employee and customer loyalty, productivity and customer satisfaction. This study found that employee morale (62%), retention (38%) and loyalty (37%) are most affected when organizations grant religious accommodation to their employees.

The tenets of many religions, such as acting with integrity and treating others with respect, can easily be incorporated into workplace conduct. These tenets in most cases serve as an ethical compass and part of the individual’s well-being. Organizations can benefit by tapping into the religious diversity of their workforce. By creating diverse teams within their organizations, employers will be able to make the most of the unique talents, experiences and backgrounds of their workforce to succeed in a very competitive global marketplace.
Methodology

A sample of HR professionals for this survey was randomly selected from SHRM’s membership database, which included approximately 225,000 individual members at the time the survey was conducted. Only members who had not participated in a SHRM survey or poll in the last four months were included in the sampling frame. Members who were students, located internationally or had no e-mail address on file were excluded from the sampling frame. In April 2008, an e-mail that included a hyperlink to the SHRM 2008 Religion/Spirituality in the Workplace Survey was sent to 3,000 randomly selected SHRM members. Of these, 2,773 e-mails were successfully delivered to respondents, and 543 HR professionals responded, yielding a response rate of 20%. The survey was accessible for a period of three weeks, and three e-mail reminders and a fax reminder were sent to nonrespondents in an effort to increase response rates. The sample of HR professionals was generally representative of SHRM membership population, although there were some differences by industry and staff size of respondents’ organizations.

Notations

Analysis
Analyses by HR professionals’ staff size, industry, region, operations location and employment sector are presented and discussed, when applicable. When appropriate, the general results from the current survey of HR professionals are compared with a previous survey. In some cases, the data are not depicted in corresponding tables/figures even though the results are statistically significant.

- **Industry categories:** only industries that had 20 or more respondents were included in industry analyses. Although respondents from other industries participated in the study, analysis from industries with fewer than 20 respondents sometimes yields inconclusive or questionable results.

- **Organization staff size categories:** small (1 to 99 employees), medium (100 to 499 employees) and large (500 or more employees). The analysis by staff size refers to the number of part-time and full-time employees at the HR professional’s work location only.

- **Organization sector:** publicly owned for-profit organization, privately owned for-profit organization, nonprofit organization, government sector and ‘other.’ Results are not presented for ‘other’ employment sectors due to the small number of organizations in this category.

- **Organization region:** the U.S. Census Bureau recognizes four census regions within the United States, and these regions are groupings of the 50 states.

- **Organization operations location:** U.S.-based operations only and multinational.

Differences
Conventional statistical methods were used to determine if observed differences were statistically significant (i.e., there is a small likelihood that the differences occurred by chance). Therefore, in most cases, only results that were significant are included, unless otherwise noted. It is also important to note that in some cases, data may be discussed in the text of this report but not presented in an accompanying figure or table.

Tables
Unless otherwise noted in a specific table, please note that the following are applicable to data depicted in tables throughout this report.
- Data are sorted in descending order by “overall” column in a table.

- Percentages for a question or a response option may not total 100% due to rounding.

- Tables include only response options for which there were significant differences.

- For tables by organization staff size, the sample size is based on the actual number of respondents by organization staff size who answered the question using the response options provided.

- For tables by organization sector, the sample size is based on the actual number of respondents by organization sector who answered the question using the response options provided.

- For tables by organization operations location, the sample size is based on the actual number of respondents by organization operations location who answered the question using the response options provided.

**Figures**

Unless otherwise noted in a specific figure, please note that the following are applicable to data depicted in figures throughout this report.

- Percentages for a question may not total 100% due to rounding.

**Number of respondents**

The number of respondents (indicated by “n” in figures and tables) varies from table to table and figure to figure because some respondents did not answer all of the questions. Individuals may not have responded to a question on the survey because the question or some of its parts were not applicable or because the requested data were unavailable. This also accounts for the varying number of responses within each table or figure.

**Confidence level and margin of error**

A confidence level and margin of error give readers some measure of how much they can rely on survey responses to represent all SHRM members. Given the level of response to the survey, SHRM Research is 96% confident that responses given by responding HR professionals can be applied to all SHRM members, in general, with a margin of error of approximately 4%. For example, 40% of the responding HR professionals reported that their organization has a formal avenue for employees to request religious accommodation. With a 4% margin of error, the reader can be 96% certain that between 36% and 44% of SHRM members work for organizations that have a formal avenue for employees to request religious accommodation. It is important to know that as the sample size decreases, the margin of error increases.

**Generalization of results**

As with any research, readers should exercise caution when generalizing results and take individual circumstances and experiences into consideration when making decisions based on these data. While SHRM is confident in its research, it is prudent to understand that the results presented in this survey report are only truly representative of the sample of HR professionals responding to the survey.
## About the Respondents

### Organization Staff Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (1-99 employees)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (100-499 employees)</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (500 and more employees)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 537)

### Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services (profit)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (durable goods)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (nonprofit)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale/retail trade</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (nondurable goods)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-tech</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and mining/oil and gas</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper publishing/broadcasting</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 540)

### Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned for-profit organization</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately owned for-profit organization</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit organization</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 539)

### Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midwest (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Montana, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 521)

### Operations Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-based operations only</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multinational</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 540)
Endnotes


4. Ibid


6. This survey instrument is available upon request by contacting the SHRM Survey Program at surveys@shrm.org or by phone at 703-535-6301.

7. Compared with the general SHRM membership, more HR professionals in the sample were from medium-staff-sized organizations and fewer from large-staff-sized organizations. HR professionals in this sample were more likely to be from the services (profit) and health industries.
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007 Corporate Social Responsibility Pilot Study (56 pages, April 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Management Practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health/Safety/Security</th>
<th>Management Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR’s Evolving Role in Organizations and Its Impact on Business Strategy (54 pages, May 2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other SHRM Resources on Religion

*Understanding Religion in the Workplace—A Product of the SHRM Diversity Initiative* (2001)


To access these publications, please visit www.shrm.org

- SHRM Survey Brief: Green Workplace (6 pages, January 2008)
- The Look and Feel of Strategic HR—Conversations With Senior HR Executives (24 pages, December 2006)
- 2006 Strategic HR Management Survey Report (39 pages, October 2006)
- Manufacturing Industry Findings on Human Resource Topics (57 pages, August 2006)

**Selection and Placement**

- SHRM and CCHRA 2008 Global Talent Sourcing in the United States and Canada (53 pages, March 2008)
- 2007 Advances in E-Recruiting Leveraging the Jobs Domain Survey Report (44 pages, June 2007)
- Finding and Keeping the Right Talent—A Strategic View (7 pages, November 2006)
- Are They Really Ready to Work Survey Report (64 pages, October 2006)

**Training and Development**


To access these reports and for a complete listing of all SHRM Survey Products, please visit www.shrm.org/surveys.
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