

How Many Hispanics are Catholic? A Review of Survey Data and Methodology*

by

Paul Perl, Jennifer Z. Greely, and Mark M. Gray

Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate
Georgetown University

A more recent version of this paper has been tentatively accepted for publication in the Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion.

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2004 meeting of the Association for the Sociology of Religion, San Francisco. We thank Michael Davern for valuable advice on analysis of telephone service interruption.

The Pew Hispanic Center and the Kaiser Family Foundation bear no responsibility for the interpretations offered, or conclusions made based on analysis of the Pew Hispanic Center/Kaiser Family Foundation 2002 National Survey of Latinos data.

Direct correspondence to Paul Perl, Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, 2300 Wisconsin Ave. NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20007. E-mail: pmp2@georgetown.edu

How Many Hispanics are Catholic? A Review of Survey Data and Methodology

Abstract

The proportion of Hispanics who are Catholic and Protestant remains unclear, partly because of varying survey methodologies and limited understanding of how that variation affects estimates of Hispanic religious identification. We compare results and methodologies of 11 national surveys conducted since 1990. Our review suggests English-only interviewing artificially inflates Protestant identification among Hispanics. Additionally, defining Hispanic ethnicity based on national origin or ancestry may inflate Catholic identification. We also use survey data to explore effects of sampling bias, non-coverage bias, and weighting on religious identification. Analyses suggest post-stratification weighting is advisable, particularly for language use. However, weighting is not a substitute for extensive coverage of difficult to reach sub-populations such as recent immigrants and Spanish-only speakers. We conclude that 70 percent or slightly more is a reasonable estimate of the proportion of adult Hispanics who are Catholic, and 20 percent a reasonable estimate of the proportion Protestant or other Christian.

Estimates of the proportion of Hispanics or Latinos¹ in the United States who identify as Catholic vary considerably, from slightly over half to 90 percent (e.g., Froehle and Gautier 2000:17; U.S. Department of Health and Human Resources 2000). No clear consensus has emerged among scholars, and debate persists among church leaders and activists. Recently, one of the authors heard journalist and author Peter Steinfelds say he had omitted in-depth discussion of Hispanics from his book on the state of the American Catholic Church, *A People Adrift*, in part because of conflicting information about the number of Hispanic Catholics and the rate at which this population is growing. In this paper, we sort through available evidence on the proportion of Hispanics who are Catholic. Although our primary focus is on Catholicism, we also examine the related issue of the proportion of Hispanics who are Protestant or other Christian. Our goal is – if not to arrive at exact figures – at least to narrow the range considerably and suggest what survey methods are best suited for addressing the topic of Hispanic or Latino religious identification. First we review existing survey evidence on the religious identification of adult Hispanics in the United States. Then we analyze data from a recent telephone poll to better understand how sampling bias, non-coverage bias, and post-stratification weighting are likely to affect estimates.

The Problem: Difficulties Measuring Religious Identification of Hispanics

The terms Hispanic and Latino refer to a particular ethnicity and are not race categories. For this reason, the U.S. Census Bureau asks about Hispanic ethnicity in a question that is separate from race. There were slight differences in the Hispanic origin questions used by the Census in 1990 and 2000. The 1990 Census questionnaire asked: “Is this person of Spanish/Hispanic origin?” and the 2000 Census questionnaire asked, “Is this person

Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?” Furthermore, the Census Bureau determined between the 1990 and 2000 censuses that presenting the race question after the question on Hispanic identification improved the reporting for both race and Hispanic ethnicity (Cresce, Schmidley, and Ramirez 2004). Consequently, in the 2000 Census form the Hispanic question and race question were reversed so that race identification now follows Hispanic origin. A plurality of Hispanics in the United States identify their race as white.² Nine percent of the U.S. population in the 1990 Census and 12 percent in the 2000 Census identified as Hispanic or Latino.

According to Census figures, the Hispanic population in the United States grew from 22.3 million in 1990 (Gibson and Jung 2002) to 39.9 million in 2003 (U.S. Census Bureau 2004), an increase of 78 percent. Over the same time span, the non-Hispanic population grew from 226.4 million to 250.9 million, an increase of 11 percent. The higher growth rate for Hispanics is due to a combination of immigration and a higher birth rate (Malone et al. 2003; Downs 2003). Data reported by Ramirez and de la Cruz (2003) indicate that 21 percent of the Hispanic population in 2002 had immigrated to the United States during the period of 1990 to 2002. Thirty-four percent of the Hispanic population in 2002 was under the age of 18, compared with just 23 percent of non-Hispanic whites (Ramirez and de la Cruz 2003). Given the relatively high rate of growth in the U.S. Hispanic population and the national origin of most Hispanics in predominately Catholic countries – two-thirds report their origin as Mexico and nearly one-quarter as Central/South America or Puerto Rico (Ramirez and de la Cruz 2003) – it is not a tremendous leap to infer a great deal of growth in Hispanic Catholics. In fact, virtually nobody disputes that the number of Hispanic Catholics in the U.S. is growing rapidly. However,

identifying the *proportion* of Hispanics who identify as Catholic, and the extent to which it is changing, is not a straightforward task.

The high rate of immigration of Hispanics complicates this task, setting in motion two apparently countervailing trends. First, evidence indicates that over the course of recent decades the proportion of U.S. Hispanics who are Catholic has declined while the proportion who are Protestant has increased (Hunt 1999; Kosmin, Mayer, and Keysar 2001; Greeley 1988, 1997; see also Greeley 1990: 120-123). However, Espinosa, Elizondo, and Miranda (2003) note that second and third generation Hispanics are more likely than their first generation counterparts to identify as Protestant. This suggests that conversion from Catholicism to Protestantism often accompanies assimilation. Thus, while it is reasonable to expect continuing defection to Protestantism among the children and grandchildren of Hispanic immigrants, the sheer number of new Hispanic Catholic arrivals slows down the overall rate of growth in Hispanic Protestantism (Espinosa et al. 2003).

These findings are, of course, derived from surveys. Because the Census Bureau does not ask about religion, random sample surveys of individuals are the best method for measuring religious identification in the U.S. population. Data taken from church records or surveys of congregations are occasionally used for this purpose but are ultimately inadequate. For example, one can count Hispanics affiliated with Catholic and Protestant congregations in a geographic area and divide by the total Hispanics residing in the area, as taken from the Census or *Current Population Survey (CPS)*. One problem is that many religious adherents are not registered as congregation members, something that is particularly true of Hispanic Catholics (Davidson 2000). Our own unpublished analyses of survey data show that 53 percent of Hispanic Catholics

are registered parishioners compared to 71 percent of Anglo Catholics. Even among those who report attending Mass at least once a week, the registration rates are 65 and 86 percent, respectively.³ Congregation records are also fraught with accuracy problems. Some church members (particularly those residing in urban areas) are registered at multiple congregations. And many congregations are slow to clean their membership roles of those who have moved away or simply left the faith altogether.

Because they require no base level of congregational involvement, surveys of individuals are superior to data from congregations for understanding rates of religious identification. However such surveys also have disadvantages. One is that most surveys are limited to adults. Thus it becomes necessary to make supplemental calculations about the proportion of children and teens who are Catholic or Protestant. In this paper we focus on adult Hispanics and leave the issue of Hispanic children and teens for future research. Another salient disadvantage is that all surveys miss some individuals. Most obviously, telephone polls miss people residing in households without telephones. Even face-to-face surveys are likely to provide incomplete coverage of certain difficult-to-reach populations. This is particularly pertinent to the study of Hispanics because recent immigrants and migrant workers are probably among those most likely to be excluded by even the best surveys.

A final disadvantage is that polling methods vary greatly, probably contributing to varying results for religious identification. We consider three aspects of variation in polling methodology that are particularly relevant for surveying Hispanics. (1) Some surveys are conducted in English only while other surveys are bilingual. (2) Polls are inconsistent in how they define who is and who is not Hispanic. Some polls identify Hispanics based on questions

about ancestry or national origin rather than the Census approach of asking people directly if they are Hispanic or Latino. Even polls that do ask this directly often use different wording. (3) Surveys vary in whether or not sampling and post-stratification weighting are used. Surveys that do use weighting vary in whether post-stratification is based on population characteristics of Hispanics. In the following section, we explore the implications of variation in polling methodology by examining results from previous surveys.

A Review of Existing Survey Evidence

Table 1 lists 11 national surveys conducted since 1990 that provide an estimate of religious identification among Hispanics or Latinos. Three of the surveys are well-known recurring academic studies, the *General Social Survey (GSS)*, the *National Election Studies (NES)*, and the *World Values Study (WVS)*. Others have been chosen because of large numbers of Hispanics (some are polls of Hispanics only) or because of a focus on religion. Most of the surveys are telephone polls. The exceptions are the *GSS*, the *WVS*, and the *Latino National Political Survey (LNPS)*, which use in-person interviewing, and the *NES*, which employs both telephone and in-person interviewing.

The surveys in Table 1 are divided into two categories: surveys of the general public – which have all been conducted primarily or exclusively in English – and bilingual surveys that focus on Hispanics or Latinos. The table presents each survey’s estimate of the percentage of Hispanic respondents who identify themselves as Catholic, as Protestant or other Christian, and as having no religion. The table also presents the number of Hispanic respondents in each survey. Percentages have been generated using the weighting variable (if any) recommended by the original data collectors. Wherever possible, percentages and *Ns* exclude invalid responses

(refusals and “don’t know”s). In every case where the data are publicly available⁴ we have run the numbers ourselves. For the others, we have relied on published information, occasionally supplemented by personal communications with the original researchers. The Appendix provides additional information about the polls in Table 1, including the question or method used to identify respondents as Hispanic or Latino, whether weighting has been used to generate the percentages, and the percentage of interviews conducted in Spanish.

[Table 1 About Here]

The lowest proportion Catholic – 47 percent – comes from the 1999-2000 wave of the *World Values Study*. The highest proportion – 76 percent – comes from the *Latino National Political Survey*. The proportion Protestant or other Christian⁵ ranges from 14 percent (*LNPS*) to 39 percent (1996 *NES*). The proportion who identify with no religion⁶ ranges, from 6 percent (e.g., 2004 *National Survey of Latinos*) to 25 percent (1999-2000 *WVS*). The latter two ranges should perhaps be qualified because of two outliers. The *WVS* produces a higher level of no religion than other surveys because of the wording of its religious identification question. The *WVS* asks, “do you belong to a religious denomination?” Perhaps because of confusion or discomfort with the concept of a “denomination,” this leads to a relatively high proportion of all respondents reporting no religion, including a fifth to a quarter of Hispanics. Excluding the *WVS*, the range for no religion is 6 to 15 percent. The *NES* estimate for Protestants or other Christians is higher than that of other surveys, including other surveys with low estimates for Catholics. The reason is not obvious. However, it should be noted that the *NES* is not truly a survey of the “general public” but of U.S. citizens; it excludes immigrants who are non-citizens.⁷ We speculate below about other possible reasons why so many in this survey identify as

Protestants/other Christians in this survey. Even when excluding the *NES* the range is 14 to 29 percent, with the latter estimate doubling the former.

BILINGUAL INTERVIEWING

What accounts for the variation in religious identification among the polls? Bilingual interviewing stands out as one source. In the last five or six years estimates for proportion Catholic from the predominately-English surveys (the first panel in Table 1) range from the upper forties to the mid 60s. The *Religion and Public Life Survey*, which uses English only, produces estimates in the range of 51 to 61 percent Catholic. The two most recent waves of the *World Values Study*, the second of which was entirely in English, put the proportion Catholic at 59 and 47 percent (albeit with low *Ns*). The estimate produced by the English-only *American Religious Identification Survey* is 57 percent. The *National Election Studies*, which have been conducted in entirely in English since 1994, have yielded estimates in the mid to upper 50s in the last decade, with the exception of 64 percent in 1998. The English-only *General Social Survey* produces some of the highest estimates in the first panel: 63 percent Catholic in 2000 and 67 percent in 2002.

In contrast, all but one of the bilingual surveys in Table 1 yield an estimate in the upper sixties to mid 70s. Note that Spanish was used in at least half the interviews of the bilingual surveys for which information is available. (Forty-nine percent of respondents to the 2003 version of the *National Survey of Latinos* were interviewed primarily in Spanish, the *lowest* level of Spanish interviewing – see the Appendix.) An indication of the importance of Spanish interviewing in reaching Hispanics is that Hispanics make up only 4 to 8 percent of all respondents in most of the predominately-English surveys (see the Appendix). The finding of

Epinosa and colleagues (2003) that Hispanics of the second and third generations (and who most likely can be interviewed in English) identify as Catholic at a lower rate lends support to the inference that those who are excluded are disproportionately Catholic.

IDENTIFYING HISPANICS

Another possible source of variation among surveys in Table 1 lies in the way they identify Hispanics. All but two use an approach similar to that of the Census – directly asking respondents if they think of themselves as Hispanic or Latino. The two surveys in Table 1 that depart substantially from the approach of the Census are the *WVS* and the *LNPS*. It is difficult to imagine a more cumbersome measure of racial and ethnic identity than that used in the *World Values Study*. Respondents are asked: “Which of the following best describes you?” and presented a list of five statements, one of which reads, “Above all, I am an Hispanic American.” Other, parallel, statements substitute “white American,” “black American,” and “Asian American.” Thus the question makes racial categories (such as white and black) mutually exclusive from Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. Perhaps an even greater difficulty is that another response category states, “I am an American first, and then a member of some ethnic group.” Roughly 30-40 percent of all respondents (depending on which wave of the *WVS* is examined) choose this option and remain essentially unidentified on race and ethnicity.

World Values Survey interviewers separately record the race or ethnicity of respondents based on their own physical observation. In the 1999-2000 wave, one of the options for interviewers to record was “Hispanic.” This measure has its own problems, including interviewer effects, and we have deliberately chosen not to use it for Table 1. Still, the fact that 21 of 98 respondents coded as Hispanic by the interviewer chose to describe themselves as

“American first” may provide a very general idea of the number of Hispanics who remain unidentified.⁸ As discussed above, the *WVS* produces the lowest proportion of Hispanics identifying as Catholic. This is due in large part to a relatively high proportion of respondents who report no affiliation. However, given the tenuous measure of Hispanic ethnicity, it is perhaps not surprising that the *World Values Study* is an outlier on Hispanic religious identification.

The *Latino National Political Study* identifies Hispanics indirectly, with questions about national origin. To qualify for the study, respondents had to have at least one parent or two grandparents solely of Puerto Rican, Mexican, or Cuban origin. For reasons related to the original purpose of the study, Hispanics of other origins (e.g., Central/South America and Spain only) were excluded. This exclusion obviously makes the survey somewhat less than ideal for understanding characteristics of all Hispanics. However, the emphasis on national origin – as well as setting a minimum number of parents or grandparents as a criteria – is well removed from the Census approach of allowing people to identify as Hispanic or Latino based on any subjective criteria of their own choosing.

What are the likely consequences of this approach? The *GSS* offers an opportunity to compare samples produced by a Census-style definition of Hispanic ethnicity and an ancestry-based definition. The *GSS* first included a question about Hispanic ethnicity in 2000. Prior to 2000, researchers using the *GSS* to investigate Hispanics (e.g., Greeley 1988, 1997; Hunt 1999) had to rely on an ancestry question: “From what countries or part of the world did your ancestors come?” Using the combined 2000 and 2002 *GSS*, we recreated Hunt’s (1999) approach to identifying Hispanics based on four ancestries: Mexico, Puerto Rico, Spain, and

“Other Spanish.”⁹ Substituting this definition leads to the gain of 18 individuals and the loss of 80. The net result is a loss of 62 individuals, decreasing the sample size of Hispanics from 414 to 352. This change marginally increases the proportion who are Catholic, from 65 to 67 percent. For the year 2000 alone, the increase in Catholic identification is larger, from 67 to 71 percent.

We suspect that identifying Hispanics on the basis of national origin or ancestry may distort religious identification, though perhaps only subtly. Of the 80 *GSS* respondents who are lost when going from the Hispanic question to Hunt’s (1999) ancestry definition, 30 are people who report one of the ancestries Hunt uses but do not identify most strongly with it. Nineteen are people who do not provide any ancestry at all or give an indeterminate response such as “other,” “American only,” or something uncodeable. The remaining 31 respondents provide ancestries that fit none of the categories Hunt uses (15 mention only white European ancestries and 16 mention at least one non-European ancestry). Members of the first two groups are Hispanics who are multi-ethnic/multi-racial or who do not identify with a particular nationality. They are probably less likely than other Hispanics to be first generation Americans and more likely to be assimilated. Though more ambiguous, those who mention no nationality associated with Hispanic ethnicity are presumably even more assimilated. Given the apparent inverse relationship between assimilation and the likelihood of identifying as Catholic (Espinosa et al. 2003; Brodie et al. 2002), it is easy to see how losing these individuals from the sample might inflate the proportion Catholic. Indeed, only 59 percent of those in the first two groups identify as Catholic. For those who report none of the ancestries Hunt uses, the proportion is even lower, 40 percent. Based on this evidence, we counsel caution with estimates from polls

such as the *Latino National Political Survey*, which departs even further from the Census approach than does the *GSS*.¹⁰

WEIGHTING

Weighting is used by researchers to correct for intentional for over- and under-sampling of particular groups and for departure of respondent characteristics from population characteristics due to non-response or other error. Strictly speaking, sampling (or inverse probability) weights correct for the former and post-stratification weights for the latter; in practice, creating the two types of weights typically involves very similar processes (e.g., Gelman and Little 1998). A majority of surveys in Table 1 have weighting variables. Weighting is of particular interest in the surveys focusing on Hispanics. First, because of the high cost of reaching Hispanics through true random sampling, some of these surveys use stratified samples, for example over-sampling urban areas or high-density Hispanic neighborhoods (see the Appendix for details). Second, because the surveys focus on Hispanics, post-stratification weights can match demographic characteristics of the Hispanic population.

We explored the impact of weighting in the surveys for which datasets have been made publically available. In cases where a weighting variable was created by the original researchers, we ran frequencies for religious identification with and without weighting. The results are consistent: weighting never makes more than a few percentage point's difference. It makes the largest difference for two of the bilingual polls: the *National Survey on Latinos in America* and the *2002 National Survey of Latinos*. When weighting is *not* used, the proportion of Catholics drops four percentage points in each of these polls. Though not trivial, it is difficult to describe this change as anything but small. Weighting produces even smaller changes in other

surveys. For example the proportions of 1990-2002 *NES* respondents who identify as Catholic and Protestant remain virtually unchanged when weighting is not used.¹¹

It is perhaps easy to understand why weighting would make little difference for the *NES*, which is a survey of U.S. citizens. Post-stratification is based on characteristics of the entire citizen population and not specifically on characteristics of the Hispanics or Latino population. However, weighting also has a relatively limited effect on religious identification in the surveys of Hispanics for which data are publically available. It is instructive to examine the factors used for weighting in the *LNPS* and in the *National Survey of Latinos* – the two surveys of Hispanics for which researchers have provide detailed information on weighting. The two surveys use remarkably similar approaches; both correct for stratified sampling by region or residential location; both weight on the basis of national origin (in part to correct for intentional over-sampling of Hispanics of particular origins); and both weight to the age and sex distribution of the national Hispanic population.

Weighting by national origin is beneficial because religious identification varies by origin. The 2002 *National Survey of Latinos* finds that Puerto Ricans and Salvadorans are more likely than Cubans to identify as Protestant – and Cubans more likely than Mexicans or Dominicans. This is consistent with Greeley’s (1988) analysis of *GSS* respondents, which indicates that defection from Catholicism to Protestantism is greater among those of Puerto Rican than Mexican descent. For similar reasons, weighting by region or residential area seems important. Hispanics of various national origins are not evenly distributed across the nation, and failure to weight for this could conceivably skew results for religious identification. Polls that stratify their samples by over-selecting high-density Hispanic neighborhoods face similar risks

because of the tendency of recent immigrants to settle in neighborhoods with large numbers of people sharing their national origin. Nevertheless, the small impact made by weighting suggests that perhaps stratified sampling does not, in practice, necessarily skew religious identification greatly. What is noteworthy in our view is that these two studies do not weight to demographic characteristics that are strongly associated with assimilation among Hispanics, particularly generation (i.e., nativity) and language use.

In summary, our review of existing research appears to highlight the importance of obtaining a full national representation of the Hispanic population for studying Hispanic religious identification. The strongest indicator of this is an apparent relationship between bilingual interviewing and responses on religious identification. However, a few questions remain. First, are respondents interviewed in Spanish indeed more likely than those interviewed in English to identify as Catholic? If so, which indicator of assimilation is more strongly related to religious identification, language use or generation? Second, how does sampling bias (i.e., non-response bias) in a “typical” poll tend to affect estimates of Hispanic religious identification? Third, why does post-stratification weighting tend to have such a small effect when estimating religious identification? Is there any way that it can be improved for this purpose? Finally, how does the use of telephone polling – and the consequent exclusion of households without telephones – affect estimates of Hispanic religious identification?

Understanding the Impact of Sampling Bias, Coverage Bias, and Post-Stratification in Telephone Polls of Hispanics

In this section we explore under- and over-sampling of particular types of Hispanics in telephone polls and the effectiveness of post-stratification weighting in correcting for this. We

use data from the *2003 CARA Catholic Poll (CCP)* conducted by the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate at Georgetown University. Polling took place in January, 2003. It used random digit dialing to residential telephone exchanges in the United States. An adult was randomly selected from within each household using the most recent birthday method, and a screening question asked his or her religious preference. Those identifying as Catholic were the main target of the poll. However, a small amount of information was collected from non-Catholics before the call was terminated. Hispanics were identified with the following question: “Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish descent?” Bilingual interviewing in Spanish or English was available. In terms of methodology, the *CCP* represents a middle point between the two types of surveys in Table 1 – those that are English-only surveys of the general public and those that are bilingual surveys focusing on Hispanics or Latinos. It is effectively a survey of the general public but is conducted in both English and Spanish. This is useful because it allows us to examine sampling bias both without the egregious exclusion of all Spanish speakers and without a sampling frame that intentionally over-samples Hispanics. The survey should offer some insight into the “natural tendencies” of sampling bias.

The *CCP* includes 293 Hispanic respondents with valid data on religious identification.¹² The first column of percentages in Table 2 shows the proportion of these Hispanic respondents with each of several demographic characteristics. The second column of percentages compares these characteristics to those of all adult Hispanics in the United States, taken primarily from the March 2003 *Current Population Survey* (with one exception discussed below). The final column reports the unweighted percentage of poll respondents in each demographic subgroup who are Catholic (in most of the discussion below, we focus on the proportion Catholic for sake of

simplicity). Of the entire sample of Hispanics, 57 percent identify themselves as Catholic, 28 percent as Protestant or other Christian, and 13 percent as having no religion. Despite bilingual interviewing, the proportion Catholic falls well below that in the surveys in Table 1 that focus on Hispanics. A prime suspect is sampling bias.

[Table 2 About Here]

SAMPLING BIAS IN THE 2003 CCP

Respondents to the *2003 CARA Catholic Poll* are reasonably representative of the gender and age¹³ composition of Hispanics nationally. Hispanics residing in the West are under-represented, reflecting a more general problem with the poll; Anglos residing in the West are also under-represented. Still, this under-representation is significant because Hispanics in the West are disproportionately Catholic (perhaps because a majority have ties to Mexico, a country with a strong Catholic identity). The poll also slightly under-represents Hispanics living in the most populous metropolitan counties while under-representing those in non-metropolitan counties. County type is modestly correlated with religious identification, as those in urban areas are disproportionately Catholic and those in more rural areas disproportionately Protestant.

Particular interest lies with generation and language, as these are indicators of assimilation. The poll under-represents first-generation Hispanics (immigrants). Fifty percent of poll respondents were born outside the United States, but 61 percent of adult Hispanics in the March 2003 *Current Population Survey* were born outside the country. There is also initial reason to suspect that the *CCP* over-samples those who speak English. Sixty-five percent of Hispanic respondents were interviewed primarily in English and 35 percent primarily in Spanish. Our own experience with bilingual polls of the general public suggests that the rate of Spanish

language interviewing can vary considerably. It depends in part on whether all or only some interviewers are bilingual and on how aggressively polling houses call back residences where a Spanish speaker initially answers the phone (but is either not selected to be interviewed or is unable to respond at the time). The rate of 35 percent is fairly typical; it is roughly the same rate of Spanish interviewing with Hispanics obtained by Gallup polls of the general public (Winseman 2004). However, in all the polls in Table 1 focusing on Hispanics, at least 49 percent of interviews were conducted in Spanish.

So far as we know, nobody has ever quantified how many interviews are likely to be conducted in Spanish if a survey achieves full representation of the Hispanic or Latino population. To help resolve the issue, we rely on a pair of questions adapted from the U.S. Census long form and asked to Hispanic respondents in the poll. The first asked, “Do you speak Spanish at home?”¹⁴ For those who replied “yes,” a follow-up question asked, “How well do you speak English?” with response categories of “very well,” “well,” “not well,” and “not at all.” Following the preferred approach of Census researchers, we collapse the three responses of “well” to “not at all.” Responses confirm over-sampling of English-fluent Hispanics. In the 2000 Census, 18 percent of Hispanics said they speak only English at home. In comparison, 31 percent of *CCP* respondents say they speak only English at home. Still, this difference is not enormous. The magnitude of the difference suggests that if the poll had matched the Census distribution for language use, 40 percent rather than 35 percent of interviews would have been conducted primarily in Spanish.¹⁵ This remains well below the rate of Spanish interviewing of the bilingual polls described in Table 1. It may be that more respondents to those surveys who *could* have completed the interviews in English opted to do so in Spanish. Whatever the case,

the evidence suggests that not only is bilingual interviewing essential to understanding Hispanic religious identification, polls *focusing on Hispanics* may tend to provide of fuller representation of the Hispanic population. They are presumably likely to be highly scrupulous in their use of Spanish interviewers and more adept at obtaining cooperation among initially reluctant Hispanic respondents.

The final column in Table 2 allows us to see the probable impact of under-representation of difficult-to-reach Hispanic groups on religious identification as Catholic. Results confirm what was merely apparent in Table 1: Spanish speakers are more likely to identify as Catholic. Seventy-two percent of those interviewed primarily in Spanish identify as Catholic compared to just 49 percent of those interviewed primarily in English. Results also replicate the previously established correlation between generation and religious identification (Brodie et al. 2002; Espinosa et al. 2003). Sixty-eight percent of those born outside the U.S. identify as Catholic, compared to 47 percent of second and third generation respondents. The less assimilated Hispanics are – and generally the more difficult they are to reach through traditional polling techniques – the greater the likelihood that they identify as Catholic. Given the under-representation of recent immigrants and those lacking English fluency, it is easy to understand why the unweighted proportion Catholic – 57 percent – falls near the low end of the spectrum of polls examined earlier in this paper.

Which is more strongly associated with religious identification—language use or generation? We used multinomial logistic regressions to explore this question. The results (not shown) indicate that once the effect of language use is taken into account, generation has no significant effect in differentiating Catholic and Protestant respondents. We also explored this

topic using two other datasets – the *National Survey on Latinos in America* and the 2002 *National Survey of Latinos*. These two surveys have very different measures of language ability/use than that in the *CCP*. However, results are generally similar.¹⁶ Language appears to be the key.

EFFECTS OF POST-STRATIFICATION WEIGHTING

To what extent can post-stratification weighting correct the various aspects of sampling bias described above? We begin by examining the effect of weighting to a single characteristic – generation. As described above and shown in Table 2, 61 percent of adult Hispanics in the United States were born outside the country. This compares to just 50 percent of Hispanics in the *CCP*. These 50 percent of respondents receive a weight of 1.22 (61 divided by 50).¹⁷ Similarly, third generation Hispanics represent 22 percent of the population but 29 percent of poll respondents; they are assigned the weight of .76 (22 divided by 29). In other words, with weighting, each of the first generation respondents represents the equivalent of 1.22 people and each of the third generation respondents represents .76 people. Weighting in this manner bumps up the proportion of Catholics in the poll from 57 to 60 percent, a rather modest change. Doing the same for language use changes the percentage from 57 to 61 percent.

What happens when weighting corrects for both these characteristics simultaneously? The simplest approach for creating a combined weighting variable is to multiply two separate weights together. However, this is not appropriate for the present situation because generation and language use are highly correlated ($r = .60$). Neither is it possible to create a weight value “by hand” for each of the nine cells in a generation by language matrix because the population characteristics come from two different sources (the Census and the *CPS*). The most frequently-

used solution is to create a weighting variable using a computerized iterative process sometimes called sample balancing (Deming and Stephan 1940; see also Voss, Gelman, and King 1995). Doing so only marginally increases the percentage of respondents who are Catholic, to 62 percent. Including two more characteristics in the weighting – Census region and county type – causes the proportion Catholic to edge up to 64 percent (and the proportion Protestant down to 23 percent). There is no further change when sex and age are added to the weighting. Unfortunately, national origin is not available in the *2003 CCP*.

Thus, through weighting to correct for under- and over-sampling on just four characteristics – language use, generation, geographic region, and urban-rural location – the proportion Catholic has changed by 7 percentage points (from 57 to 64 percent). So far as we know, this is more than the effect of weighting in any survey in Table 1. Arguably, this could be due to greater under-representation of particular Hispanic sub-populations in the *CCP*. However, we suspect that our inclusion of weighting to generation and language use contributes to the greater impact on religious identification. Regardless, the change produced by weighting in the *CCP* does not take us all the way to the level of Catholic identification in the bilingual surveys in Table 1 conducted since the late 1990s, generally from 66 to 73 percent. We conclude that post-stratification weighting should certainly be used in studying Hispanic religious identification, especially weighting to language use and generation. But by itself, weighting is no substitute for a survey with excellent coverage of ordinarily difficult-to-reach portions of the Hispanic population, particularly those who do not speak English.

EXCLUSION OF HOUSEHOLDS WITHOUT TELEPHONES

In a final analysis of *CCP* data, we attempt to understand the implications of non-coverage bias – that is, exclusion of households without telephone service – from the poll. We view this as important because the surveys focusing on Hispanics in recent years have been telephone polls. The March 2003 *Current Population Study* reveals that 7 percent of Hispanic adults live in households that lack a telephone. It also suggests that these individuals tend to be less assimilated than other Hispanics. In 20 percent of Hispanic households with a telephone, all adults speak Spanish only. However, in 30 percent of Hispanic households *lacking* a telephone, all adults speak Spanish only. Having a telephone is less strongly related to generation. Still, 61 percent of Hispanics with a phone and 66 percent of Hispanics without a phone are immigrants. We therefore expect those without telephones to be more likely to identify as Catholic.

For the obvious reason that households without telephones are not represented in the *CCP*, the impact of their exclusion can only be investigated indirectly. Doing so requires the premise that being without telephone service is usually not a permanent state for households, but rather a temporary experience related to economic hardship or mobility. Households that are currently without telephone service are similar in many ways to those that have been without service in the recent past (Keeter 1995; Brick, Waksberg, and Keeter 1996; Davern et al. 2002). Through weighting, the latter can be used to represent the former in generating descriptive statistics. *CCP* respondents were asked if their household had been without service for at least one week during the previous 12 months. The period of at least a week is often used by researchers to avoid including those who have experienced an interruption of service due to weather or technical problems (Davern et al. 2002). As shown at the bottom of Table 2, 15 percent of *CCP* respondents replied that they had been without service for at least a week. The

sample size is rather small (44 cases). Even so, the surprising result is that these respondents are *less* likely to be Catholic than others (45 percent compared to 59 percent).

How assimilated are these respondents? They are slightly more likely to be Spanish-speakers. Forty-eight percent of those who experienced telephone interruption describe themselves as speaking English no better than “well.” This compares to 40 percent of those who did not experience a telephone interruption. However, those experiencing telephone interruption are equally likely as other respondents to be immigrants (50 percent each). Thus, our measure of telephone interruption appears to do only a middling job of replicating the less-assimilated nature of *CPS* Hispanics who lack telephones. But this provides no indication why respondents who have experienced interruption in phone service would be less likely than others to be Catholic. What then is the reason?

One part of the answer may be that *2003 CCP* respondents experiencing phone interruption disproportionately live in less urban areas. They also tend to be quite young. Half are age 28 or younger, and more than a quarter are 25 or younger. This makes us wonder whether the frequent residential mobility of young people who have only recently left their parents’ home is implicated in the results. For this reason it is debatable whether information on telephone interruption should be used in weighting. However, we explore the consequences of doing so. We weight those who experienced a phone interruption more strongly than other respondents so that they effectively represent themselves plus the 7 percent of Hispanics living in a household without a telephone (Davern et al. 2002). Doing so, in combination with the weighting described above, drops the proportion of respondents who are Catholic from 64 to 62 percent.

Discussion

What is the best estimate of Hispanic religious identification? The place to begin is with a rudimentary comparative analysis of the bilingual polls focusing on Hispanics that have been conducted since 1999 (see the second panel in Table 1). We place the most confidence in the *National Survey on Latinos in America* and the *National Survey of Latinos* because the researchers have published the most detail about their methods and shown the most attention to weighting (albeit not in all the ways we would recommend). Yet despite differences in sampling and weighting, the various bilingual polls conducted since 1999 produce fairly similar results for religious identification. Casting aside the outlier of the 2003 *National Survey of Hispanic Adults*, they produce a range of 66 to 73 percent Catholic and 17 to 23 percent Protestant or other Christian. Taking the midpoints of those ranges, we arrive at roughly 70 percent Catholic and 20 percent Protestant or other Christian.

Prior to analyzing data from the 2003 *CARA Catholic Poll*, we would have predicted that coverage bias associated with telephone polls would depress the proportion Catholic relative to face-to-face surveys. Our results, though tentative, raise the possibility that coverage bias may not have this effect. Still, we are almost obliged to assume that the most difficult Hispanics to reach via *any* polling methods – migrant workers and the most recent immigrants, perhaps especially those who prefer anonymity because of their legal status in this country – are likely to be disproportionately Catholic. For this reason, we suggest an estimate of 70 percent *or the low 70s* for Catholics. In general, this estimate seems to be in line with results from the 2001 Canadian Census, which asked religious identification. Sixty-eight percent of all Latin Americans (including children and teens) in that Census are identified as Catholic and 14 percent

as Protestant. It is reasonable to expect that the proportion Catholic would be somewhat higher in the United States, with its high level of immigration from Mexico.

Our review of evidence on Hispanic religious identification yields lessons for future study in this area. First, we recommend that no conclusions about exact figures for Hispanic religious identification be drawn from polls that are conducted only in English. The fact that prominent general-use surveys produced by the academic community continue to be conducted only in English is unfortunate and must be corrected.¹⁸ We are concerned that reliance on such surveys may have led to questionable inferences in the past. Though it has much to recommend it, the *General Social Survey* should probably be used only when there are no other alternative data sources for studying Hispanic religious identification, at least until Spanish interviewing is introduced. Furthermore, polls that have a high level of Spanish interviewing should nevertheless weight for language use. Results from our analyses suggest that the previously-documented correlation between generation and religious identification is mostly explained by language use. Several of the bilingual polls in Table 1 do ask about language use or ability but do not use questions that make it possible to compare results to known population characteristics. Our use of a question adapted from the Census shows how easy this would be. Though information is not available in existing surveys for weighting to language use, many surveys do have information on nativity. Researchers have so far not incorporated it into weighting, but this could be easily changed in future use of the data.

Our review also has implications for interpreting previous research. In retrospect, we may know very little about the exact rate at which Catholic Hispanics are defecting from

Catholicism to Protestantism. Virtually all published research that has examined the religious identification of Hispanics at different points in time (more than a couple years apart) or self-reported conversion of Hispanics since childhood has relied on English-only surveys (Greeley 1988, 1997; Hunt 1999; Kosmin, et al. 2001). And much of this research has examined ancestry-based samples of Hispanics from the *GSS* (Greeley 1988, 1997; Hunt 1999). No research has attempted to distinguish how much of the apparent decline in Catholic identification over time is within-generation versus across-generation. About five years from now, it will be possible to address the issue with a much greater degree of confidence. At that time, a decade will have passed since the introduction of high quality surveys focusing on Hispanics in the late-1990s/early 2000s, creating the opportunity for replication. In our view, a replication of the 1990 *Latino National Political Survey* would not be particularly useful for this purpose because of the way it identifies Hispanics.

For the time being, predictions about coming changes in the religious identification of U.S. Hispanics or Latinos must remain quite tentative and speculative. Demographic trends will result in a disproportionate growth in the number of Hispanics who are members of the second generation during the next decade and a half (Suro and Passel 2003). One factor that will be important for religious identification is whether the shift from Catholicism to Protestantism is greatest between the first and second generation or between the second and third generation. In the *Hispanic Churches in American Public Life* poll, Espinosa et al. (2003) find that the proportion of Hispanics currently identifying as Catholic is 74 percent in the first generation, 72 percent in the second generation, and 62 percent in the third generation. This suggests that the shift is greatest between the second and third generations. Our results suggest the shift is

greatest between the first and second generations: 74 percent in the first and 47 percent each in the second and third generations. And the 2002 *National Survey of Latinos* indicates a more balanced shift: 76 percent in the first generation, 66 in the second, and 50 in the third.

Notes

1. For sake of brevity, we most often use the term “Hispanic” in this paper rather than the increasingly accepted “Hispanic or Latino.”
2. According to the 2000 Census, 48 percent of 35.3 million Hispanics identified as white, 2 percent as black, 1 percent as American Indian or Alaska Native, and 6 percent as two or more races. A relatively large proportion (46 percent) of Hispanics identified as “some other race,” signaling the resistance of many Hispanics to choosing a particular race classification in addition to their Hispanic ethnicity.
3. The results come from a 2001 poll by the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate.
4. The first eight surveys, except the *American Religious Identification Survey*, plus the 2002 *National Survey of Latinos*.
5. Increasingly, large numbers of poll respondents prefer to identify themselves as “Christian” rather than Protestant. They include some individuals who do not identify with a particular denomination, but also many affiliates of Protestant denominations. Some, but not all, researchers recode responses of “Christian” to Protestant. For sake of consistency, we combine these responses in cases where the original researchers did not. (However, we exclude Orthodox Christians from this category wherever possible as our intent is to approximate the traditionally understood concept of “Protestant.”) Note also that many poll respondents will choose “other” over “Protestant” when not given the option of “Christian” (and not given the opportunity to volunteer a response). This often leads to the unhelpful situation in which some Christians are irretrievably coded with non-Christian adherents. Fortunately, this is the case for just two of the 11 polls reviewed in this paper (the *WVS* and the *National Survey of Hispanic Adults*).
6. Figures for “none” are not available for a few surveys because they are coded with invalid

responses (the *NES* and the *National Survey of Hispanic Adults*) or because they are coded with “other”s (*Hispanic Churches in American Public Life*).

7. It is also worth noting how the *NES* measures religious identification. Respondents are first asked if they attend religious services. Those who reply “yes,” are asked the denomination where they usually attend. Only those who do not attend services are asked the denomination with which they *identify*. We speculate that this elevates the level of Protestantism among Hispanics. Specifically, some Hispanics who identify as Catholic may nevertheless attend Protestant churches (perhaps because they are attending with family members). This is plausible, though not certain, because there is a much higher ratio of Catholics to Protestants among *NES* Hispanics who never attend services than among those who attend infrequently. (Among Anglos in the *NES*, the ratio is virtually identical among those who never attend services and those who attend infrequently).

8. Note also that of the 79 respondents who identify themselves as “Hispanic American,” eight (or 10 percent) are perceived by interviewers to be something other than Hispanic. Using the sample of those subjectively identified by the interviewer as Hispanic drops the proportion identifying as Catholic from 47 to 45 percent.

9. Respondents are coded as Hispanic if the only ancestry with which they identify (or the one with which they most strongly identify) is one of these four. They are also coded as Hispanic if they mention any two of these ancestries. See Hunt (1999: 1,605).

10. See Cresce and Ramirez (2003) and Lavrakas, Courser, and Diaz-Castillo (2002) for broader discussion of the implications of identifying Hispanics via the Census approach versus ancestry or national origin. Though the *National Survey of Hispanic Adults* asks about “national ancestry,” it follows up with, “if you are not of Hispanic origin, just say so.”

11. The proportion of Protestants drops from 32.6 to 32.3 percent. Though with rounding this appears to be a change of 1 percentage point, it is substantively trivial enough to be considered no change.
12. We have also excluded respondents for whom gender is missing.
13. The age categories are somewhat unusual because – for reasons related to the original purpose of the poll – they partially reflect Strauss and Howe’s (1991) generational categories.
14. The Census asks, “Do you speak a language other than English at home?” Only 1 percent of Hispanics in the 2000 Census who replied “yes” to this question reported speaking a language other than Spanish.
15. We derive the figure of 40 percent using single-variable weighting, as described below.
16. In the *National Survey on Latinos in America*, generation has no significant effect in differentiating Catholics from Protestants/other Christians once a measure of primary language is controlled. In the 2002 *National Survey of Latinos*, generation does have a significant effect (primarily reflecting the difference between the third generation and the first two) but a weaker effect than that of primary language.
17. For weighting, we replace missing values with the “most likely” values, as determined by cross-tabulation with other demographic variables.
18. It is especially odd that the *WVS* – using a questionnaire translated into many languages for use around the globe – is only rarely administered in a language other than English in the United States.

APPENDIX: Details on Surveys

- 1 *National Survey of Religious Identification, 1990*
Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: “Are you of Hispanic origin or background?”
Bilingual Interviewing: English only.
Weighting Used: Yes.
Unweighted Proportion of Entire Sample that is Hispanic: 4 percent.

- 2 *American Religious Identification Survey, 2001*
Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: “Are you of Hispanic origin or background?”
Bilingual Interviewing: English only.
Weighting Used: Yes.
Unweighted Proportion of Entire Sample that is Hispanic: approximately 6 percent
Notes: The exact *N* for valid responses on religious identification is not available. There were 2,957 Hispanics in the entire sample, with approximately 3 percent refusing the question. The number of “don’t know”s is unavailable.

- 3 *General Social Survey*
Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: The *GSS* never directly asked about Hispanic ethnicity until 2000: “Are you Spanish, Hispanic or Latino/Latina?”
Bilingual Interviewing: English only.
Weighting Used: No.
Proportion of Entire Sample that is Hispanic: 7 percent.

- 4 *National Election Studies*
Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: “Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin or descent?”
Bilingual Interviewing: Very small numbers of Spanish interviews were conducted through the early 1990s. In 1990, 16 percent of interviews with Hispanics were conducted in Spanish. In 1992, 14 percent were conducted in Spanish. In 1994, 3 percent were conducted in Spanish. Since 1994, interviewing has been conducted completely in English.
Weighting Used: Yes. We have generated percentages for Table 1 using the post-stratification variable *vcf009a* in the cumulative dataset.
Unweighted Proportion of Entire Sample that is Hispanic: 8 percent.
Measure of Religious Identification: The *NES* counts those who attend worship at a congregation of a particular denomination as being affiliated with that denomination.
Notes: *NES* respondents are U.S. citizens, which seems likely to screen out some Hispanic or Latino immigrants. Responses of “don’t know” on religious identification are included with “none,” so percentages and *N*s in Table 1 include some invalid responses.

- 5 *World Values Study*
Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: Analyses in Table 1 are based on respondents who select “Above all, I am an Hispanic American” in response to “Which of the following best describes you?” In the 1999-2000 wave, interviewers also had the option of “Hispanic” in recording a race or ethnicity based on physical observation.
Bilingual Interviewing: The 1999-2000 wave was conducted entirely in English. A very small number of interviews in the 1995-1997 wave took place in Spanish, including 7 percent of interviews with Hispanics.
Weighting Used: Yes.
Unweighted Proportion of Entire Sample that is Hispanic: 6 percent based on the self-identification question (for both waves combined). 8 percent based on interviewer observation in the 1999-2000 wave.
Measure of Religious Identification: Respondents were asked: “Do you belong to a religious denomination?” (If “Yes:”) “Which one?” A precise estimate of Protestant or other Christian is unavailable.
- 6 *Religion and Public Life Survey*
(Pew Research Center for the People & the Press)
Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: “Are you of Hispanic origin or descent?”
Bilingual Interviewing: English only.
Weighting Used: Yes.
Unweighted Proportion of Entire Sample that is Hispanic: 6 percent in 2001, 7 percent in 2002, and 11 percent in 2003.
Notes: Religious identification is missing for a rather high proportion (8 percent) of all Hispanics in the 2003 survey.
- 7 *Latino National Political Survey, 1990*
Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: To qualify, respondents had to have at least one parent or two grandparents solely of Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban origin.
Bilingual Interviewing: 60 percent of interviews were conducted in Spanish.
Weighting Used: Yes.
Sampling: Forty primary sampling units consisted of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas and groups of rural counties. High density Latino neighborhoods were over-sampled within these primary sampling units.
- 8 *National Survey on Latinos in America, 1999*
(Washington Post, Kaiser Family Foundation, Harvard University)
Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: “Are you, yourself of Hispanic or Latin origin or descent such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or some other Latin background?”
Bilingual Interviewing: 53 percent of interviews were conducted primarily in Spanish.
Weighting Used: Yes.
Sampling: Most of the Latino sample was drawn from five states and the District of Columbia. Further details on the sampling are not available.
- 9 *Hispanic Churches in American Public Life, 2000*

Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: “Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino?”

Bilingual Interviewing: The percentage of interviews conducted in Spanish is not available.

Weighting Used: No information available.

Sampling: The sample was drawn from six metropolitan areas and rural areas of two states. Over-samples from high-density Hispanic areas and directory-listed households with Spanish surnames were used.

Notes: The exact *N* for valid responses on religious identification is not available. There are 1,709 Hispanics or Latinos in the entire sample.

10 *National Survey of Latinos*

(Pew Hispanic Center, Kaiser Family Foundation)

Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: In 2002 and 2003: “Are you, yourself of Hispanic or Latin origin or descent, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Central or South American, Caribbean, or some other Latin background?” In 2004, this was changed to read “some other Latin American background?”

Bilingual Interviewing: 57 percent of interviews in 2002 and 2004 and 49 percent of interviews in 2003 were conducted primarily in Spanish.

Weighting Used: Yes.

Sampling: States with high proportions of Latinos were over-sampled, as were telephone exchanges with high Latino population incidence. The 2002 survey included over-samples of Salvadorans, Dominicans, Colombians, and Cubans.

Notes: The exact *Ns* for valid responses on religious identification are not available for 2003 and 2004. There are 1,508 Hispanics or Latinos in the entire 2003 sample, and 2,288 in the entire 2004 sample.

11 *National Survey of Hispanic Adults*

(The Latino Coalition)

Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: “What is your national ancestry? If you are not of Hispanic origin, just say so.” To qualify, respondents had to give one of the following responses: Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, South American, Central American, or other Hispanic.

Bilingual Interviewing: 56 percent of 2001 interviews, 55 percent of 2002 interviews, and 60 percent of 2003 interviews were conducted in Spanish.

Measure of Religious Identification: The question for religious identification apparently did not offer a “none” response, leading to an inflated number of “don’t know”/refusals. Thus, invalid responses are included in the percentages and *Ns* in Table 1. A precise estimate of Protestant or other Christian is unavailable.

Weighting Used: No.

Sampling: Published information states that interview selection was “random within predetermined population units. . . structured to statistically correlate with the nation’s adult Hispanic population.” Our understanding is that the population units were states and that there was no other stratifying of the samples.

12 *2003 CARA Catholic Poll*

(Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate)

Measure of Hispanic Ethnicity: “Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish descent?”

Bilingual Interviewing: 35 percent of interviews with Hispanics were conducted primarily in Spanish.

Unweighted Proportion of Entire Sample that is Hispanic: 9 percent.

Sampling: An *epsem* RDD sample was used. It was not stratified to produce a higher incidence of Hispanic respondents.

Notes: “Other Christians” were coded from verbatim responses to a question asking those who initially described their religion as “other” to specify it.

References

- Brick, Michael, Joseph Waksberg, and Scott Keeter. 1996. "Using Data on Interruptions in Telephone Service as Coverage Adjustments." *Survey Methodology* 22: 185-97.
- Brodie, Mollyann, Annie Steffenson, Jaime Valdez, Rebecca Levin, and Roberto Suro. 2002. *2002 National Survey of Latinos: Summary of Findings*. Menlo Park, CA and Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center and Kaiser Family Foundation.
- Butler, Margaret A. and Calvin L. Beale. 1994. *Rural-Urban Continuum Codes for Metro and Non-metro Counties, 1993*. Staff Report No. 9425. Washington, DC: Agriculture and Rural Economy Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Cresce, Arthur R. and Roberto R. Ramirez. 2003. "Analysis of General Hispanic Responses in Census 2000." Working Paper No. 72. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Available at <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0072/twps0072.pdf>
- Cresce, Arthur R., Audrey Dianne Schmidley, and Roberto R. Ramirez. 2004. "Identification of Hispanic Ethnicity in Census 2000: Analysis of Data Quality for the Question on Hispanic Origin." Working Paper No. 75. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Available at <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0075/twps0075.pdf>
- Davern, Michael, Jim Lepkowski, Kathleen Thiede Call, Lynn Blewett, and Tracy Johnson. 2002. "Evaluating the Importance of Telephone Service Interruption Weighting Adjustments for State Health Insurance Surveys." Paper presented at the 2002 meeting of the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers, St. Pete Beach, FL.
- Davidson, James D. 2000. "A Racial and Ethnic Picture of American Catholics." Unpublished paper, Purdue University.
- Deming, W. Edwards and Frederick F. Stephan. 1940. "On a Least Squares Adjustment of a Sampled Frequency Table When the Expected Marginal Totals are Known." *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 11: 427-44.
- Downs, Barabara A. 2003. *Fertility of American Women: June 2002*. Current Population Reports, P20-548. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Available at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/p20-548.pdf>
- Espinosa, Gastón, Vigilio Elizondo, and Jesse Miranda. 2003. "Hispanic Churches in American Public Life: Summary of Findings." *Interim Reports* (paper series) 2003 (2). Notre Dame, IN: Institute for Latino Studies.
- Froehle, Bryan T. and Mary L. Gautier. 2000. *Catholicism USA: A Portrait of the Catholic*

Church in the United States. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

Gelman, Andrew and Thomas C. Little. 1998. "Improving on Probability Weighting for Household Size." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 62: 398-404.

Gibson, Campbell and Kay Jung. 2002. "Historical Census Statistics on Population Totals By Race, 1790 to 1990, and By Hispanic Origin, 1970 to 1990, For The United States, Regions, Divisions, and States." Working Paper Series No. 56. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Population Division.

Greeley, Andrew M. 1988. "Defection Among Hispanics." *America* 159 (July 30): 61-2.

—. 1990. *The Catholic Myth: The Behavior and Beliefs of American Catholics*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

—. 1997. "Defection Among Hispanics (Updated)." *America* 177 (September 27): 12-3.

Hunt, Larry L. 1999. "Hispanic Protestantism in the United States: Trends by Decade and Generation." *Social Forces* 77: 1601-24.

Keeter, Scott. 1995. "Estimating Telephone Noncoverage Bias With a Telephone Survey." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 59: 196-217.

Kosmin, Barry, Egon Mayer, and Ariela Keysar. 2001. "American Religious Identification Survey 2001." New York: Graduate Center of the City University of New York.

Lavrakas, Paul J., Matthew Courser, and Lillian Diaz-Castillo. 2002. "Differences Between Hispanic 'Origin' vs. Hispanic 'Identity' and Their Implications." Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, St. Pete Beach, FL.

Malone, Nolan, Kaari F. Baluja, Joseph M. Costanzo, and Cynthia J. Davis. 2003. *The Foreign Born Population: 2000*. Census 2000 Brief, C2KBR-34. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Available at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-34.pdf>

Ramirez, Roberto R. and G. Patricia de la Cruz. 2003. *The Hispanic Population in the United States: March 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Economics and Statistics Administration.

Strauss, William and Neil Howe. 1991. *Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069*. New York: William Morrow.

Suro, Roberto and Jeffrey S. Passel. 2003. "The Rise of the Second Generation: Changing Patterns in Hispanic Population Growth." Washington DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Available at <http://www.pewhispanic.org/site/docs/pdf/PHC%20Projections%20final.pdf>

U.S. Census Bureau. 2004. "Table 3. Annual Estimates of the Population by Sex, Race and Hispanic or Latino Origin for the United States: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2003." (NC-EST2003-03). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Population Division. Available at <http://eire.census.gov/popest/data/national/tables/NC-EST2003-srh.php>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Resources. 2000. *Substance Abuse Treatment for Persons with HIV/AIDS. Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series 37*. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment.

Voss, Stephen D., Andrew Gelman, and Gary King. 1995. "A Review: Preelection Survey Methodology: Details from Eight Polling Organizations, 1988 and 1992." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 59: 98-132.

Winseman, Albert L. 2004. "Race and Religion: The Protestant Catholic Divide." Gallup Poll Tuesday Briefing. Washington, DC: Gallup Organization.

TABLE 1: Survey-Based Estimates of the Religious Identification of Adult Hispanics or Latinos in the United States

	N	Catholic	Protestant or Other Christian	None
Surveys of the General Public Conducted Primarily in English				
1 <i>National Survey of Religious Identification, 1990</i>	4,818	66%	25%	6%
2 <i>American Religious Identification Survey, 2001</i>	~2,850	57	22	12
3 <i>General Social Survey</i>				
2000	212	67	20	11
2002	199	63	20	15
Combined	411	65	20	13
4 <i>National Election Studies</i>				
1990	167	62	32	—
1992	216	54	36	—
1994	144	54	33	—
1996	146	54	39	—
1998	137	64	19	—
2000	129	57	34	—
2002	89	58	32	—
Combined	1,027	57	33	—
5 <i>World Values Study</i>				
1995-1997	83	59	—	19
1999-2000	76	47	—	25
Combined	159	52	—	22
6 <i>Religion and Public Life Survey</i> (Pew Research Center for the People & the Press)				
2001	118	51	29	14
2002	125	61	23	11
2003	180	59	24	13
Bilingual Surveys Focusing on Hispanics or Latinos				
7 <i>Latino National Political Survey, 1990</i>	2,816	76	14	7
8 <i>National Survey on Latinos in America, 1999</i> (Washington Post, Kaiser Family Foundation, Harvard University)	2,401	72	17	8
9 <i>Hispanic Churches in American Public Life, 2000</i>	~1,700	70	23	—
10 <i>National Survey of Latinos</i> (Pew Hispanic Center, Kaiser Family Foundation)				
2002	2,909	70	20	8
2003	~1,500	68	20	9
2004	~2,250	66	23	6
11 <i>National Survey of Hispanic Adults</i> (The Latino Coalition)				
2001	1,000	72	—	—
2002	1,000	73	—	—
2003	1,000	61	—	—

Note: With the exceptions of the *National Election Studies*, the 2003 and 2004 *National Survey of Latinos*, and the *National Survey of Hispanic Adults*, percentages exclude invalid responses on religious identification (refusals and “don’t know”s). Percentages are generated using the weighting variable (if any) recommended by the original researchers. All Ns are unweighted.

TABLE 2: Characteristics of Adult Hispanics or Latinos, 2003 CARA Catholic Poll and U.S. Population

	2003 CCP	(N)	U.S. Hispanic or Latino Population*	Unweighted Percentage of CCP Sample Catholic
All Hispanics or Latinos	100%	(293)	100%	57%
Gender				
Male	48%	(142)	51%	50%
Female	52	(151)	49	64
Age				
18-28	35%	(100)	30%	47%
29-41	36	(104)	33	72
42-59	23	(66)	25	55
60 and over	6	(18)	11	44
Missing		(5)		
Census Region				
Northeast	23%	(67)	14%	58%
Midwest	12	(35)	9	46
South	38	(112)	36	52
West	27	(79)	42	70
County Type^a				
Central county of a metropolitan area over 1 million in population	59%	(173)	68%	61%
Other metropolitan county	24	(70)	24	54
Non-metropolitan	17	(50)	8	50
Generation				
First (R born outside the U.S.)	50%	(147)	61%	68%
Second (R born in U.S., at least one parent born outside)	21	(62)	17	47
Third (R and both parents born in U.S.)	29	(83)	22	47
Missing		(1)		

*With the exception of language use in the home, characteristics of the U.S. Hispanic or Latino population are taken from the March 2003 *Current Population Survey*. Language use is taken from the 2000 Census.

^aButler and Beale (1994)

**TABLE 2, CONTINUED: Characteristics of Adult Hispanics or Latinos, 2003
CARA Catholic Poll and U.S. Population**

	<i>2003 CCP</i>	(N)	U.S. Hispanic or Latino Population*	Unweighted Percentage of CCP Sample Catholic
Primary Language of Interview				
English	65%	(189)	–	49%
Spanish	35	(104)	–	72
Language Use in the Home				
Speaks only English at home	31%	(91)	18%	35%
Speaks Spanish at home, speaks English “very well”	28	(80)	36	63
Speaks Spanish at home, speaks English “well” to “not at all”	41	(119)	46	71
Missing		(3)		
Telephone Service				
Household was without phone service for at least one week during last 12 months	15%	(44)	–**	45%
Household had service continually during last 12 months	85	(246)	–**	59
Missing		(3)		

*With the exception of language use in the home, characteristics of the U.S. Hispanic or Latino population are taken from the March 2003 *Current Population Survey*. Language use is taken from the 2000 Census.

**Not available.