

# Latinos Online

## Topline and Detailed Methodology Report

*Survey Dates: June 5 – July 3, 2006, and August 10 – October 4, 2006*

*For results based on the total sample (n=6016), one can say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling and other random effects is +/-2.07%.*

*Telephone interviews were conducted by International Communications Research on behalf of the Pew Hispanic Center and the Pew Internet & American Life Project. Bilingual interviewers gave respondents a choice about whether to answer in English or Spanish. Since language proficiency is a key part of our analysis, we have included the breakouts for respondents who are Spanish-dominant, bilingual, or English-dominant.*

*Only questions pertaining to internet and cell phone use are included in this document.*

### **Survey Questions:**

- 1ab. Do you use the internet, at least occasionally? Do you send or receive email, at least occasionally?  
(Asked of all respondents)

	YES
All Hispanic adults (n=6016)	56%
Spanish-dominant	32
Bilingual	76
English-dominant	78

- 2a. Do you happen to have a cell phone, or not?  
(Asked of all respondents to the June-July 2006 survey)

	YES
All Hispanic adults (n=2000)	59%
Spanish-dominant	42
Bilingual	71
English-dominant	75

- 2b. Do you ever send or receive text messages on your cell phone?  
*(Asked of all cell phone users in the June-July 2006 survey)*

	YES
Hispanic cell phone users (n=1133)	49%
Spanish-dominant	40
Bilingual	54
English-dominant	53

3. What is the MAIN reason you don't use the internet or email?  
*(Asked of all non-users of the internet in August-October 2006 survey)*

	NO ACCESS	NO INTEREST	TOO DIFFICULT	TOO EXPENSIVE	TOO BUSY
Hispanic non-users (n=1639)	53%	18%	10%	6%	5%
Spanish-dominant	52	15	11	7	6
Bilingual	56	25	5	5	3
English-dominant	55	22	10	1	2

4. Do you ever use the internet from HOME?  
*(Asked of all internet users in August-October 2006 survey)*

	YES
Hispanic internet users (n=1994)	79%
Spanish-dominant	73
Bilingual	79
English-dominant	84

5. Does the computer you use at HOME connect to the internet through a dial-up telephone line, or do you have some other type of connection, such as a DSL-enabled phone line, a cable TV modem, a wireless connection, or a T-1 or fiber optic connection?  
*(Asked of all home internet users in August-October 2006 survey)*

	BROADBAND	DIAL-UP/DK
Hispanic home internet users (n=1569)	66%	34%
Spanish-dominant	53	47
Bilingual	70	30
English-dominant	71	29

**Methodology:**

This analysis is based predominantly upon the merging of data from two surveys—the 2006 National Survey of Latinos (NSL), and the 2006 Hispanic Religion Survey—both of which were conducted by International Communications Research (ICR) on behalf of Pew Research Center.

In order to fully represent the opinions of Latino people living in the United States, ICR conducted interviews with a statistically representative sample of Latinos so that they could be examined nationally, in target regions of high Latino concentration. Furthermore, to increase the statistical power of various subgroups, the design was stratified so as to capture fewer Mexicans and greater numbers of non-Mexicans, as will be described below.

The size of the combined sample is 6,016, and the margin of error for total respondents is +/-2.07 at the 95% confidence interval.

For the NSL:

- Interviews were conducted from June 5 – July 3, 2006 among a nationally representative sample of 2,000 Latino respondents ages 18 and older. Of those respondents, 569 were native born (excluding Puerto Rico). The margin of error for total respondents is +/- 3.80 at the 95% confidence level. The margin of error for native-born respondents is +/-6.55 at the 95% confidence level. The margin of error for foreign-born respondents is +/-4.35 at the 95% confidence level.

For the Religion Survey:

- Interviews were conducted from August 10 – October 4, 2006 among a nationally representative sample of 4,016 Latino respondents age 18 and older. Of those respondents, 1,195 were Native born (including Puerto Rico) and 2,814 were Foreign born (excluding Puerto Rico). The margin of error for total respondents

is +/-2.44 at the 95% confidence level. The margin of error for native-born respondents is +/-4.18 at the 95% confidence level. The margin of error for Foreign born respondents is +/-2.88 at the 95% confidence level.

For both surveys, ICR maintained a staff of Spanish-speaking interviewers whom, when contacting a household, were able to offer respondents the option of completing the survey in Spanish or in English.

- For the NSL, a total of 468 respondents were surveyed in English and 1,560 respondents were interviewed in Spanish (16 were surveyed in both languages).
- For the Religion survey, a total of 1,036 respondents were surveyed in English and 2,949 respondents were interviewed in Spanish (and another 31 equally in both languages).

### ***Eligible Respondent***

Both surveys were administered to any male or female age 18 and older that is of Latino origin or descent, though some screening was necessary to interview fewer Mexicans and fewer Central Americans (as described below).

### ***Field Period***

For the NSL, the field period was June 5 – July 3, 2006.

For the Religion Survey, the field period was August 10 – October 4, 2006.

For both surveys, the interviewing was conducted by ICR/International Communications Research in Media, PA. All interviews were conducted using the Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system. The CATI system ensured that questions followed logical skip patterns and that the listed attributes automatically rotated, eliminating “question position” bias.

### ***Sampling Methodology***

A stratified sample via the Optimal Sample Allocation sampling technique was used for both surveys. By utilizing a stratified sample, one sample source was used to complete all interviews in each survey. This technique provides a highly accurate sampling frame thereby reducing the cost per *effective* interview. In this case, we examined a list of all telephone exchanges within a target area (national, by state, etc.) and listed them based on BOTH concentration of Latino households and specific Latino heritage. We then divided these exchanges into various groups, or strata.

Consequently, we used a disproportionate stratified RDD sample of Latino households. The primary stratification variables are the estimates of Latino household incidence and heritage in each NPA-NXX (area code and exchange) as provided by the GENESYS

System – these estimates are derived from Claritas and are updated at the NXX level with each quarterly GENESYS database update. The basic procedure was to rank all NPA-NXXs in the US by the incidence of Latino households and their ethnicity. This produced strata that were called Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Central American, South American, High Latino, Medium Latino, and Low Latino. These strata were then run against InfoUSA and other listed databases, and then scrubbed against known Latino surnames. Any “hits” were subdivided into ‘surname’ strata, with all other sample being put into ‘RDD’ strata. Overall, then the study employed 18 strata, 9 (Mexican, Puerto Rican, etc.) x 2 (surname/RDD). There are two important aspects of this plan worth noting. First, the existence of surname strata does not mean this was a surname sample design. The sample is RDD, only telephone numbers were then divided by whether they were found to be associated with or without a Latino surname. This was done simply to increase the number of strata (thereby increasing the control we have to meet ethnic targets) and to ease administration (allowing for more effective assignment of interviewers and labor hours). Second, just because a stratum is called, for example, “Mexican,” did not mean Mexicans were the only respondents we interviewed in that stratum. Rather, we accepted any Hispanic as valid for the study, in every strata.

For purposes of estimation, we employed an optimal allocation scheme. This “textbook” approach allocates interviews to a stratum proportionate to the number of Latino HH, but inversely proportionate to the square root of the relative cost, the relative cost in this situation being a simple function of the incidence. As such, the number of completed interviews increases as you move from a lower incidence strata to higher incidence strata. Again, this is a known, formulaic approach to allocation that provides a starting point for discussions of sample allocation and associated costs. We have also provided estimates of the “effective sample size” associated with the resultant disproportionate allocation.

For the NSL:

- Sample generation within each defined stratum utilized a strict epsem sampling procedure, providing equal probability of selection to every telephone number.

For the Religion Survey:

- One of the major goals was to attain sufficient numbers of non-Catholic Hispanics, since overall about a quarter of Hispanics say they are not Catholic. The study was designed so that in fact 50% of all completes were from non-Catholics. This was done using two strategies. First, non-Catholics from all ICR conducted Pew studies from 2002 to the present were re-contacted for this interview. Second, additional completes using the sample design described above were executed to attain additional non-Catholic Hispanics.

## ***Weighting and Estimation***

For the NSL:

- Weighting and estimation was performed independently within the strata. The first phase involved the adjustment of the actual final sample sizes to proportionality. Within strata, the population totals were determined from the 2006 Claritas data. An initial weight, or proportionality factor, was then computed for each strata.
- Then, interviews were balanced using a sample balancing routine controlling for age within sex, gender, education, heritage, and foreign/native born status, using 2005 CPS data. The balancing process also controlled to produce weights scaled to the earlier determined proportionality weights.

For the Religion Survey:

- A two-stage weighting design was executed to ensure an accurate representation of the national Hispanic population. First all interviews that were attained of non-Catholics from prescreened sample (sample pulled from prior Pew studies) were analyzed to determine which strata they would have come from had they been interviews from the main study design. They were then temporarily assigned to those strata for weighting purposes. Then, all sample was rebalanced with a pre-weight to correct for the disproportionality of the stratified sampling design.
- The file was then split into five main data files by Heritage (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central and South America, and Other). Each data file was put through a post-stratification sample balancing routine. The post-stratification weighting utilized national 2006 estimates from the Census and Claritas on age, gender, education, foreign/native born status, and Catholic/non-Catholic status. As the Census is not allowed to ask about religion, counts for Catholic/non-Catholic status were based on the weighted percentages on religion found in all past ICR-conducted Pew Hispanic studies.
- Each of the five data files was balanced to the proper proportion of its Heritage group based on national estimates. Thus, with 4,016 overall completes, the Mexican weighting run balanced to 2,538 interviews to reflect the estimate that 63.2 percent of the U.S. Hispanic population is Mexican. In the end, the combination of these five files accurately represent the overall U.S. Hispanic population.

**Response Rate**

For the NSL:

- Following is a full disposition of the sample selected for this survey:

	TOTAL
TOTAL NUMBERS DIALED	107,757
INTERVIEW (Category 1)	
Full interview	2,000
Short interview with non-Latinos	6,840
ELIGIBLE, NON-INTERVIEW (Category 2)	
Refusals	6,846
UNKNOWN ELIGIBILITY, NON-INTERVIEW (Category 3)	
No answer	13,394
Busy	361
No screener completed	6,304
NOT-ELIGIBLE (Category 4)	
Data/modem/fax line	5,837
Non-working, disconnected, business or government	48,179
No eligible respondents to answer	909
Overquota	2317
Non-residence	14,526
Other	244

For the Religion Survey:

- Following is a full disposition of the sample selected for this survey:

	TOTAL
TOTAL NUMBERS DIALED	246,623
INTERVIEW (Category 1)	
Full interview	4,016
Short interview with non-Latinos	14,064
ELIGIBLE, NON-INTERVIEW (Category 2)	
Refusals	8,252
UNKNOWN ELIGIBILITY, NON-INTERVIEW (Category 3)	
No answer	24,868
Busy	1,033
No screener completed	25,153
NOT-ELIGIBLE (Category 4)	
Data/modem/fax line	9,426
Non-working, disconnected, business or government	129,849
No eligible respondents to answer	1,505
Overquota	19,897
Non-residence	7,313
Other	1,247