



**The James J. Heaney Institute
for the Inquiry into Natural Philosophy
and Science-y Things**



February 2012:

Countering Countering Conventional Wisdom

February 2012

**Countering *Countering Conventional Wisdom*:
A Review of the Evidence on Religion and Contraceptive Use**

James J. Heaney

CONTENTS!

Background:	3
Objectives:	7
Disclaimer:	8
Findings:	9
Methodology:	16
Tables:	20

Background

Back in 2011, the Alan Guttmacher Institute, the research arm of Planned Parenthood, published a report entitled “Countering Conventional Wisdom: New Evidence on Religion and Contraception Use.” Despite its billing, the report was less than groundbreaking, revealing only what had already been widely assumed for many years: that a great many Catholic women use artificial birth control forbidden by the Catholic Church. The report was released, rather, as a salvo in the war between the abortion-and-contraceptives industry and the 112th United States Congress, then still in its early hours. As the report’s Backgrounder reveals, the Guttmacher Institute was distressed over the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops’ opposition to “publicly funded family planning programs” and the USCCB’s insistence on “special exemptions so broad as to allow entire institutions, including insurance plans and hospital networks, to refuse to provide contraceptive services and supplies.” So the Institute, with the cooperation of an associate at the dissident Catholic organization Catholics for Choice, pointed out an important piece of context: plenty of Catholics contracept. Guttmacher went on to make the theological

claim that “strongly held religious beliefs and contraceptive use... may be highly compatible,” and concluded with their usual ideological line: “Policies that make contraceptives more affordable and easier to use are not just sound public health policy—they also reflect the needs and desires of the vast majority of American women and their partners, regardless of their religious affiliation.

“Countering Conventional Wisdom”, amid much nifty and uncontroversial data about religion, reproductive-age women, and church attendance, contained three key findings:

- ∂ “Among all women who have had sex, 99% have ever used a contraceptive method other than natural family planning. This figure is virtually the same, 98%, among sexually experienced Catholic women.” (p. 4)
- ∂ “Only 2% of Catholic women rely on natural family planning; even among Catholic women who attend church once a month or more, only 2% rely on this method.” (pp. 4-5)
- ∂ “Never-married women of reproductive age who attend religious services every week are less likely to have ever had sex than are those who attend less frequently (48% vs. 74–80%).” (Page 4)

These were couched in various other true statistical statements obviously selected to convey the impression, to the maximum extent possible given the data, that there is virtually no important statistical difference between Catholics and the general population when it comes to sexual behaviour, especially when it comes to the artificial birth control Planned Parenthood peddles. One can hardly blame an openly ideological think tank for presenting the data most favorable their ideology. Given the large number of decisions the author of a statistical study must make, where there simply is no single objectively “correct” decision, some of this is bound to happen. No blame is assigned to Ms. Rachel K. Jones and Mr. Jeorg Dreweke, primary authors of “Countering Conventional Wisdom,” although our study does take exception to several of their decisions.

The Guttmacher study lay dormant for nearly a year. Then, shortly after the White House announced the regulation now popularly known as the “contraception mandate,” Cecilia Muñoz, a White House official, wrote in a 1 February 2012 blog post:

According to a study by the Guttmacher Institute, most women, including 98 percent of Catholic women, have used contraception.

The line of argument, implicit in the post though never stated directly, suggested that *because the overwhelming majority of Catholics contracept, it is morally and legally upright to require Catholic institutions to buy contraceptives for their employees.* Since the James J. Heaney Institute inquires only into natural philosophy, we cannot investigate the validity of this argument as a matter of moral philosophy (see instead our affiliated blog, *De Civitate*).

The Papist blogosphere, it would be fair to say, exploded. Led by Lydia McGrew at the *What’s Wrong with the World?* blog, Catholics the Web over pointed out a couple dozen reasons the White House statistic was (1) incorrect, (2) did not show the relationship between Catholics and contraception it implied, to say nothing of whether (3) it was relevant to the mandate’s conscientious objectors in any way:

- ∂ Writing on their website, the U.S. Catholic bishops pointed out, correctly, that Ms. Muñoz had made too broad a statement: Guttmacher’s finding was that 98% of *sexually experienced, self-proclaimed* Catholic women *age 15-44* had used some contraceptive technique (other than the Church-approved “Natural Family Planning” techniques). This measure excluded from consideration elderly Catholics of a more Papist generation, not to mention nuns and virgins – but included, for example, Susan Wysocki, chair of the radical dissenting group Catholics for Choice.
- ∂ As Tom Hoopes at CatholicVote.org explained, the population Guttmacher had selected to derive their 98% figure included that one thrice-divorced woman who shows up to Mass for Christmas and Easter, doesn’t know when to kneel, and can’t say the Nicene Creed, but excluded the quiet Catholic college girl who’s read every book Chris West ever wrote just so she can reinforce her hard-won decision to hang on to her virginity. Further, because the statistic describes birth control “ever used,” if there were, say, a young lady raised atheist and taught at Planned Parenthood’s knee, who’d had four sexual partners (but no children) by age 30, who then had a sudden spiritual experience in a perpetual adoration chapel, converted to Catholicism, joined the Missionaries of Charity, and never had sex, much less touched a condom, ever again... she would be included in the population examined, and specifically within the 98%. The *founder* of the Missionaries of Charity, Mother Teresa, would be excluded completely.
- ∂ Ms. McGrew was especially hard on the study’s analysis of *current* contraception use, which, she argued (and we agree) is by far the more relevant statistic for describing Catholic compliance with Catholic teaching. She wrote, “it excluded any women who were a) not sexually active, where that is defined as having had sexual intercourse in the past three months... b) postpartum, c) pregnant, or d) trying to get pregnant! In other words, the study was specifically designed... to include only women for whom a pregnancy would be unintended and who are ‘at risk’ of becoming pregnant,” prompting commenter Bryan White to wryly add, “It makes it appear that the Guttmacher folks used a sample of women who were using some form of contraception to estimate the percentage of contraceptive use.”

Politifact wrote a rather poorly reasoned— controversy, rating Muñoz’s statement but factually accurate—piece on the “Mostly True.” The Washington Post did a

somewhat better job of holding the media accountable for repeating the claim without adding the appropriate qualifications. It also criticized the media and opinion-makers for frequently conflating the “ever used” and “currently used” statistics. (For example, Nancy Pelosi was reported to have said, “98% of Catholic women use birth control,” in the present tense, which is categorically false.) This second error dramatically exaggerated the rate of artificial birth control use among Catholics, even compared to the reporting by Guttmacher (which showed only 87% of Catholic women using birth control, even after adding all the above-described qualifications and restrictions).

However, it appears to have escaped wide attention that the Guttmacher study was not based on inaccessible data from an internal survey. It was built on the results from the National Survey of Family Growth, which is conducted periodically by the Centers for Disease Control. Ms. McGrew and her crew realized this, and delved into old CDC reports, hoping to shed more light on the variables that were of interest to them. However, this was a publicly-funded, publicly-conducted study. *The full results are public.* No one needs to read any more context into the Guttmacher-published numbers. The original numbers are available online for public consumption and complete statistical re-examination!

This study is the James J. Heaney Institute’s re-consideration of the Guttmacher study, using the publicly available data from the National Survey of Family Growth, 2006-2010.

Objectives

This study has the following aims:

1. Update the Guttmacher Institute's key reported figures on religion and contraceptive use with the latest available numbers, now that the NSFG 2006-2010 cycle is complete. (The Guttmacher Institute was forced to rely on 2006-2008 figures.)
2. Replicate—and thus verify—the Guttmacher Institute's findings on Catholics and contraceptive use.
3. Parse the data more carefully, drawing clear and published distinctions between women who are prescribed the Pill for solely medical reasons and those who take it for birth control; or between those who are naturally sterilized, or sterilized for purely medical reasons, and those who are sterilized for contraceptive purposes.
4. Examine the same data through a Catholic lens, attempting to answer the question that is at the heart of the controversy between Ms. McGrew and the White House: *"How many Catholic couples follow the Church's teachings on sexuality and family planning?"* To that end, we will consider several factors that Guttmacher, in its zeal and occasional confusion about Church teaching, considered incompletely or incorrectly:
 - a. Mass attendance
 - b. Marriage state
 - c. Attitude toward past contraceptive sterilization

Disclaimer

As with other studies you ever read, hear about, or see mentioned off-handedly by harried, low-paid reporters on TV, **please** read the Methodology before drawing any conclusions from our findings. You may find you object to the way we imputed some particular variable, and that this, to you, casts serious doubt on our key findings. You may even notice that we did something wrong. It wouldn't be the first time we at the Institute have slipped up in our hot-headed pursuit of Truth and Science-y Things.

Finally, we are not a statistician. We are a computer programmer with a strong, but amateur, interest in statistics.

If you do find an error in the report, please contact us by email at jamesjheaney@gmail.com. We will publish corrections as quickly as they can be verified.

Findings

Replicating and Updating Guttmacher

We were able to replicate the Guttmacher Institute's figures on religion and contraceptive use, especially among Catholics. After discovering that the Guttmacher placed small but unreported additional filters on their data—for example, they excluded from their results all women who were non-contraceptively sterile—we were able to duplicate their original findings from the 2006-2008 cycle of the National Survey of Family Growth.¹ Once we had their parameters in hand, it was easy to update their key findings with the expanded data from the full 2006-2010 cycle. They were substantially unchanged. The two key updated figures:

- ∂ Among all women who have had sex, 99% have ever used a contraceptive method other than natural family planning or noncontraceptive sterilization. This figure is virtually the same, 98%, among sexually experienced Catholic women. (Table 1-3b). In fact, the updated numbers show very slightly *more*

¹ These findings were reported by AGI in "Supplemental Tables on Religion and Contraceptive Use," Tables 1 and 2. Replication of their findings is reported by JJHI in Tables 1-3a and 2-2a of this report.

contraceptive use among Catholics than the Guttmacher Institute saw, but the change is not statistically significant.

- ∂ Of Catholic women ages 15-44 who are not currently pregnant, trying to become pregnant, postpartum, or non-contraceptively sterile ("at risk of unintended pregnancy," in AGI parlance), exactly 2% rely on Natural Family Planning as their most effective form of contraception. This is unchanged from the 2006-2008 cycle.

Lies, Damn Lies, and Statistics

However, these statistics are *not* the best means for getting at the answer to the question: "How many Catholic couples follow Church teaching on sexuality and family planning?" The "ever-used" statistic, in particular, says little about a couple's *current* use of or attitude toward artificial birth control. Consider, for example, one of our findings:

- ∂ Among women "at risk of unintended pregnancy," 5% were sterilized for contraceptive reasons but *would reverse it* if safe, certain, and affordable. This figure is the same for Catholic women,

and represents over 15% of all contraceptive sterilizations (Table 3-2).

We reach the novel conclusion that *people change*. The White House was wrong to ignore this. (Unfortunately, artificial sterilization was the only method for which the NSFG recorded information about users' attitudes over time.²)

Although we object to its popularity, we examined the “ever-used” statistic in considerable detail. A number of people familiar with the controversy recommended that we exclude from the “ever-used” count those who had used only the Pill and only for medical reasons. Although the dataset was not well-suited to this restriction, we found two ways of applying it, and reran the numbers. There was essentially no change. One method, described in detail in the Methodology, showed that these medicinal-only Pill users accounted for less than 0.05% of all sexually experienced women (Table 1-10). Another method (which simply multiplied the first row of Table 1-8 by the first row of Table 1-9) estimated they accounted for 0.2% of sexually experienced women—but this is still far too few for statistical significance, especially given the method's imprecision.

² An astute reader might argue that the NSFG's EA-18 through EA-22 series provides a good proxy for user attitude, but those questions are again about the user's attitude in the past, not the present.

However, other methods for reanalyzing the “ever-used” statistic yielded more striking differences:

- ∂ When Catholic women are broken out by Mass attendance, a clear difference emerges between those attending Mass once a week or more and those who are not: 3% of sexually experienced practicing Catholic women have never used artificial birth control, compared to 1% of lapsed Catholics (who are indistinguishable from the general population in this respect).
- ∂ When all women older than the average age of first intercourse (17 for American women, according to AGI) are included, the number of contraceptors drops to 90% for all populations, because of the sizable influence of sexually inexperienced women—or, in old-timey speak, women who have preserved their virtue, possibly “for the sake of the kingdom.”
- ∂ Including these “counter-cultural virgins,” who have preserved their virginity longer than average, yields even more significant results among practicing Catholics: 14% of them have never used artificial birth control, compared to 10% of the general population and only 8% of lapsed Catholics.

The “ever-used” statistic remains, however, a deeply flawed method for measuring Catholic compliance with official Catholic teaching.

Taking off the Condom-Colored Glasses

A sensible analysis of the question the White House presents us begins, rather, where the bulk of the Guttmacher data was focused: *current* contraceptive practices among women. Among women “at risk of unintended pregnancy,”³ undifferentiated by religious intensity, these numbers are nothing for the Catholic bishops to write home to Rome about (Table 3-3):

- ∂ Among the general population, less than 1% of women “at risk of unintended pregnancy” rely on NFP. 11% use no method. 3% are on the Pill, but for purely medical reasons. In the eyes of the Catholic Church, a total of 14% are “open to life.” 81% use artificial birth control. (The excluded 5% are sterilized, but want a reversal.)
- ∂ The numbers are hardly different for Catholics: 15% are “open to life,” and 80% are on artificial birth control.

³ “Women at risk of unintended pregnancy” refers to women ages 15-44 who are not currently pregnant, trying to become pregnant, postpartum, or naturally or non-contraceptively sterile, and whose current male partners are not non-contraceptively or naturally sterile. It will not be explained again.

However, there should be serious reservations about this measurement. Since the Catholic Church is unabashedly pro-natalist, and pregnancy and childbearing are considered morally praiseworthy, many of the very couples most loyal to Church teaching will not show in this sample population, because they do not consider themselves “at risk” of unintended pregnancy—they *intend* pregnancy! Meanwhile, other important parts of the female Catholic demographic, like nuns, are left out. Bryan White was right to note that, perhaps with the best of intentions, the Alan Guttmacher Institute selected a population inherently less likely to embrace Church teaching on artificial birth control. There were good reasons for selecting that particular yardstick, but AGI should have studied other yardsticks and published those results, too. If it weren’t wearing condom-colored glasses, incapable of seeing female sexuality except through the lens of physical mechanics, sexually transmitted disease, and the “treatment” of humankind’s miraculous fertility, its researchers may have more readily realized this.

When we expand our measurement to include contraceptive use among *all* women ages 15-44, the numbers change dramatically (Table 3-2):

- ∂ Among the general population, thanks mainly to a 12% virginity rate, a 7% sexual inactivity rate, and 9% pregnant, seeking pregnancy, or postpartum, the proportion of women “open to life” for Catholic purposes jumps to 40%, and artificial birth control use falls to 57%.
- ∂ Catholics (still undifferentiated by intensity) tell a similar story: 41% are open to life; 55% use artificial birth control.

Despite these numbers, no doubt heartening to Papists under the false impression that 99% of the world has turned entirely against the Catholic understanding of human sexuality, all evidence to this point agrees with the Guttmacher Institute about one of its main claims: Catholics behave no differently from the general population when it comes to sex and *Humanae Vitae*.

We broke down the current-use statistics further, so we could take a look at specifically *practicing Catholics* – those who do not merely culturally self-identify as a Catholic, but who *actually practice* –albeit imperfectly—the religion they profess. The most visible and simple proxy for this is Mass attendance. One of Catholicism’s fundamental precepts is obligation to participate in the celebration of the Mass every Sunday, regardless of desire, vacation, or family engagements. Those who attend

Mass weekly are at least trying to be good Catholics—hence “practicing.”⁴ Those who do not can be described as nominal Catholics—although common parlance prefers “lapsed.”

Our findings proved interesting:

- ∂ Practicing Catholic women “at risk of unintended pregnancy” rely on Natural Family Planning in 3% of cases. 17% of them are “open to life” overall. 78% use artificial birth control. This NFP reliance rate is fully three times that of the general population... but it’s still 3%. (Table 3-4)
- ∂ When the figure is expanded to *all* practicing Catholic women in the target age range, substantial differences with the general population open up: for the first time, artificial birth control users represent slightly *less* than half the population. 17% of these practicing Catholic women ages 15-44 have maintained their virginity, compared to just 12% of the general population and 10% of lapsed Catholics. (Table 3-5)
- ∂ 11% of these practicing Catholics are currently involved in pregnancy (pregnant, seeking pregnancy, or postpartum), compared to just 8% of the general population, or 9% of lapsed

⁴ In this context, the word “practicing” is actually more closely related to the Greek *praxis*, the translation of idea to action, but we prefer the pun.

Catholics and practicing Protestants.
(Table 4-1)

- ∂ These differences are largely the result of Catholics who attend Mass more than once a week. Among these women, fully 8% of those who are “at risk of unintended pregnancy” rely on NFP, while nearly 20% are using no method at all, remaining entirely the “handmaids of the Lord,” as the saying goes among Catholics of this cohort. 9% are sterilized but wish to reverse it – double the rate of desired reversals compared to the general population.
- ∂ Among *all* women who attend Mass more than once each week, 9% are seeking pregnancy – again, nearly twice the rate in the general population. 54% of these women are “open to life,” compared to only 40% using artificial birth control.⁵

The Hand that Rules the World

It is also worth our time to look at Catholic wives. Many Catholic commentators, such as Tom Hoopes at CatholicVote.org, have criticized the statistics in *Countering Conventional Wisdom* and other similar publications because they generally do not

⁵ Please note, however, that these figures are less reliable than the others in this paper, due to a small sample size of high-attendance Catholics. Refer to the Tables sections for revised statistical confidence levels.

differentiate between sexual activity with husbands, cohabitants, and one-night stands. This, commentators suggest, leads the statistics to inappropriately represent “promiscuous party girls,” while monogamous Catholic wives are left out. These Papists hope that this subset of Catholic women—living their faith, raising their families, and supporting the modern 21st-century parish—will prove more receptive than other Catholics to Magisterial teachings, including those on artificial birth control. Contrariwise, detractors of the Church’s teaching prefer to paint a disconnect, wherein the bishops—invariably described as “celibate, male,” and usually “old”—run their mouths off about contraception, while virtually every real-world Catholic wife smiles politely at her bishop’s medieval opinions, then quietly runs down to the pharmacy to refill her Yaz prescription while picking up some socks for next week’s Sunday collection for the homeless.

The reality is somewhere in between:

- ∂ Among practicing, monogamous Catholic wives “at risk of unintended pregnancy,” 4% rely on one of the two main NFP methods for family planning. This is four times the rate among the general population, and fifteen times the rate of wives identifying as having “no religion,” ... but, again, it is still 4%. All

the same, this statistic, combined with higher proportions of Catholic women who are either using no method or taking the Pill for purely medical reasons, give practicing Catholic wives a statistically large gap with all other wives over total “openness to life”: 17% of “at risk” Catholic women are open to life, while only 11% of the general population are similarly open. (Tables 3-7, 3-9)

- ∂ When all wives are considered, not merely those “at risk of unintended pregnancy,” the gap is similar: 66% of practicing Catholic wives are contracepting at any given time, compared to 72% of the general population. (Tables 3-6, 3-8)

The reality is a long way from the titular conventional wisdom: fully one-third of practicing Catholic wives are living at any given time in accordance with Church teaching. Those proportions are much higher among Catholics attending Mass more than once per week. While the Guttmacher Institute’s claim that 98% of Catholic women are contracepting was accurate given the tight restrictions and qualifications they placed on their sample data, it simply does not fully reflect the reality of Catholic American life. At the same time, the Catholic hierarchy does indeed face a vast disconnect between its moral

proclamations and the widespread practice of Catholics “on the ground.” Fewer than half of the married couples in their flocks are fully integrating their faith into their wedded lives. This result holds up despite statistical parameters as generous as the Guttmacher Institute’s were stingy.

Data Geekery, and a Conclusion

We noticed a couple of other interesting facts in the data, which we added to the report simply because we were in the neighborhood:

- ∂ The Guttmacher Institute found that a similar proportion of wives are always pregnant, seeking pregnancy, or post-partum, and that this does not vary across religion. This is broadly true, even when practicing vs. non-practicing is considered: we found 14% of Catholic wives and practicing non-Catholic wives were involved in pregnancy, while 12% of the rest are similarly involved at any given moment. However, when *all* women are considered, a gap opens up: 11% of practicing Catholic women are involved in pregnancy, compared to 9% for other religious at 8% for the rest. (Tables 4-1, 4-2, 4-3)
- ∂ This gave us pause, until we realized the probable explanation: practicing

Catholics have a higher marriage rate. Sure enough, practicing members of any religion have much higher marriage rates than the rest of the non-practicing population: at 57% - 39%, the gap is nearly 20 percentage points. (Table 4-7)

∂ Because we had five extra minutes, and an associate of the Heaney Institute asked out of curiosity, our data intern glanced briefly at the satisfaction rate for NFP methods, then pulled out the satisfaction rate for the Pill to provide a comparison. The result was somewhat surprising, even in these quarters: only 9% of NFP users stopped using it because of dissatisfaction with the method. Fully 30% of Pill users have done so (Tables 4-5 and 4-6).

It is worth noting, finally, that Catholics are roughly one-quarter of the general population. Their behaviour has a significant

impact on the general population figures.

Were we to consider Catholics versus non-Catholics, instead of Catholics versus the general population as we largely did above, the gaps between Catholic practice and the rest of the world would grow considerably larger, especially compared to those with “no religion.” That data is largely open to examination in the tables provided below.

This concludes our analysis.

Methodology

This report was based on data from the 2006–2010 National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG). Designed and administered by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), the NSFG produces national estimates of factors affecting pregnancy, including sexual activity and contraceptive use. Data were gathered using in-person interviews with 12,279 women aged 15–44 between June 2006 and June 2010. All data used for this analysis were weighted, and the findings are nationally representative. All *differences* presented are statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, as measured by the Pearson chi-squared significance test, using the NSFG’s weights. All *figures* reported have a $\pm 5\%$ margin of error or better and a 91%⁶ confidence level or better, except where otherwise noted.

The primary author took Statistics I from Professor Agnes Kiss at the University of St. Thomas in Fall 2007. He received an A. He hopes he remembered how to confidence levels correctly.⁷

During our study, we discovered that, in addition to the reported restrictions in the Alan Guttmacher Institute’s measurement for “women who are at risk of unintended pregnancy”, the Institute also apparently excluded: (1) naturally sterile women, (2) women with naturally sterile male sex partners, (3) women who were noncontraceptively sterilized, and (4) women whose current male sex partners were noncontraceptively sterilized. This made small differences in their findings, but no results moved by more than about 2%, and it had no statistically significant impact on measured NFP use or the use of no birth control method, which were the figures of greatest interest to us. Once we realized the Guttmacher Institute’s unreported restrictions, we moved to imitate them wherever we attempted to reconstruct Guttmacher findings.

Many women reported multiple methods of contraception in use during a given month, but the structure of our study required that we choose only one method for each woman. We followed to approaches to this problem.

The Guttmacher Institute, whose objective was to measure the widespread use of so-called “highly effective” birth control methods—surgical sterilization, hormonal contraceptives, and

⁶ We picked 91% simply to underscore to non-experts that confidence level and margin-of-error are *different* and *unrelated* uncertainty measurements, and they *stack*.

⁷ Quite possibly he didn’t. Weights always gave him some trouble. He erred on the side of caution and lower confidence whenever there was doubt.

IUDs—chose to measure the *most effective* form of birth control (under *typical use* scenarios⁸) that the woman was currently using. Where we were replicating, updating, or providing context to AGI’s numbers, we adopted their methodology.

Catholic Papists, on the other hand, are primarily interested in *adherence to Church teaching* (which they understand to be handed down to the Magisterium by the Holy Spirit, the third person of Almighty God). The statistic of interest to Catholics is not birth control *effectiveness* but *compliance*. Where we were providing a Catholic analysis of the data, or answering questions posed by the Catholic objectors to the original study, we chose to measure the method *least compliant* with Church teaching⁹ that the woman was currently using. Thus, a woman who, during the same month, used Natural Family Planning, withdrawal, and the arguably abortifacient Plan B morning-after pill, was classified as currently using the morning-after pill. On both AGI-prioritized and Catholic-prioritized tables, we have ordered our results by effectiveness or Catholic compliance, respectively, and readers are free to inspect them for themselves in our Tables section.

The default weight was WGTQ1Q16, which weights for the entire 2006-2010 cycle. Where we attempted to replicate the Guttmacher Institute’s numbers, FINALWGT30, reflecting only the 2006-2008 period, was used instead.

Whether the use of hormonal contraceptives was a “medical use” or “contraceptive use” was determined by examining the NSFG variables YUSEPILL1-6. If ANY of the (up to six) reasons given for Pill use were “birth control,” the user was labeled a “contraceptive user” of birth control pills. If all reasons given were *not* birth control, “medical use” was assigned. (Other options were “cramps, or pain during menstrual periods”, “treatment for acne”, “endometriosis”, “other reasons”, “to regulate menstrual periods”, “refused”, and “don’t know”.)

Importantly, YUSEPILL applied only to pill use during the month of the interview or the immediately preceding month. For those who had used the pill prior to that, and since stopped or changed reasons, the government collected no data on reason for Pill use. For this reason, we were forced to *estimate or impute* users’ historical reasons for using the Pill, so that we could exclude exclusively medical users of the Pill from “women who have *ever used* birth

⁸ Wikipedia currently has an excellent chart measuring various methods of birth control under *typical-use* and *perfect-use* regimes. See: “Comparison of Birth Control Methods” on the English Wikipedia (oldid: 479441556)

⁹ As defined in *Humanae Vitae* (the encyclical confirming the infallibility of Catholic teaching on birth control) and subsequent papal and ecumenical documents of lesser authority

control”. There are several alternative approaches to this problem, all with their pros and cons. We used two. The first is explained below. The second was simply a multiplication of the top rows of Tables 1-8 and 1-9. Neither method showed a statistically significant difference from the baseline.

We relied on the NSFG’s CONSTAT1-4 recodes for most of our findings on current contraceptive use, including its means for assessing whether sterilization was natural, contraceptive, or non-contraceptive. The NSFG’s method is described in its documentation and was satisfying to us. Measurements of female desire to reverse surgical sterilization were available only for tubal ligations and vasectomies; we used RWANTRVT and RWANTREV to compute this data.

The following computations, which we used in our analysis of the “ever-used contraception” statistics, are listed in full because they were very long and very messy, and therefore especially susceptible to error. (However, they were also the only computations that accurately reproduced Guttmacher’s numbers for the ever-used category, so there is some reason for confidence in them.)

Expression 1: Computation for women who have ever used a birth control method, other than NFP or noncontraceptive sterilization: (CONDOM=1) | (VASECTMY=1) | (DEPOPROV=1) | (LUNELLE=1) | (WIDRAWAL=1) | (PATCH=1) | (RING=1) | (PILL=1) | (MORNPIII=1) | (OTHRMETH01 < 95) | (ANYFSTER = 1 & (RHADALL = 1 | RHADALL2 = 1 | RHADALL3 = 1 | RHADALL4=1 | HHADALL = 1 | HHADALL2 = 1 | HHADALL3 = 1 | HHADALL4=1 | BCREAS = 1 | BCREAS2 = 1 | BCREAS3 = 1 | BCREAS4 = 1) & (FMEDREAS1 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS2 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS3 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS4 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS5 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS7 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS8 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS9 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS10 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS11 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS12 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS13 & FMEDREAS14 & FMEDREAS15 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS16 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS17 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS19 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS20 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS21 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS22 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS23 ~= 1)) | (ANYMSTER = 1 & (RHADALLM = 1 | HHADALLM=1 | BCREASM = 1))

Expression 2: To also count exclusively medical users of the Pill as No, while counting contraceptive users as Yes, while excluding entirely those who took it for unknown reasons: (CONDOM=1) | (VASECTMY=1) | (DEPOPROV=1) | (LUNELLE=1) | (WIDRAWAL=1) | (PATCH=1) | (RING=1) | (MORNPIII=1) | (OTHRMETH01 < 95) | (ANYFSTER = 1 &

(RHADALL = 1 | RHADALL2 = 1 | RHADALL3 = 1 | RHADALL4=1 | HHADALL = 1 | HHADALL2 = 1 | HHADALL3 = 1 | HHADALL4=1 | BCREAS = 1 | BCREAS2 = 1 | BCREAS3 = 1 | BCREAS4 = 1) & (FMEDREAS1 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS2 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS3 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS4 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS5 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS7 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS8 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS9 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS10 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS11 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS12 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS13 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS14 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS15 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS16 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS17 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS18 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS19 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS20 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS21 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS22 ~= 1 & FMEDREAS23 ~= 1)) | (ANYMSTER = 1 & (RHADALLM = 1 | HHADALLM=1 | BCREASM = 1)) | (PILL_RECENT = 1 & PILLISBC = 1 & PILLONLY=1). This expression was to apply only if ~(PILLONLY = 1 & PILL_RECENT = 5) to exclude people whose only contraceptive method was the Pill, but who used it for unknown reasons in the non-recent past (and so were not well-captured by the NSFG survey).

PILL_RECENT, representing use of the Pill in the current or preceding month, was computed simply from the presence or absence of data in YUSEPILL1. PILLONLY, which represents a contraception user who used ONLY the Pill among all methods other than non-contraceptive sterilization and NFP; it was computed by removing PILL=1 from Expression 1, negating the entire expression, and joining it back to "& (PILL=1)". PILLISBC, representing whether recent use of the Pill was for birth control or for exclusively medical reasons, is a recode from YUSEPILL1-6. If YUSEPILL1-6 = 0 or SYSMIS, PILLISBC = 0 = "N/A". Else, if any of YUSEPILL1-6 = 1, PILLISBC = 1 = "Yes". Else, PILLISBC = 0.

"AGI" refers to the Alan Guttmacher Institute. "PPVI" refers to Pope Paul VI, author of *Humane Vitae* and confirmer of Catholic teaching about birth control.

Do not attempt to print the Tables section, unless you have very unusually shaped paper. The Tables are on huge sheets in order to prevent page breaks from getting in the way.

Tables: Section 1 – “Ever Used Contraception”

Table 1-1. Women ages 15-44 who have ever used any form of contraception, including NFP, at any time, any number of times, for any reason, including non-contraceptive reasons, by religion, NSFG 2006-2010

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Ever used any method for any reason (RECODE)	YES	86.8%	2681	89.5%	5120	78.5%	831	91.5%	2149	88.2%	10781
	NO	13.2%	454	10.5%	636	21.5%	206	8.5%	202	11.8%	1498

Table 1-2. Sexually experienced women* ages 15-44 who have ever used any form of contraception, including NFP, at any time, any number of times, for any reason, including non-contraceptive reasons, by religion, NSFG 2006-2010

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Ever used any method for any reason (RECODE)	YES	98.5%	2615	99.4%	4983	98.4%	802	99.4%	2099	99.1%	10499
	NO	1.5%	42	0.6%	31	1.6%	17	0.6%	16	0.9%	106

*Refers to heterosexual vaginal intercourse. This terminology is used by the NSFG, AGI, and Politifac; it is not an attempt by the Heaney Institute to slight homo- or heterosexual sodomitic acts.

DATA NOTES: RESTRICTIONS: HADSEX = 1 / Has had heterosexual vaginal intercourse

Table 1-3a. Sexually experienced women* ages 15-44 who have ever used any form of contraception, except NFP, at any time, any number of times, for any reason, including non-contraceptive reasons, by religion, NSFG 2006-2008

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Ever used a birth control method, excluding NFP and non-contraceptive sterilization	Yes	98.0%	1616	99.3%	2909	98.2%	536	99.3%	1181	98.9%	6242
	No	2.0%	31	0.7%	27	1.8%	15	0.7%	14	1.1%	87

*Refers to heterosexual vaginal intercourse.

**For the full formula used to compute this table, refer to the Methodology.

DATA NOTES: WEIGHT: FINALWGT30 (normal weight is WGTQ1Q16)
 RESTRICTIONS: HADSEX = 1 (has had heterosexual vaginal intercourse)
 CMINTVW <= 1308 (interview in December 2008 or earlier)

THIS TABLE **REPLICATES** GUTTMACHER DATA. SEE “Supplemental Tables on Religion and Contraceptive Use,” Guttmacher Institute, 15 Feb 2012, TABLE 1.

Table 1-3b. Sexually experienced women* ages 15-44 who have ever used any form of contraception, etc., etc., except NFP or non-contraceptive sterilization, by religion, NSFG 2006-2010**

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Ever used a birth control method, excluding NFP and non-contraceptive sterilization	Yes	98.2%	2602	99.1%	4969	98.2%	800	99.3%	2098	98.8%	10469
	No	1.8%	55	0.9%	45	1.8%	19	0.7%	17	1.2%	136

*Refers to heterosexual vaginal intercourse.

**For the full formula used to compute this table, refer to the Methodology.

DATA NOTES: HADSEX = 1 (has had heterosexual vaginal intercourse)

THIS TABLE **UPDATES** GUTTMACHER DATA. SEE “Supplemental Tables on Religion and Contraceptive Use,” Guttmacher Institute, 15 Feb 2012, TABLE 1.

Table 1-4. Sexually experienced Catholic women* ages 15-44 who have ever used any form of contraception, etc., etc., except NFP or non-contraceptive sterilization, by Mass attendance, NSFG 2006-2010

	IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services									
	More than once a week		Once a week		PRACTICING CATHOLICS (1+/wk)		LAPSED CATHOLICS (<1/wk)		Total	
	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Ever used a birth control method, excluding NFP and non-contraceptive sterilization	96.5%	90	96.8%	625	96.8%	715	98.7%	1887	98.2%	2602
No	3.5%	5	3.2%	24	3.2%	29	1.3%	26	1.8%	55

*Refers to heterosexual vaginal intercourse.

**For the full formula used to compute this table, refer to the Methodology.

DATA NOTES: HADSEX = 1 (has had heterosexual vaginal intercourse)
RELIGION=2 (Catholic)

Table 1-5. Sexually experienced women* ages 15-44 who have ever used any form of contraception, etc., etc., except NFP, non-contraceptive sterilization, or exclusively medical use of the Pill, by religion, NSFG 2006-2010**

	Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
	CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Second attempt at capturing ever used birth control except NFP and non-contraceptive sterilization or Pill	98.1%	2565	99.1%	4923	98.1%	794	99.2%	2077	98.8%	10359
No	1.9%	57	0.9%	46	1.9%	19	0.8%	18	1.2%	140

*Refers to heterosexual vaginal intercourse.

**Women who had used only the Pill, and only for unknown reasons, were excluded entirely. For the full formula used to compute this table, refer to the Methodology.

DATA NOTES: HADSEX = 1 (has had heterosexual vaginal intercourse)

Table 1-6. Sexually experienced Catholic women* ages 15-44 who have ever used any form of contraception, etc., etc., except NFP, non-contraceptive sterilization, or exclusively medical use of the Pill, by Mass attendance, NSFG 2006-2010**

	IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services									
	More than once a week		Once a week		PRACTICING CATHOLICS (1+/wk)		LAPSED CATHOLICS (<1/wk)		Total	
	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Second attempt at capturing ever used birth control except NFP and non-contraceptive sterilization or Pill	96.5%	88	96.7%	609	96.7%	697	98.7%	1868	98.1%	2565
No	3.5%	5	3.3%	24	3.3%	29	1.3%	28	1.9%	57

*Refers to heterosexual vaginal intercourse.

**Women who had used only the Pill, and only for unknown reasons, were excluded entirely. For the full formula used to compute this table, refer to the Methodology.

RELIABILITY NOTE: Findings in the "more than once a week" column have a margin of error of +/- 8.4% at a confidence level of 91%, or +/- 5% at 69% confidence.

DATA NOTES: HADSEX = 1 (has had heterosexual vaginal intercourse)
RELIGION=2 (Catholic)

Table 1-7. Women, including virgins, at or above the average age of first intercourse (all women ages 17-44), who have ever used any form of contraception, etc., etc., except NFP, non-contraceptive sterilization, or exclusively medical use of the Pill, by religion, NSFG 2006-2010**

	Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
	CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Second attempt at capturing ever used birth control except NFP and non-contraceptive sterilization or Pill	90.1%	2535	91.1%	4846	81.4%	781	93.2%	2032	90.3%	10194
No	9.9%	317	8.9%	484	18.6%	159	6.8%	153	9.7%	1113

**Women who had used only the Pill, and only for unknown reasons, were excluded entirely. For the full formula used to compute this table, refer to the Methodology.

DATA NOTES: RSCRAGE >= 17 (17 years or older)

(17 is the average age of first female intercourse in the United States, according to the Guttmacher Institute, citing *Vital and Health Statistics*.)

Table 1-8. Women, including virgins, at or above the average age of first intercourse (all women ages 17-44), who have ever used any form of contraception, etc., etc., except NFP, non-contraceptive sterilization, or exclusively medical use of the Pill, by Mass attendance, NSFG 2006-2010**

		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services									
		More than once a week		Once a week		PRACTICING CATHOLICS (1+/wk)		LAPSED CATHOLICS (<1/wk)		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Second attempt at capturing ever used birth control except NFP and non-contraceptive sterilization or Pill	Yes	89.0%	88	85.4%	604	85.8%	692	91.7%	1843	90.1%	2535
	No	11.0%	18	14.6%	115	14.2%	133	8.3%	184	9.9%	317

**Women who had used only the Pill, and only for unknown reasons, were excluded entirely. For the full formula used to compute this table, refer to the Methodology.

RELIABILITY NOTE: Findings in the "more than once a week" column have a margin of error of +/- 7.9% at a confidence level of 91%, or +/- 5% at 71% confidence.

DATA NOTES: RSCRAGE >= 17 (17 years or older)
RELIGION = 2 (Catholic)

Table 1-8. Contraceptive vs. non-contraceptive use of the Pill among women, ages 15-44, who used the Pill during the current or preceding month, NSFG 2006-2010

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Recent Pill use was/is at least partly contraceptive	Yes	87.3%	477	84.8%	768	90.8%	137	86.3%	400	86.2%	1782
	No	12.7%	89	15.2%	161	9.2%	19	13.7%	65	13.8%	334

DATA NOTES: PILLISBC == 0 (used Pill for birth control)
RECODE: PILLISBC →
= 0 = "N/A" if YUSEPILL1-6 = 0 or YUSEPILL1-6 = SYSMIS;
= 1 = "YES" if any of YUSEPILL1-6 = 1
= 5 = "NO" in all other cases

Table 1-9. Sexually experienced women* ages 15-44 whose only method of contraception ever used, besides NFP or noncontr. steriliz., was the Pill, NSFG 2006-2010

		Column N %	Unweighted Count
Has only used the Pill, among all artificial, intentional contraceptive methods	Yes	1.5%	151
	No	98.5%	10454

DATA NOTES: HADSEX = 1 (has had heterosexual vaginal intercourse)

Table 1-10. Tables 1-3b and 1-5, with more precision, illustrating that excluding medical users of the Pill makes a negligible difference

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Ever used a birth control method, excluding NFP and non-contraceptive sterilization	Yes	98.185%	2567	99.113%	4924	98.140%	794	99.298%	2078	98.836%	10363
	No	1.815%	55	0.887%	45	1.860%	19	0.702%	17	1.164%	136
Second attempt at capturing ever used birth control except NFP and non-contraceptive sterilization or Pill	Yes	98.137%	2565	99.106%	4923	98.140%	794	99.248%	2077	98.812%	10359
	No	1.863%	57	0.894%	46	1.860%	19	0.752%	18	1.188%	140

Tables: Section 2 – Current contraceptive use, AGI classifications

Table 2-1. Current contraceptive use among all women ages 15-44, 2006-2010 NSFG, using Alan Guttmacher Institute's prioritization method

(In this and all later tables, subtotals are CAPITALIZED)

	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Female sterilization (contraceptive)	16.5%	1809
Male sterilization (contraceptive)	6.2%	526
Female sterility (natural)	1.4%	188
Male sterility (natural)	0.3%	37
Female sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.4%	48
Male sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.0%	1
Male sterilization (unknown reasons)	0.0%	1
STERILIZATION	24.8%	2610
Norplant or Implanon implant	0.3%	44
Lunelle (injectable)	0.1%	12
Depo-Provera (injectable)	2.2%	377
Pill (contraceptive use)	15.1%	1689
Pill (medical use only)	2.1%	281
Contraceptive patch	0.5%	82
Contraceptive ring	1.3%	174
Morning-after pill	0.1%	8
PILL OR OTHER HORMONAL	21.7%	2667
IUD	3.4%	459
Condom	10.4%	1370
Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.2%	19
Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	0.6%	80
NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING	0.8%	99
OTHER METHODS	3.5%	433
NO METHOD	7.7%	989
Pregnant	3.8%	459
Seeking pregnancy	4.0%	452
Postpartum (< -2.5 months)	0.7%	104
Never had intercourse (since first period)	11.8%	1498
Sexually inactive (has had intercourse, but not in > 3 mts)	7.3%	1139
Total	100.0%	12279

Table 2-2a. Current contraceptive use among women at risk of unintended pregnancy*, by religious affiliation, 2006-2008 NSFG, AGI classifications

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method, following AGI prioritization rules	Female sterilization (contraceptive)	23.7%	277	28.0%	582	11.9%	51	19.3%	155	24.0%	1065
	Male sterilization (contraceptive)	8.1%	76	9.6%	161	10.6%	29	6.7%	63	8.8%	329
	STERILIZATION	31.9%	353	37.6%	743	22.5%	80	26.0%	218	32.8%	1394
	Norplant or Implanon implant	0.3%	3	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	5
	Lunelle (injectable)	0.8%	8	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	9
	Depo-Provera (injectable)	3.0%	55	3.2%	119	0.9%	9	2.6%	34	2.8%	217
	Pill (contraceptive use)	22.0%	294	21.3%	470	24.5%	91	22.1%	201	21.9%	1056
	Pill (medical use only)	1.9%	42	3.6%	90	3.0%	14	3.0%	31	3.1%	177
	Contraceptive patch	0.8%	15	0.6%	24	0.9%	6	0.6%	12	0.7%	57
	Contraceptive ring	2.0%	25	2.6%	45	1.3%	7	1.4%	22	2.1%	99
	Morning-after pill	0.1%	2	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.5%	3	0.1%	6
	PILL OR OTHER HORMONAL	31.0%	444	31.4%	750	30.6%	127	30.3%	305	31.1%	1626
	IUD	5.2%	71	4.2%	89	5.9%	25	5.9%	54	4.9%	239
	CONDOM	15.4%	202	11.3%	319	26.1%	103	17.4%	165	14.7%	789
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.5%	7	0.1%	4	0.1%	1	0.5%	2	0.3%	14
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	1.5%	18	0.7%	17	0.6%	6	0.1%	4	0.8%	45
	NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING	2.0%	25	0.8%	21	0.7%	7	0.6%	6	1.0%	59
	Withdrawal	3.7%	66	4.9%	98	4.7%	18	5.9%	55	4.7%	237
	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	Other method	0.0%	1	0.1%	4	0.2%	2	0.2%	2	0.1%	9
	Diaphragm (with or w/out jelly or cream)	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.3%	2	0.1%	3
	Foam	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	Today sponge	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	Suppository or insert	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	3
	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.0%	0	0.1%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	Cervical Cap	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	OTHER METHOD	3.7%	67	5.1%	107	5.2%	22	6.4%	60	5.0%	256
	No method used (sexually active)	11.0%	159	9.6%	277	9.0%	45	13.4%	119	10.5%	600
NO METHOD	11.0%	159	9.6%	277	9.0%	45	13.4%	119	10.5%	600	
Total	100.0%	1321	100.0%	2306	100.0%	409	100.0%	927	100.0%	4963	

*Refers to women who are (1) not pregnant, (2) not attempting to become pregnant, (3) not postpartum, (4) fecund or contraceptively sterile, (5) whose most current male sex partner is fecund or contraceptively sterile, (6) have had sex during the three months prior to survey, and (7) are age 15-44.

DATA NOTES: WEIGHT: FINALWGT30 (normal weight is WGTQ1Q16)
 RESTRICTIONS: CMINTVW <= 1308 (interview in December 2008 or earlier)

THIS TABLE REPLICATES GUTTMACHER DATA. SEE "Supplemental Tables on Religion and Contraceptive Use," Guttmacher Institute, 15 Feb 2012, TABLE 2.

Table 2-2b. Current contraceptive use among women at risk of unintended pregnancy*, by religious affiliation, 2006-2010 NSFG, AGI classifications

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method, following AGI prioritization rules	Female sterilization (contraceptive)	20.9%	432	28.5%	1020	13.1%	80	18.7%	277	23.5%	1809
	Male sterilization (contraceptive)	8.1%	121	9.7%	253	9.3%	42	7.6%	110	8.9%	526
	STERILIZATION	29.0%	553	38.2%	1273	22.4%	122	26.2%	387	32.4%	2335
	Norplant or Implanon implant	0.3%	12	0.5%	22	0.1%	2	0.4%	8	0.4%	44
	Lunelle (injectable)	0.6%	9	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	3	0.2%	12
	Depo-Provera (injectable)	3.6%	87	3.6%	209	1.0%	14	2.7%	67	3.2%	377
	Pill (contraceptive use)	22.6%	460	19.8%	716	22.1%	134	23.7%	379	21.4%	1689
	Pill (medical use only)	2.6%	72	3.1%	136	2.1%	17	3.4%	56	3.0%	281
	Contraceptive patch	0.9%	22	0.5%	33	1.1%	9	0.6%	18	0.7%	82
	Contraceptive ring	1.5%	37	2.1%	85	1.3%	8	2.1%	44	1.9%	174
	Morning-after pill	0.1%	2	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.3%	5	0.1%	8
	PILL OR OTHER HORMONAL	32.2%	701	29.7%	1202	27.6%	184	33.3%	580	30.8%	2667
	IUD	4.3%	118	4.0%	176	8.6%	47	6.3%	118	4.9%	459
	CONDOM	16.1%	353	12.8%	584	24.1%	151	14.6%	282	14.9%	1370
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.5%	10	0.1%	6	0.1%	1	0.3%	2	0.2%	19
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	1.4%	34	0.9%	30	0.8%	7	0.2%	9	0.9%	80
	NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING	2.0%	44	1.0%	36	0.9%	8	0.4%	11	1.1%	99
	Withdrawal	5.0%	111	4.2%	163	4.3%	32	5.5%	92	4.7%	398
	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	Other method	0.1%	3	0.1%	8	0.1%	2	0.2%	5	0.1%	18
	Diaphragm (with or w/out jelly or cream)	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.4%	2	0.1%	4
	Foam	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	Today sponge	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	Suppository or insert	0.2%	2	0.1%	3	0.1%	1	0.0%	1	0.1%	7
	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.0%	0	0.1%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3
	Cervical Cap	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	OTHER METHOD	5.2%	116	4.6%	181	4.6%	36	6.1%	100	5.0%	433
No method used (sexually active)	11.2%	231	9.9%	471	11.8%	70	13.0%	217	10.9%	989	
NO METHOD	11.2%	231	9.9%	471	11.8%	70	13.0%	217	10.9%	989	
Total	100.0%	2116	100.0%	3923	100.0%	618	100.0%	1695	100.0%	8352	

*Refers to women who are (1) not pregnant, (2) not attempting to become pregnant, (3) not postpartum, (4) fecund or contraceptively sterile, (5) whose most current male sex partner is fecund or contraceptively sterile, (6) have had sex during the three months prior to survey, and (7) are age 15-44.

THIS TABLE **UPDATES** GUTTMACHER DATA. SEE "Supplemental Tables on Religion and Contraceptive Use," Guttmacher Institute, 15 Feb 2012, TABLE 2.

Table 2-3. Current contraceptive use among Catholic women at risk of unintended pregnancy*, by Mass attendance, 2006-2010 NSFG, AGI classifications

		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services									
		More than once a week		Once a week		PRACTICING CATHOLICS (1+/wk)		LAPSED CATHOLICS (<1/wk)		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method, following AGI prioritization rules	Female sterilization (contraceptive)	27.1%	15	28.6%	123	28.4%	138	18.3%	294	20.9%	432
	Male sterilization (contraceptive)	14.3%	5	7.4%	31	8.2%	36	8.1%	85	8.1%	121
	STERILIZATION	41.4%	20	36.0%	154	36.6%	174	26.4%	379	29.0%	553
	Norplant or Implanon implant	0.0%	0	0.9%	5	0.8%	5	0.2%	7	0.3%	12
	Lunelle (injectable)	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.7%	8	0.6%	9
	Depo-Provera (injectable)	6.1%	6	3.2%	20	3.6%	26	3.6%	61	3.6%	87
	Pill (contraceptive use)	7.2%	8	16.7%	79	15.5%	87	25.0%	373	22.6%	460
	Pill (medical use only)	1.3%	2	4.0%	17	3.7%	19	2.2%	53	2.6%	72
	Contraceptive patch	0.0%	0	1.0%	7	0.9%	7	0.9%	15	0.9%	22
	Contraceptive ring	0.0%	0	1.8%	7	1.5%	7	1.5%	30	1.5%	37
	Morning-after pill	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2
	PILL OR OTHER HORMONAL	14.6%	16	27.9%	137	26.2%	153	34.2%	548	32.2%	701
	IUD	1.7%	3	3.5%	22	3.3%	25	4.7%	93	4.3%	118
	CONDOM	11.9%	10	14.7%	81	14.3%	91	16.7%	262	16.1%	353
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.0%	0	2.1%	6	1.8%	6	0.1%	4	0.5%	10
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	8.5%	2	1.2%	11	2.1%	13	1.2%	21	1.4%	34
	NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING	8.5%	2	3.2%	17	3.9%	19	1.3%	25	2.0%	44
	Withdrawal	2.9%	6	5.1%	24	4.8%	30	5.0%	81	5.0%	111
	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	Other method	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	3	0.1%	3
	Diaphragm (with or w/out jelly or cream)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	Foam	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	Today sponge	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	Suppository or insert	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.3%	2	0.2%	2
	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	Cervical Cap	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	OTHER METHOD	2.9%	6	5.1%	24	4.8%	30	5.4%	86	5.2%	116
No method used (sexually active)	19.0%	13	9.7%	53	10.8%	66	11.3%	165	11.2%	231	
NO METHOD	19.0%	13	9.7%	53	10.8%	66	11.3%	165	11.2%	231	
Total	100.0%	70	100.0%	488	100.0%	558	100.0%	1558	100.0%	2116	

*Refers to women who are (1) not pregnant, (2) not attempting to become pregnant, (3) not postpartum, (4) fecund or contraceptively sterile, (5) whose most current male sex partner is fecund or contraceptively sterile, (6) have had sex during the three months prior to survey, and (7) are age 15-44.

RELIABILITY NOTE: Findings in the "more than once a week" column have a margin of error of +/- 10% at a confidence level of 91%, or +/- 5% at 60%

DATA NOTES: RELIGION = 2 (Catholic)

Tables: Section 3 – Current contraceptive use, PPVI classifications

Table 3-1. Current contraceptive use among all women ages 15-44, 2006-2010 NSFG, using Pope Paul VI's *Humanae Vitae* prioritization method

	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Virgin (since first period)	11.8%	1498
Sexually inactive (no intercourse in > 3 months)	7.3%	1139
Pregnant	3.8%	459
Postpartum (< ~2 months)	0.7%	104
Seeking pregnancy	4.0%	452
No method used (sexually active)	7.7%	989
Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.1%	10
Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	0.4%	58
Pill (medical use)	2.1%	274
Female sterility (natural)	1.0%	127
Male sterility (natural)	0.2%	36
Female sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.3%	43
Male sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.0%	1
OPEN TO LIFE	39.4%	5190
Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	2.8%	340
Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	0.6%	44
STERILIZED - WOULD REVERSE	3.4%	384
Withdrawal	3.6%	430
Condom (male)	10.8%	1431
Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	3
Diaphragm (with or w/out jelly or cream)	0.1%	4
Foam	0.1%	7
Today sponge	0.0%	2
Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.1%	14
Suppository or insert	0.1%	11
Other method	0.1%	22
Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	12.8%	1363
Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	5.9%	504
Male sterilization/sterility (nature unknown)	0.1%	9
Pill (contraceptive use)	15.3%	1710
Hormonal patch	0.5%	83
Hormonal ring	1.4%	176
Norplant or Implanon implant	0.3%	45
Lunelle (injectable)	0.1%	12
Depo-Provera (injectable)	2.4%	394
Morning-after pill	0.1%	12
IUD	3.6%	473
ARTIFICIAL BIRTH CONTROL	57.2%	6705
Total	100.0%	12279

Table 3-2. Current contraceptive use among all women, ages 15-44, by religious affiliation, 2006-2010 NSFG, PPVI classifications

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	Virgin (since first period)	12.5%	436	10.8%	655	21.3%	205	8.4%	202	11.8%	1498
	Sexually inactive (no intercourse in > 3 months)	6.8%	251	7.1%	543	7.0%	101	8.7%	244	7.3%	1139
	Pregnant	4.6%	118	4.0%	233	2.9%	42	2.9%	66	3.8%	459
	Postpartum (< ~2 months)	0.7%	27	0.7%	52	0.6%	5	0.8%	20	0.7%	104
	Seeking pregnancy	4.4%	123	4.1%	215	3.7%	43	3.2%	71	4.0%	452
	Female sterility (natural)	1.2%	28	0.8%	65	1.4%	12	0.9%	22	1.0%	127
	Male sterility (natural)	0.2%	9	0.2%	17	0.5%	2	0.3%	8	0.2%	36
	Female sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.3%	11	0.3%	22	0.1%	3	0.5%	7	0.3%	43
	Male sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	No method used (sexually active)	7.7%	231	7.1%	471	7.3%	70	9.6%	217	7.7%	989
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.2%	7	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	10
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	0.8%	29	0.3%	17	0.3%	4	0.1%	8	0.4%	58
	Pill (medical use)	1.7%	69	2.2%	132	1.3%	17	2.5%	56	2.1%	274
	OPEN TO LIFE	41.0%	1339	37.7%	2425	46.5%	504	38.1%	922	39.4%	5190
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	2.8%	92	3.6%	190	0.8%	8	1.8%	50	2.8%	340
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	0.9%	12	0.6%	19	0.4%	3	0.4%	10	0.6%	44
	STERILIZED - WOULD REVERSE	3.7%	104	4.2%	209	1.1%	11	2.1%	60	3.4%	384
	Withdrawal	3.8%	120	3.4%	177	3.2%	37	4.3%	96	3.6%	430
	Condom (male)	11.2%	359	9.6%	627	14.8%	152	11.3%	293	10.8%	1431
	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	1	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3
	Diaphragm (with or w/out jelly or cream)	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.3%	3	0.1%	4
	Foam	0.1%	3	0.1%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	7
	Today sponge	0.1%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.0%	1	0.1%	9	0.2%	2	0.0%	2	0.1%	14
	Suppository or insert	0.1%	3	0.1%	5	0.1%	2	0.0%	1	0.1%	11
	Other method	0.0%	3	0.1%	11	0.1%	3	0.1%	5	0.1%	22
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	11.1%	325	15.5%	765	7.1%	67	11.0%	206	12.8%	1363
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	5.0%	115	6.7%	245	5.6%	42	5.3%	102	5.9%	504
	Male sterilization/sterility (nature unknown)	0.1%	2	0.0%	4	0.0%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	9
	Pill (contraceptive use)	15.6%	462	14.5%	731	13.7%	133	17.8%	384	15.3%	1710
	Hormonal patch	0.6%	22	0.4%	33	0.7%	10	0.4%	18	0.5%	83
	Hormonal ring	1.1%	38	1.5%	85	0.8%	9	1.5%	44	1.4%	176
	Norplant or Implanon implant	0.2%	12	0.4%	23	0.1%	2	0.3%	8	0.3%	45
Lunelle (injectable)	0.4%	9	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	3	0.1%	12	
Depo-Provera (injectable)	2.5%	91	2.7%	218	0.6%	15	2.2%	70	2.4%	394	
Morning-after pill	0.1%	3	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.3%	8	0.1%	12	
IUD	3.2%	122	3.0%	182	5.3%	47	4.7%	122	3.6%	473	
ARTIFICIAL BIRTH CONTROL	55.3%	1692	58.1%	3122	52.4%	522	59.8%	1369	57.2%	6705	
Total	100.0%	3135	100.0%	5756	100.0%	1037	100.0%	2351	100.0%	12279	

Table 3-3. Current contraceptive use among women at risk of unintended pregnancy*, by religious affiliation, 2006-2010 NSFG, PPVI classifications

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	No method used (sexually active)	11.1%	231	9.8%	471	11.7%	70	12.9%	217	10.9%	989
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.3%	7	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	10
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	1.1%	29	0.5%	17	0.4%	4	0.2%	8	0.6%	58
	Pill (medical use)	2.5%	69	3.1%	132	2.1%	17	3.4%	56	2.9%	274
	OPEN TO LIFE	15.0%	336	13.4%	622	14.2%	91	16.5%	282	14.4%	1331
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	4.0%	92	5.1%	190	1.2%	8	2.4%	50	4.0%	340
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	1.3%	12	0.8%	19	0.6%	3	0.5%	10	0.9%	44
	STERILIZED - WOULD REVERSE	5.3%	104	5.9%	209	1.8%	11	2.8%	60	4.8%	384
	Withdrawal	5.5%	120	4.7%	177	5.1%	37	5.7%	96	5.1%	430
	Condom (male)	16.1%	359	13.3%	627	23.8%	152	15.3%	293	15.2%	1431
	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	1	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3
	Diaphragm (with or w/out jelly or cream)	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.4%	3	0.1%	4
	Foam	0.1%	3	0.1%	2	0.0%	0	0.1%	2	0.1%	7
	Today sponge	0.1%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.0%	1	0.2%	9	0.4%	2	0.1%	2	0.1%	14
	Suppository or insert	0.2%	3	0.1%	5	0.2%	2	0.0%	1	0.1%	11
	Other method	0.1%	3	0.1%	11	0.2%	3	0.2%	5	0.1%	22
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	16.1%	325	21.6%	765	11.4%	67	14.9%	206	18.1%	1363
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	7.1%	115	9.3%	245	8.9%	42	7.1%	102	8.3%	504
	Male sterilization/sterility (nature unknown)	0.2%	2	0.0%	4	0.0%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	9
	Pill (contraceptive use)	22.5%	462	20.2%	731	21.9%	133	24.0%	384	21.6%	1710
	Hormonal patch	0.9%	22	0.5%	33	1.1%	10	0.6%	18	0.7%	83
	Hormonal ring	1.6%	38	2.1%	85	1.4%	9	2.1%	44	1.9%	176
	Norplant or Implanon implant	0.3%	12	0.5%	23	0.1%	2	0.4%	8	0.4%	45
	Lunelle (injectable)	0.6%	9	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	3	0.2%	12
	Depo-Provera (injectable)	3.7%	91	3.8%	218	1.0%	15	2.9%	70	3.3%	394
	Morning-after pill	0.1%	3	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.3%	8	0.1%	12
	IUD	4.5%	122	4.2%	182	8.5%	47	6.3%	122	5.0%	473
	ARTIFICIAL BIRTH CONTROL	79.7%	1692	80.8%	3122	83.9%	522	80.6%	1369	80.7%	6705
	Total	100.0%	2132	100.0%	3953	100.0%	624	100.0%	1711	100.0%	8420

*Refers to women who are (1) not pregnant, (2) not attempting to become pregnant, (3) not postpartum, (4) fecund or contraceptively sterile, (5) whose most current male sex partner is fecund or contraceptively sterile, (6) have had sex during the three months prior to survey, and (7) are age 15-44.

Table 3-4. Current contraceptive use among Catholic women at risk of unintended pregnancy*, by Mass attendance, 2006-2010 NSFG, PPVI classifications

		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services									
		More than once a week		Once a week		PRACTICING CATHOLICS (+1/wk)		LAPSED CATHOLICS (<1/wk)		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
	No method used (sexually active)	18.7%	13	9.5%	53	10.6%	66	11.2%	165	11.1%	231
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.0%	0	1.0%	3	0.9%	3	0.1%	4	0.3%	7
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	8.4%	2	1.2%	12	2.1%	14	0.8%	15	1.1%	29
	Pill (medical use)	1.2%	2	3.8%	16	3.4%	18	2.2%	51	2.5%	69
	OPEN TO LIFE	28.4%	17	15.4%	84	17.0%	101	14.3%	235	15.0%	336
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	9.0%	7	3.8%	22	4.4%	29	3.9%	63	4.0%	92
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	1.7%	11	1.3%	12
	STERILIZED - WOULD REVERSE	9.0%	7	4.0%	23	4.6%	30	5.6%	74	5.3%	104
	Withdrawal	2.9%	6	5.8%	26	5.5%	32	5.5%	88	5.5%	120
	Condom (male)	13.1%	11	15.1%	87	14.9%	98	16.5%	261	16.1%	359
	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1
	Foam	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	3	0.1%	3
	Today sponge	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	Suppository or insert	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.3%	3	0.2%	3
	Other method	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	3	0.1%	3
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	17.7%	8	22.9%	94	22.2%	102	13.9%	223	16.1%	325
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	14.1%	5	8.3%	34	9.0%	39	6.5%	76	7.1%	115
	Male sterilization/sterility (nature unknown)	0.0%	0	0.6%	1	0.5%	1	0.1%	1	0.2%	2
	Pill (contraceptive use)	7.1%	8	16.9%	81	15.7%	89	24.9%	373	22.5%	462
	Hormonal patch	0.0%	0	1.0%	7	0.9%	7	0.9%	15	0.9%	22
	Hormonal ring	0.0%	0	1.7%	7	1.5%	7	1.6%	31	1.6%	38
	Norplant or Implanon implant	0.0%	0	0.9%	5	0.8%	5	0.2%	7	0.3%	12
	Lunelle (injectable)	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.7%	8	0.6%	9
	Depo-Provera (injectable)	6.1%	6	3.5%	22	3.8%	28	3.6%	63	3.7%	91
	Morning-after pill	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	3
	IUD	1.7%	3	3.4%	22	3.2%	25	5.0%	97	4.5%	122
	ARTIFICIAL BIRTH CONTROL	62.7%	47	80.6%	389	78.4%	436	80.1%	1256	79.7%	1692
	Total	100.0%	71	100.0%	496	100.0%	567	100.0%	1565	100.0%	2132

*Refers to women who are (1) not pregnant, (2) not attempting to become pregnant, (3) not postpartum, (4) fecund or contraceptively sterile, (5) whose most current male sex partner is fecund or contraceptively sterile, (6) have had sex during the three months prior to survey, and (7) are age 15-44.

RELIABILITY NOTE: Findings in the "more than once a week" column have a margin of error of +/- 10% at a confidence level of 91%, or +/- 5% at 60%

DATA NOTES: RELIGION = 2 (Catholic)

Table 3-5. Current contraceptive use among all Catholic women, ages 15-44, by Mass attendance, 2006-2010 NSFG, PPVI classifications

		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services									
		More than once a week		Once a week		PRACTICING CATHOLICS (+1/wk)		LAPSED CATHOLICS (<1/wk)		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	Virgin (since first period)	17.0%	23	17.3%	156	17.3%	179	10.5%	257	12.5%	436
	Sexually inactive (no intercourse in > 3 months)	5.0%	12	7.8%	74	7.4%	86	6.5%	165	6.8%	251
	Pregnant	4.1%	5	5.5%	37	5.3%	42	4.3%	76	4.6%	118
	Postpartum (< -2 months)	0.1%	1	0.9%	7	0.8%	8	0.7%	19	0.7%	27
	Seeking pregnancy	9.4%	8	4.1%	34	4.8%	42	4.2%	81	4.4%	123
	Female sterility (natural)	0.0%	0	0.5%	8	0.4%	8	1.5%	20	1.2%	28
	Male sterility (natural)	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.2%	8	0.2%	9
	Female sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.0%	0	0.2%	4	0.2%	4	0.4%	7	0.3%	11
	No method used (sexually active)	12.1%	13	6.0%	53	6.8%	66	8.1%	165	7.7%	231
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.0%	0	0.6%	3	0.6%	3	0.1%	4	0.2%	7
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	5.4%	2	0.8%	12	1.3%	14	0.6%	15	0.8%	29
	Pill (medical use)	0.8%	2	2.4%	16	2.2%	18	1.5%	51	1.7%	69
	OPEN TO LIFE	53.8%	66	46.2%	405	47.1%	471	38.6%	868	41.0%	1339
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	5.8%	7	2.4%	22	2.8%	29	2.8%	63	2.8%	92
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	1.2%	11	0.9%	12
	STERILIZED - WOULD REVERSE	5.8%	7	2.5%	23	2.9%	30	4.0%	74	3.7%	104
	Withdrawal	1.9%	6	3.7%	26	3.5%	32	3.9%	88	3.8%	120
	Condom (male)	8.5%	11	9.6%	87	9.5%	98	11.8%	261	11.2%	359
	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1
	Foam	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	3	0.1%	3
	Today sponge	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1
	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	Suppository or insert	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.2%	3	0.1%	3
	Other method	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	3	0.0%	3
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	11.4%	8	14.5%	94	14.2%	102	9.9%	223	11.1%	325
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	9.1%	5	5.2%	34	5.7%	39	4.7%	76	5.0%	115
	Male sterilization/sterility (nature unknown)	0.0%	0	0.4%	1	0.3%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2
	Pill (contraceptive use)	4.6%	8	10.8%	81	10.0%	89	17.8%	373	15.6%	462
	Hormonal patch	0.0%	0	0.6%	7	0.6%	7	0.6%	15	0.6%	22
	Hormonal ring	0.0%	0	1.1%	7	1.0%	7	1.1%	31	1.1%	38
	Norplant or Implanon implant	0.0%	0	0.6%	5	0.5%	5	0.1%	7	0.2%	12
	Lunelle (injectable)	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.5%	8	0.4%	9
	Depo-Provera (injectable)	3.9%	6	2.2%	22	2.4%	28	2.6%	63	2.5%	91
	Morning-after pill	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	3
	IUD	1.1%	3	2.2%	22	2.0%	25	3.6%	97	3.2%	122
	ARTIFICIAL BIRTH CONTROL	40.4%	47	51.2%	389	49.9%	436	57.4%	1256	55.3%	1692
	Total	100.0%	120	100.0%	817	100.0%	937	100.0%	2198	100.0%	3135

RELIABILITY NOTE: Findings in the "more than once a week" column have a margin of error of +/- 7.7% at a confidence level of 91%, or +/- 5% at 72% confidence.

DATA NOTES: RELIGION = 2 (Catholic)

Table 3-6. Current contraceptive use among faithful Catholic wives, ages 15-44, by Mass attendance, 2006-2010 NSFG, PPVI classifications

		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services									
		More than once a week		Once a week		PRACTICING CATHOLICS (1+/wk)		LAPSED CATHOLICS (<1/wk)		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	Sexually inactive (no intercourse in > 3 months)	3.3%	3	2.3%	10	2.4%	13	0.8%	13	1.4%	26
	Pregnant	5.3%	3	6.1%	21	6.0%	24	7.0%	38	6.7%	62
	Postpartum (< -2 months)	0.2%	1	0.6%	4	0.5%	5	0.8%	6	0.7%	11
	Seeking pregnancy	9.3%	6	7.1%	28	7.3%	34	6.8%	55	7.0%	89
	No method used (sexually active)	16.6%	8	7.0%	24	8.2%	32	5.1%	44	6.1%	76
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.0%	0	1.2%	3	1.1%	3	0.1%	2	0.4%	5
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	10.6%	2	1.2%	9	2.4%	11	1.3%	12	1.6%	23
	Pill (medical use)	0.0%	0	2.1%	4	1.9%	4	0.5%	7	1.0%	11
	Female sterility (natural)	0.0%	0	0.6%	4	0.5%	4	2.0%	10	1.5%	14
	Male sterility (natural)	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.1%	1	0.4%	6	0.3%	7
	Female sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.7%	4	0.5%	5
	OPEN TO LIFE	45.5%	23	28.5%	109	30.5%	132	25.4%	197	27.1%	329
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	6.1%	3	2.5%	13	2.9%	16	3.7%	25	3.5%	41
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	0.0%	0	0.3%	1	0.2%	1	2.2%	8	1.5%	9
	STERILIZED - WOULD REVERSE	6.1%	3	2.8%	14	3.2%	17	5.9%	33	5.0%	50
	Withdrawal	0.7%	3	5.8%	16	5.2%	19	5.1%	44	5.2%	63
	Condom (male)	10.6%	8	11.8%	44	11.6%	52	13.5%	111	12.9%	163
	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1
	Foam	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1
	Today sponge	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.1%	1
	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.1%	1
	Suppository or insert	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.5%	2	0.3%	2
	Other method	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	2	0.1%	2
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	8.5%	3	22.0%	59	20.4%	62	13.6%	106	15.9%	168
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	17.9%	5	8.9%	32	10.0%	37	10.3%	63	10.2%	100
	Male sterilization/sterility (nature unknown)	0.0%	0	0.7%	1	0.6%	1	0.2%	1	0.3%	2
	Pill (contraceptive use)	5.9%	5	10.9%	38	10.3%	43	15.9%	111	14.0%	154
	Hormonal patch	0.0%	0	1.0%	5	0.9%	5	0.3%	3	0.5%	8
	Hormonal ring	0.0%	0	1.8%	4	1.6%	4	0.7%	9	1.0%	13
	Norplant or Implanon implant	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.3%	5	0.2%	6
	Lunelle (injectable)	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.1%	1	0.7%	2	0.5%	3
	Depo-Provera (injectable)	3.2%	3	2.2%	8	2.3%	11	1.7%	17	1.9%	28
IUD	1.5%	2	3.2%	15	3.0%	17	5.4%	44	4.6%	61	
ARTIFICIAL BIRTH CONTROL	48.4%	29	68.7%	225	66.3%	254	68.7%	523	67.9%	777	
Total	100.0%	55	100.0%	348	100.0%	403	100.0%	753	100.0%	1156	

RELIABILITY NOTE: Findings in the "more than once a week" column have a margin of error of +/- 11.4% at a confidence level of 91%, or +/- 5% at 54% confidence.

DATA NOTES: RMARITAL = 1 (currently married)
 RELIGION = 2 (Catholic)
 CURRPRTS = 0 (no current sexual partners other than husband)

Table 3-7. Current contraceptive use among faithful Catholic wives at risk of unintended pregnancy*, by Mass attendance, 2006-2010 NSFG, PPVI classifications

		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services									
		More than once a week		Once a week		PRACTICING CATHOLICS (1+/wk)		LAPSED CATHOLICS (<1/wk)		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
	No method used (sexually active)	20.3%	8	8.4%	24	9.7%	32	6.0%	44	7.2%	76
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.0%	0	1.4%	3	1.3%	3	0.1%	2	0.5%	5
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	13.0%	2	1.5%	9	2.8%	11	1.5%	12	1.9%	23
	Pill (medical use)	0.0%	0	2.6%	4	2.3%	4	0.6%	7	1.2%	11
	Female sterility (natural)	0.0%	0	0.7%	4	0.6%	4	2.3%	10	1.7%	14
	Male sterility (natural)	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	0.5%	6	0.4%	7
	Female sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.8%	4	0.6%	5
	OPEN TO LIFE	33.4%	10	14.8%	46	16.9%	56	11.8%	85	13.6%	141
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	7.5%	3	3.0%	13	3.5%	16	4.4%	25	4.1%	41
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	0.0%	0	0.3%	1	0.3%	1	2.6%	8	1.8%	9
	STERILIZED - WOULD REVERSE	7.5%	3	3.3%	14	3.8%	17	7.0%	33	5.9%	50
	Withdrawal	0.8%	3	6.9%	16	6.2%	19	6.1%	44	6.1%	63
	Condom (male)	13.0%	8	14.0%	44	13.9%	52	16.0%	111	15.3%	163
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1
	Foam	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1
	Today sponge	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.2%	1
	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.0%	0	0.3%	1	0.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.1%	1
	Suppository or insert	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.5%	2	0.4%	2
	Other method	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	2	0.1%	2
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	10.4%	3	26.2%	59	24.4%	62	16.0%	106	18.9%	168
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	21.9%	5	10.6%	32	11.9%	37	12.2%	63	12.1%	100
	Male sterilization/sterility (nature unknown)	0.0%	0	0.8%	1	0.7%	1	0.2%	1	0.4%	2
	Pill (contraceptive use)	7.2%	5	13.0%	38	12.4%	43	18.8%	111	16.6%	154
Hormonal patch	0.0%	0	1.2%	5	1.1%	5	0.3%	3	0.6%	8	
Hormonal ring	0.0%	0	2.1%	4	1.9%	4	0.9%	9	1.2%	13	
Norplant or Implanon implant	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.3%	5	0.2%	6	
Lunelle (injectable)	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	0.9%	2	0.6%	3	
Depo-Provera (injectable)	3.9%	3	2.6%	8	2.8%	11	2.1%	17	2.3%	28	
IUD	1.8%	2	3.8%	15	3.6%	17	6.4%	44	5.4%	61	
ARTIFICIAL BIRTH CONTROL	59.1%	29	81.9%	225	79.3%	254	81.2%	523	80.5%	777	
	Total	100.0%	42	100.0%	285	100.0%	327	100.0%	641	100.0%	968

*Refers to women who are (1) not pregnant, (2) not attempting to become pregnant, (3) not postpartum, (4) fecund or contraceptively sterile, (5) whose most current male sex partner is fecund or contraceptively sterile, (6) have had sex during the three months prior to survey, and (7) are age 15-44.

RELIABILITY NOTE: Findings in the "more than once a week" column have a margin of error of +/- 13.1% at a confidence level of 91%, or +/- 5% at 48% confidence.

DATA NOTES: RMARITAL = 1 (currently married)
 RELIGION = 2 (Catholic)
 CURRPRTS = 0 (no current sexual partners other than husband)

Table 3-8. Current contraceptive use among all faithful wives, ages 15-44, by religion, 2006-2010 NSFG, PPVI classifications

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	Virgin (since first period)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	Sexually inactive (no intercourse in > 3 months)	1.4%	26	0.6%	24	1.2%	9	1.3%	13	1.0%	72
	Pregnant	6.7%	62	5.0%	108	4.9%	33	5.0%	29	5.4%	232
	Postpartum (< ~2 months)	0.7%	11	1.0%	23	1.3%	5	1.2%	6	1.0%	45
	Seeking pregnancy	7.0%	89	7.0%	136	6.0%	33	5.8%	35	6.7%	293
	No method used (sexually active)	6.1%	76	5.9%	111	8.0%	38	6.7%	46	6.3%	271
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.4%	5	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	7
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	1.6%	23	0.7%	14	0.5%	4	0.2%	5	0.9%	46
	Pill (medical use)	1.0%	11	0.4%	11	0.2%	2	0.0%	0	0.5%	24
	Female sterility (natural)	1.5%	14	0.5%	18	0.1%	2	0.5%	5	0.7%	39
	Male sterility (natural)	0.3%	7	0.4%	11	0.0%	0	0.7%	5	0.3%	23
	Female sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.5%	5	0.2%	6	0.0%	0	1.0%	3	0.4%	14
	Male sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	OPEN TO LIFE	27.1%	329	21.9%	465	22.3%	127	22.4%	147	23.3%	1068
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	3.5%	41	4.6%	79	0.5%	3	2.8%	20	3.6%	143
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	1.5%	9	1.3%	16	0.7%	2	1.1%	8	1.2%	35
	STERILIZED - WOULD REVERSE	5.0%	50	5.8%	95	1.2%	5	3.9%	28	4.8%	178
	Withdrawal	5.2%	63	4.7%	85	3.7%	17	5.3%	27	4.8%	192
	Condom (male)	12.9%	163	9.0%	171	21.0%	95	13.5%	73	11.9%	502
	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	Diaphragm (with or w/out jelly or cream)	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	1.0%	2	0.1%	3
	Foam	0.1%	1	0.2%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	4
	Today sponge	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	2
	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.1%	1	0.2%	6	0.5%	2	0.0%	0	0.2%	9
	Suppository or insert	0.3%	2	0.1%	2	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	6
	Other method	0.1%	2	0.0%	2	0.2%	2	0.2%	2	0.1%	8
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	15.9%	168	22.7%	348	12.1%	48	15.4%	79	18.7%	643
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	10.2%	100	13.5%	202	10.3%	33	13.3%	71	12.2%	406
	Male sterilization/sterility (nature unknown)	0.3%	2	0.1%	3	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.2%	6
	Pill (contraceptive use)	14.0%	154	13.9%	231	17.5%	74	14.7%	77	14.4%	536
	Hormonal patch	0.5%	8	0.3%	7	0.9%	4	0.1%	1	0.4%	20
	Hormonal ring	1.0%	13	1.0%	21	0.5%	4	0.4%	4	0.9%	42
	Norplant or Implanon implant	0.2%	6	0.4%	5	0.0%	0	0.3%	2	0.3%	13
Lunelle (injectable)	0.5%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.2%	3	0.2%	6	
Depo-Provera (injectable)	1.9%	28	1.4%	33	0.1%	1	1.8%	9	1.5%	71	
IUD	4.6%	61	4.8%	92	9.7%	38	7.2%	42	5.6%	233	
ARTIFICIAL BIRTH CONTROL	67.9%	777	72.3%	1213	76.6%	319	73.7%	395	71.8%	2704	
Total	100.0%	1156	100.0%	1773	100.0%	451	100.0%	570	100.0%	3950	

*Refers to women who are (1) not pregnant, (2) not attempting to become pregnant, (3) not postpartum, (4) fecund or contraceptively sterile, (5) whose most current male sex partner is fecund or contraceptively sterile, (6) have had sex during the three months prior to survey, and (7) are age 15-44.

DATA NOTES: RMARITAL = 1 (currently married)
 CURRPRTS = 0 (no current sexual partners other than husband)

Table 3-9. Current contraceptive use among all faithful wives at risk of unintended pregnancy*, by religion, 2006-2010 NSFG, PPVI classifications

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
	No method used (sexually active)	7.2%	76	6.9%	111	9.3%	38	7.7%	46	7.3%	271
	Periodic abstinence: NFP, cervical mucus test or temperature rhythm	0.5%	5	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.2%	7
	Periodic abstinence: calendar rhythm	1.9%	23	0.8%	14	0.6%	4	0.3%	5	1.0%	46
	Pill (medical use)	1.2%	11	0.5%	11	0.2%	2	0.0%	0	0.6%	24
	Female sterility (natural)	1.7%	14	0.6%	18	0.2%	2	0.6%	5	0.8%	39
	Male sterility (natural)	0.4%	7	0.4%	11	0.0%	0	0.8%	5	0.4%	23
	Female sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.6%	5	0.3%	6	0.0%	0	1.1%	3	0.4%	14
	Male sterilization (noncontraceptive)	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	OPEN TO LIFE	13.6%	141	9.5%	174	10.2%	46	10.5%	64	10.7%	425
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	4.1%	41	5.3%	79	0.6%	3	3.3%	20	4.2%	143
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would reverse)	1.8%	9	1.4%	16	0.8%	2	1.3%	8	1.4%	35
	STERILIZED - WOULD REVERSE	5.9%	50	6.8%	95	1.4%	5	4.5%	28	5.6%	178
	Withdrawal	6.1%	63	5.4%	85	4.3%	17	6.1%	27	5.6%	192
	Condom (male)	15.3%	163	10.4%	171	24.2%	95	15.6%	73	13.9%	502
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	Female condom / vaginal pouch	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
	Diaphragm (with or w/out jelly or cream)	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	1.2%	2	0.2%	3
	Foam	0.1%	1	0.2%	2	0.0%	0	0.1%	1	0.1%	4
	Today sponge	0.2%	1	0.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.1%	2
	Jelly or cream (not with diaphragm)	0.1%	1	0.2%	6	0.6%	2	0.0%	0	0.2%	9
	Suppository or insert	0.4%	2	0.1%	2	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	6
	Other method	0.1%	2	0.0%	2	0.2%	2	0.2%	2	0.1%	8
	Female sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	18.9%	168	26.3%	348	14.0%	48	17.8%	79	21.8%	643
	Male sterilization (contraceptive) (would not reverse)	12.1%	100	15.6%	202	11.9%	33	15.3%	71	14.2%	406
	Male sterilization/sterility (nature unknown)	0.4%	2	0.1%	3	0.0%	0	0.2%	1	0.2%	6
	Pill (contraceptive use)	16.6%	154	16.1%	231	20.2%	74	17.0%	77	16.8%	536
	Hormonal patch	0.6%	8	0.4%	7	1.1%	4	0.1%	1	0.5%	20
	Hormonal ring	1.2%	13	1.2%	21	0.6%	4	0.4%	4	1.0%	42
	Norplant or Implanon implant	0.2%	6	0.4%	5	0.0%	0	0.3%	2	0.3%	13
	Lunelle (injectable)	0.6%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.2%	3	0.2%	6
	Depo-Provera (injectable)	2.3%	28	1.7%	33	0.1%	1	2.1%	9	1.7%	71
	IUD	5.4%	61	5.6%	92	11.2%	38	8.3%	42	6.6%	233
	ARTIFICIAL BIRTH CONTROL	80.5%	777	83.8%	1213	88.4%	319	85.0%	395	83.6%	2704
	Total	100.0%	968	100.0%	1482	100.0%	370	100.0%	487	100.0%	3307

*Refers to women who are (1) not pregnant, (2) not attempting to become pregnant, (3) not postpartum, (4) fecund or contraceptively sterile, (5) whose most current male sex partner is fecund or contraceptively sterile, (6) have had sex during the three months prior to survey, and (7) are age 15-44.

DATA NOTES: RMARITAL = 1 (currently married)
CURRPRTS = 0 (no current sexual partners other than husband)

Tables: Section 4 – Miscellaneous Bonus Data

Table 4-1. Current pregnancy, seeking-pregnancy, and post-partum (“pregnancy-involved”) rates among all women, ages 15-44, by religion, NSFG 2006-2010

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)									
		CATHOLIC		PROTESTANT		OTHER RELIGIONS		NO RELIGION		Total	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	Pregnant	4.6%	118	4.0%	233	2.9%	42	2.9%	66	3.8%	459
	Postpartum (< ~2 months)	0.7%	27	0.7%	52	0.6%	5	0.8%	20	0.7%	104
	Seeking pregnancy	4.4%	123	4.1%	215	3.7%	43	3.2%	71	4.0%	452
	PREGNANCY-INVOLVED	9.7%	268	8.8%	500	7.3%	90	7.0%	157	8.6%	1015
	NOT PREGNANCY-INVOLVED	71.1%	2180	73.3%	4058	64.4%	641	75.9%	1748	72.4%	8627
	SEXUALLY INACTIVE	19.2%	687	18.0%	1198	28.4%	306	17.1%	446	19.1%	2637
	Total	100.0%	3135	100.0%	5756	100.0%	1037	100.0%	2351	100.0%	12279

Table 4-2. Current pregnancy, seeking-pregnancy, and post-partum (“pregnancy-involved”) rates among all women, ages 15-44, by religion and church attendance, NSFG 2006-2010

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)							
		CATHOLIC				NON-CATHOLIC			
		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services				IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services			
		PRACTICING (1+/wk)		NOT PRACTICING (<1/wk)		PRACTICING (1+/wk)		NOT PRACTICING (<1/wk)	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	Pregnant	5.3%	42	4.3%	76	4.1%	101	3.4%	240
	Postpartum (< ~2 months)	0.8%	8	0.7%	19	0.8%	26	0.7%	51
	Seeking pregnancy	4.8%	42	4.2%	81	4.2%	112	3.6%	217
	PREGNANCY-INVOLVED	10.9%	92	9.3%	176	9.1%	239	7.7%	508
	NOT PREGNANCY-INVOLVED	64.4%	580	73.7%	1600	65.6%	1807	76.3%	4640
	SEXUALLY INACTIVE	24.7%	265	17.0%	422	25.3%	774	16.0%	1176
	Total	100.0%	937	100.0%	2198	100.0%	2820	100.0%	6324

Table 4-3. Current pregnancy, seeking-pregnancy, and post-partum (“pregnancy-involved”) rates among faithful wives, ages 15-44, by religion and church attendance, NSFG 2006-2010

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)							
		CATHOLIC				NON-CATHOLIC			
		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services				IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services			
		PRACTICING (1+/wk)		NOT PRACTICING (<1/wk)		PRACTICING (1+/wk)		NOT PRACTICING (<1/wk)	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
Current contraception method LEAST compatible with Catholic teaching as expressed in Humane Vitae	Pregnant	6.0%	24	7.0%	38	5.4%	69	4.7%	101
	Postpartum (< ~2 months)	0.5%	5	0.8%	6	1.1%	16	1.1%	18
	Seeking pregnancy	7.3%	34	6.8%	55	7.2%	88	6.3%	116
	PREGNANCY-INVOLVED	13.9%	63	14.5%	99	13.8%	173	12.0%	235
	NOT PREGNANCY-INVOLVED	83.7%	327	84.7%	641	85.7%	940	86.9%	1399
	SEXUALLY INACTIVE	2.4%	13	0.8%	13	0.5%	16	1.1%	31
	Total	100.0%	403	100.0%	753	100.0%	1129	100.0%	1665

DATA NOTES: RMARITAL = 1 (currently married)
 CURRPRTS = 0 (no current sexual partners other than husband)

Table 4-4. Marriage among women with no sexual partners except husband or current coresidential partner, ages 15-44, NSFG 2006-2010

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)							
		CATHOLIC				NON-CATHOLIC			
		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services				IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services			
		PRACTICING (1+/wk)		NOT PRACTICING (<1/wk)		PRACTICING (1+/wk)		NOT PRACTICING (<1/wk)	
		Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count	Column N %	Unweighted Count
	CURRENTLY MARRIED	56.9%	403	50.4%	753	56.6%	1129	47.7%	1665
Informal marital status (RECODE)	NOT MARRIED BUT LIVING WITH OPP SEX PARTNER	11.0%	97	17.0%	316	5.1%	153	18.0%	871
	WIDOWED	0.2%	3	0.1%	6	1.0%	14	0.3%	19
	DIVORCED	1.5%	20	3.2%	56	3.4%	91	3.6%	189
	SEPARATED FOR REASONS OF MARITAL DISCORD	2.1%	25	2.2%	39	1.7%	64	2.7%	128
	NEVER BEEN MARRIED	28.2%	279	27.1%	531	32.2%	877	27.7%	1549

DATA NOTES: CURRPRTS = 0 (no current sexual partners other than husband)

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)	
		CATHOLIC	NON-CATHOLIC
		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services	IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services
	Chi-square	118887.887	1356143.788
Informal marital status (RECODE)	df	5	5
	Sig.	.000 ^a	.000 ^b

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

b. Some cell counts in this subtable are not integers. They were rounded to the nearest integer before the computation of Chi-square test.

Table 4-5. Discontinuation of the Pill due to dissatisfaction, among women who have ever used the Pill, ages 15-44, NSFG 2006-2010

		Column N %	Unweighted Count
Stopped using the Pill because dissatisfied	Yes	30.4%	2764
	No	69.6%	5883

Table 4-6. Discontinuation of NFP due to dissatisfaction, among women who have ever used NFP, ages 15-44, NSFG 2006-2010

		Column N %	Unweighted Count
Stopped using some form of NFP because dissatisfied	Yes	9.1%	152
	No	90.9%	1839

Table 4-7. Marital status by religion and attendance, women ages 15-44, NSFG 2006-2010

		Current religious affiliation (RECODE)					
		CATHOLIC		NON-CATHOLIC		Total	
		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services		IC-8 How often R currently attends religious services	
		PRACTICING (+1/wk)	LAPSED (<1/wk)	FREQUENT (+1/wk)	INFREQUENT OR NON-RELIGIOUS	FREQUENT (+1/wk)	INFREQUENT OR NON-RELIGIOUS
		Column N %	Column N %	Column N %	Column N %	Column N %	Column N %
Informal marital status when pregnancy ended - 1st (RECODE)	Married	56.5%	44.5%	56.9%	36.0%	56.8%	38.2%
	Divorced	1.1%	0.5%	1.0%	1.3%	1.0%	1.1%
	Widowed	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Separated	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
	Cohabiting	16.3%	24.5%	10.9%	23.9%	12.2%	24.1%
	Never married, not cohabiting	26.0%	30.1%	31.1%	38.6%	29.9%	36.5%