

Manuel Rodriguez

Epistemic Exclusion: Latinx Religion and its Underrepresentation within Sociology

INTRODUCTION

Over a decade ago, the sociological study of religion in the US experienced a period of paradigmatic reflection (Bender et al. 2012; Cadge, Levitt, and Smilde 2011; Edgell 2012; Gorski and Altinordu 2008; Poulson and Campbell 2010; Riesebrodt 2010; Smilde and May 2010; 2015; Smith 2008; 2010; Smith et al. 2013). Within these paradigmatic reflections, scholars discussed how to move the sociology of religion forward, such as advocating for an expansion of sociology of religion's empirical scope (Gorski and Altinordu 2008; Riesebrodt 2010; Smith 2008), acknowledging the dominance of studies on Christian religions (specifically Protestants) in the US (Cadge, Levitt, and Smilde 2011; Smilde and May 2010), and pushing towards critical engagement of religion that focused on both its positive and negative impacts (Bender et al. 2012; Smilde and May 2010; 2015). However, missing from this conversation was the lack of acknowledgment of the intersection of religion with race and ethnicity and also the lack of representation of racial and ethnic minorities in the sociological study of religion. At the same time, as the field undertook these paradigmatic reflections, other critical assessments showcased the lack of conversation between sociologists of religion and sociologists of race and ethnicity (Emerson, Korver-Glenn, and Douds 2015; Kim 2011). Emerson et. Al (2015) and Kim (2011) both highlighted the theoretical and empirical parallels between the study of race, ethnicity, and religion. They urged scholars to think deeply about how to untangle and further theorize the race-religion interplay in the US.

Following Kim (2011) and Emerson et al. (2015), I find there is still more to address on the relationship between the sociological study of religion and race. With this article, I will demonstrate how the sociology of religion continues to epistemically and socially exclude subaltern experiences from its mainstream. I will specifically focus on one subaltern experience, US Latinx religion. I chose to focus on US Latinx religion since it is a field of study that continues to struggle to garner serious attention among academic disciplines.¹ This field has not only struggled to gain attention within sociology but also in Latinx studies as well (García 2022), making this case of exclusion even more unique.

Additionally, this exclusion of US Latinx religion transpires despite the significant changes in the religious demographics of the US Latinx community, which are having a direct effect on social issues of education, immigration, and politics. Currently, Latinxs are the largest ethnic minority group in the United States, and the US Latinx population sits at approximately 62.5 million (Krogstad, Passel, and Noe-Bustamante 2022). Within this community, religious demographics have changed substantially in the last decade, with the percentage of Latinxs who identify as Catholic dropping from 57% in 2009 to 47% in 2019 and the percentage of those who identify as unaffiliated growing from 15% to 23% within the same time frame (Pew Research Center 2019). The relative omission of the US Latinx Religious experience within the sociology of religion is shocking given reports that continue to position US Latinxs as the leading indicator for the future of both the Catholic and Protestant Church due to a majority of the young Catholic population being Latinx and Latinxs being the fastest-growing group of American Evangelicals

¹ Even though I am only focusing on the exclusion of Latinx Religion, it is important to note that within the sociology of religion there is an exclusion of other subaltern voices such as the religious experiences of Black communities, the experiences of non-Christian religions such as Islam, and experiences outside of a Western context.

(Crary 2020; Winter 2021). These changes have even had significant impacts on Latinx politics, as seen through the report that religious affiliation was the most divisive demographic among Latinxs in the recent 2020 presidential election (Molina 2020). By ignoring the influence religion has on this vast community, scholars are unwittingly creating a space of misrepresentation that leads to numerous unanswered questions and the disregard of an integral component for the identity formation of US Latinxs.

This article spells out the underrepresentation within major academic journals on the sociology of religion to demonstrate the exclusion of Latinx religion. Why the examination of journal articles? Sociologists David Smilde and Matthew May argue that looking into journal articles illustrates the state of a sub-field, as they “reflect not only the interests and innovations but also the prejudices and blinders of their historical context” (Smilde and May 2010, 2). The review of previously published work has been used numerous times to gauge the state of the field (Emerson, Korver-Glenn, and Douds 2015; Poulson and Campbell 2010; Smilde and May 2010; 2015; May and Smilde 2018). Furthermore, I argue that journal articles are a crucial point of analysis because of their power over the future generation of scholars. Due to the embedding of neoliberalism within academia, journal articles have become a critical assessment for young scholars, especially those in graduate school and recent doctoral graduates, where part of their success as academics is determined by the set of journal articles they have published. Hence the common message of “publish or perish.” This structure of the journal publication sphere is a barrier to a successful academic career for scholars with research interests that do not align with the hegemonic knowledge structures. Keeping this structure of journal publication in mind is critical in understanding the damage and consequences the exclusion of subaltern research has

upon academia and why scholars must continue reexamining the imperialist structures of knowledge production that continue to be embedded within major disciplines.

In this article, I first present a theoretical explanation of how the sociology of religion is structured to exclude the study of US Latinx religion. Then, I demonstrate how the exclusion appears through a database of journal articles in the sociology of religion published from 2010 through 2023. Here, I focus on how published articles on the sociology of religion describe the samples used in their study. How are US Latinxs represented or not represented in these descriptions of the studies' samples? Even though I focus on US Latinxs, the presentation of article data here adds to the relationship between religion and race/ethnicity as a whole. My primary goal is to increase awareness of the lack of racial and ethnic minorities in the sociological study of religion through this paradigmatic reflection of the subdiscipline, considered a strength, not a weakness (Smith 2010), which benefits every scholar of religion.

HOW DID WE GET HERE? EXCLUDING THE SUBALTERN FROM THE STUDY OF RELIGION

The exclusion of US Latinx religion and other subaltern voices from the sociological study of religion can be attributed to the historical hegemonic dominance of White Anglo-Saxon Protestant experiences over the discipline of sociology. Due to its colonial and imperial origins, mainstream sociology was built on a foundation of exclusionary logic. An exclusionary logic that is based on a series of binary oppositions (Go 2020). Sociologist Julian Go explains that these binary oppositions “structured how sociologists thought about scientific knowledge, including *what* counts as knowledge and *who* could produce it,” and, most importantly, these binaries were racialized (Go 2020, 83). Therefore, sociology constructs an environment where the social experiences of White Anglo-Saxon Protestants are portrayed as universal and normative, while

anything outside of that, such as non-White and non-Christian experiences, is marked as particularistic and unnatural to the white gaze. We must not view these binary series of opposition as “a distant backdrop against which we might reflect proudly upon our present progress” but acknowledge how they persist within sociology today to serve as a reckoning for the discipline (Go 2020, 80).

This foundation of Whiteness and Christianity as universal vs. the non-White and non-Christian as particularistic creates a system of White hegemonic knowledge. Under the grasp of White hegemonic knowledge, the social issues deemed “worthy” enough to be studied sociologically were chosen by White male insiders (Collins 1986). This White male insider knowledge led mainstream sociology to place non-White and non-Christian experiences in a subaltern position. This dangerous development allowed the first few generations of American sociologists to establish “natural laws” that explained the subordination of these subaltern groups. This development of sub-altering non-White experiences limited our understanding of such experiences since they came from perspectives that were “precisely that of a white man who sees colored people at long range or only in certain capacities” (Cooper 1892, 57). This, in turn, has placed additional burdens upon scholars interested in these subaltern religious experiences where they must constantly challenge and cope with this white male hegemonic knowledge (Collins 1986).

Having White male hegemonic knowledge as the driving force of mainstream sociology is what would deter non-White scholars and topics from garnering the proper attention from the discipline. The most notable example of this exclusion is sociologist W. E. B. Du Bois, whose scholarship was devoid of recognition from mainstream sociology throughout the twentieth century, was not until the recent decades that the discipline provided critical attention to his

empirical, theoretical, and methodological contributions (Morris 2015). This history of deterring non-White scholars and topics goes beyond Du Bois. Mainstream sociology did not include non-White scholars in a meaningful way until the 1970s and historically “ignored, attacked as biased, or appropriated” work from minority scholars (Bonilla-Silva 2017). These processes place minority scholars under a status of “second class (sociological) citizenship” where they must conform to the White male hegemonic knowledge or face institutional isolation and exclusion from the mainstream (Bonilla-Silva 2017).

How does this apply to the sociological study of religion? First, we see the power of the racialized series of binary oppositions at play through the dominance of the White Protestant experience. Within the sociology of religion, the saturation of studies on US White Christianity (specifically Protestant) has characterized these experiences as universal and normative. This creates a cycle of knowledge production where religion is only understood from the white gaze, leading to a conflation of religion with White Christianity. Sociologists of religion Wendy Cade, Peggy Levitt, and David Smilde associated this with the paradigm of American exceptionalism that resides over the subdiscipline where the United States is presented as the “superior” country in all levels of society, including religion. This paradigm of American exceptionalism presents itself through the misconstruing of religion with White Protestant Christianity within the US academy (Cade, Levitt, and Smilde 2011). Associating religion with only White Protestant Christianity is why so many articles on religion have only discussed issues related to Christianity. From 1978 to 2007, over fifty percent of articles published in sociology of religion journals studied Christianity (Smilde and May 2010).

Whenever topics of religion outside of White Christianity were taken up, sociologists mainly focused on European religion that did not assimilate to the United States’ WASP culture

and the resistance of Black religious traditions (Smith et al. 2013). In the case of US Latinx religion, little attention was given to this topic throughout the early history of the sociology of religion. When its recognition increased, it was siloed as a “popular” religion. The term popular religion is a controversial term in this context because it implies that the labeled religion is not a “real” or legitimate religion since it does not follow the structure of White Anglo-Saxon Protestantism and, at times, stands at odds with institutionally sanctioned practices of the Catholic Church. Unsurprisingly, this silo of Latinx religion as “popular” only reinforces the binaries of opposition.

Furthermore, the sociology of religion suffers the same problems that sociology does in incorporating diverse voices, as scholars like Eduardo Bonilla-Silva noted. The Association of the Sociology of Religion and the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion had their first non-White presidents in 2023 and 2014, respectively. More needs to be done to include diverse voices in the subdiscipline and maintain their active participation in our scholarly debates.

DATA & METHODOLOGY

As mentioned, the research questions for this project are: How do published articles on the sociology of religion describe the racial and ethnic composition of the samples used in their study? How are US Latinxs represented or not represented in these descriptions of the studies’ samples? In order to address these questions, I reviewed journal articles published from 2010 to 2023 in the two top journals specializing in research on religion, the *Sociology of Religion* (SOR) and the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* (JSSR). I restricted the sample collection to begin in 2010 since this falls around the time that sociologists of religion were engaged in paradigmatic reflections (Bender et al. 2012; Cadge, Levitt, and Smilde 2011; Edgell 2012; Emerson, Korver-Glenn, and Douds 2015; Gorski and Altinordu 2008; Kim 2011; Poulson

and Campbell 2010; Riesebrodt 2010; Smilde and May 2010; 2015; Smith 2008; 2010; Smith et al. 2013), and since previous work has been done reviewing articles pre-2010 (Emerson, Korver-Glenn, and Douds 2015; Poulson and Campbell 2010; Smilde and May 2010). Additionally, journal articles are suitable for this type of project since they reflect both the “interests and innovations” and the “prejudices and blinders” of the subdiscipline, and their process of publication is a result of negotiations between “authors, referees, and editors” (Smilde and May 2015, 372).

To be included in the sample, the research articles had to be published under the “Articles” (SOR) or “Research Articles/Research Notes” (JSSR) tabs as presented on the journals’ online websites. Articles under special issues and forums were also included in the sample. I excluded comments, replies, presidential addresses, lectures (SOR), editor’s notes, and review essays (JSSR). Initially, these restrictions yielded a combined total of 860 published research articles. However, I added some additional restrictions to address this project’s questions. First, since I am focused on the racial and ethnic compositions of samples, the research articles also needed to use data collected from human subjects; therefore, articles utilizing methods such as historical or content analysis were excluded, as well as theoretical articles (usually delineated by whether the article had a “Data & Methods” section). Second, since I am concerned with the representation of US Latinx religion, the articles needed to be based on research located exclusively on the US, thus excluding work using samples outside of the US (including cross-national studies). This process yielded 473 articles published between March 2010 and December 2023. Table 1 shows the number of articles in the sample from each journal included in the analysis.

TABLE 1 Articles in the Sample

<i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i>	143
<i>Sociology of Religion</i>	330
	<i>N</i> = 473

Overall, I completed most of the coding by reviewing the “Data and Methods” or similar sections of each article, where I would look for whether the authors mentioned race and ethnicity in the breakdown of their sample and, if so, how they describe this racial and ethnic breakdown. I coded each of the 473 articles in the sample using eight pre-established categories: White sample, Invisibility of Whiteness, White-Black/Other binary, Race/Ethnicity (Latinx No), Race/Ethnicity (Latinx Yes), Black sample, Latinx sample, Asian sample. More details on these categories are located in Table 2. Throughout the research process, the list of categories was revised by either adding or changing the dimensions of each one. When this happened, I recoded articles to review whether their code should be changed, resulting in three rounds of article collection.

TABLE 2 Categories

White Sample	A fully White sample
Invisibility of Whiteness	An assumed to be White sample since there is no racial and ethnic breakdown of the sample
White-Black-Other Binary	Only two race/ethnicity categories with White being one of them
Latinx	A fully Latinx sample
Black	A fully Black sample
Asian	A fully Asian sample
Race/Ethnicity (Latinx No)	3 or more race/ethnicity categories but Latinx is not a category
Race/Ethnicity (Latinx Yes)	3 or more race/ethnicity categories and Latinx is a category

FINDINGS

In the following sections, I present tables and figures demonstrating how authors studying religion describe the racial/ethnic composition of their sample, if any. First, I begin with a section detailing the persistence of whiteness within the sociology of religion. Then, move to how this persistence is maintained when including non-white voices by positioning the White experience as the norm to be compared to. Finally, I end with the representation of exclusively Black, Latinx, and Asian experiences within the sociology of religion.

The Persistence of Whiteness

Throughout many of the paradigmatic reflections around 2010, many of these scholars failed to acknowledge how persistent whiteness remains in the sociological study of religion. This lack of acknowledgment can be attributed to the ignorance of whiteness, where its normativity is taken for granted and dominance remains unchallenged. Since its creation, sociology has been built on understanding the White experience as universal and normative and, therefore, receives much attention from the sociological mainstream. Sometimes, whiteness is so persistent that authors fail to provide a racial and ethnic breakdown of their sample. Table 3 below demonstrates the number of articles that used either a White-only sample or failed to mention race/ethnicity in their sample breakdown.

TABLE 3 Number of articles with a White-only sample or neglect to mention race

	White-only Sample	Invisibility of Whiteness
ASR	5	14
JSSR	8	35
Total	13	49

Combining the total numbers of the White-only sample and the invisibility of whiteness categories yields a total of 62 articles out of the 473 sample. Over the period of 2010 to 2023, published journal articles in the sociology of religion have maintained the normativity of whiteness. Alarming from these results is the high number of articles that did not provide a racial/ethnic breakdown of their sample, representing 10.359% of the sample.

Whiteness as the Norm

When the White experience is not the only topic of study, the sociology of religion has developed a process that when non-White experiences are considered, it must be done through a comparison to whiteness. In quantitative studies, this appears through a control variable for race where the White category is typically positioned as the reference category, and the non-White categories produce estimated coefficients that are interpreted as how the effect is different from the White category, not the true effect. In qualitative studies, racial/ethnic breakdown of the samples would typically either have an overtly White majority sample or just state that their sample is predominantly White.

Therefore, the Latinx experience is only represented as a comparison to how different it is from the White one, or it appears in the low numbers of experiences accounted for. However, the Latinx experience is not explicitly stated at times. First, one method of description in the comparison to whiteness is describing the sample through a binary of White/Black or White/non-White. These binaries stem from the early dominant ideology of viewing race through a White-Black racial lens (Pedraza 2000). The other method is what I call the race/ethnicity one where White is one of the reference categories along with two or more non-White categories. I split this section into two because there were times where Latinxs would not be accounted for under this method. The race/ethnicity (Latinx No) category accounts for sample descriptions that would typically fall under the “White, Black, and Other” model, leaving ambiguity on how to categorize Latinx experiences, if any are even included. Table 4 demonstrates a breakdown of how these categories appeared throughout the articles in the sample.

TABLE 4 Number of articles using a White-Black/Other binary or including at least 3 racial categories

	White-Black/Other Binary	Race/Ethnicity (Latinx No)	Race/Ethnicity (Latinx Yes)
ASR	38	17	59
JSSR	96	32	140
Total	134	49	199

Representing the Subaltern

So far, much of the results above have exhibited the persistence and normativity of White experiences in the sociological study of religion. Through the publication of journal articles, the sociology of religion has reinforced the overrepresentation of White experiences by either giving them the space to exclusively be showcased or by being used as the frame of reference for non-White experiences. This overrepresentation of whiteness comes at the cost of non-White experiences, especially the Latinx one, who are not provided with the same scholarly attention.

When it comes to these subaltern experiences, their numbers appear relatively low as compared to those of the White experiences. TABLE 5 below provides a breakdown of articles that used either a Black-only, Latinx-only, or Asian-only sample.

TABLE 5 Number of articles using a Black-only, Latinx-only, or Asian-only sample

	Black	Latinx	Asian
ASR	3	4	3
JSSR	12	4	3
Total	15	8	6

These results show the lack of centralized attention given to non-White experiences despite the increasing diversity of the US. In order to demonstrate the seriousness of these low numbers, let us compare the percentage of White-only, Black-only, Latinx-only, and Asian-only sample articles to the broader demographics of the US. For this comparison, I am categorizing both the White-only and Invisibility of Whiteness as White. Of the 473 articles, 91 used a single-race sample across both the journals. When splitting between journals, ASR's number is 29, while JSSR's number sits at 62. Within ASR, out of these 29 articles published between 2010 and 2023, 65.5% used a White sample, 13.8% used a Latinx sample, 10.3% used a Black sample, and 10.3% used an Asian sample. Within JSSR, out of these 62 articles published between 2010 and 2023, 69.3% used a White sample, 19.4% used a Black sample, 6.5% used a Latinx sample, and 4.8% used an Asian sample. TABLE 6 demonstrates these numbers, along with the percentages of both journals as a whole, and US Census demographics from 2010 and 2020.

TABLE 6 Percentage of articles using White-, Black-, Latinx-, and Asian-only samples compared to US Census racial demographics

	White %	Black %	Latinx %	Asian %
ASR	65.5%	10.3%	13.8%	10.3%
JSSR	69.3%	19.4%	6.5%	4.8%
ASR & JSSR	68.1%	16.5%	8.8%	6.6%
US 2010 Census	63.7%	12.2%	16.3%	5.6%
US 2020 Census	57.8%	12.1%	18.7%	6.0%

From this table, we can see that between both journals, there has been an overrepresentation of articles using a White-only or Black-only samples, and an underrepresentation of articles using Latinx-only or Asian-only samples. When focusing on the case of Latinx experiences, the gap between the use of Latinx-only sample and the share of Latinxs in the US is well over 8%, highlighting why the underrepresentation of this subaltern experience required attention.

DISCUSSION SECTION

As displayed in the previous section, the religious experiences of Latinx Americans in the US suffer from underrepresentation in the sociological study of religion. This exclusion occurs despite the community's continued growth in the US. Additionally, this community has experienced significant changes in its religious demographics, where Latinx Catholics no longer are the majority and there is a growing turn to nonreligion among younger Latinx Americans (Krogstad, Alvarado, and Mohamed 2023). These demographic changes are not the only reason

why we should pay attention to the religious experiences of Latinx Americans. The study of Latinx religion should get more attention from sociologists because of its unique blend of religious practices, beliefs, and organizations.

In his chapter *History and Theory in the Study of Mexican American Religion* (2008), Gastón Espinosa defines Mexican-American religion as the “blending and combinative reconstruction of Mexican and ‘American’ traditions, customs, practices, symbols, and beliefs in the United States that we call the distinctively Mexican American/Chicano religious expressions or Mexican American/Chicano/a religions.” Additionally, Espinosa highlights Mexican-American religion’s uniqueness by stating, “Chicano religious practices and traditions both resonate with their Mexican counterparts while at the same time exhibiting a blending, a combining, a fusing, or a mixing with non-U.S. practices and traditions to create a new hybrid reality that is neither entirely Mexican nor entirely American but is in fact Mexican American or Chicano” (Espinosa 2008, 41).² From Espinosa’s definition, we can understand Mexican-American religion (and Latinx religion more broadly) as a hybrid of the key sociological concepts of religion: practices, beliefs, and organizations.

Most importantly, we must recognize that the religious expressions that are produced from the Mexican American community are unique to it and understand that these phenomena cannot be reproduced entirely in Mexican nor white-U.S. communities. The parameters used to define Mexican American religions bear resemblance to those that define the other ethnic expressions within Latinx Religion, for example, the religious expressions of Cuban Americans and Guatemalan Americans. Additionally, due to the diversity of its religious demographics and

² Espinosa’s use of Chicano and Mexican-American refers to those who are of Mexican descent living in the United States.

notable numbers of converts, Latinx Americans are positioned uniquely in such a way that their social imaginations carry knowledge of not only their religion but other religions as well. Latinx religion's uniqueness through its blends of numerous cultures demonstrates why sociologists must study this field.

When engaging in the study of Latinx religion, sociologists will need to recognize that these stories are not new, and have been considered by other disciplines in academia, most notably history and theology (Espinosa 2008; García 2022; Hinojosa 2020; Nabhan-Warren 2022; Romero 2020). Many scholarly conversations are ongoing within Latinx religion that would appreciate the inclusion of sociological analysis. Some of this work includes the historical analysis of Latinx religious communities such as Latinx Catholics (Dolan and Deck 1994; Dolan and Hinojosa 1994; Dolan and Vidal 1994; Matovina 1995; 2011; Medina 2004; Treviño 2006), Latinx Protestants (Hinojosa 2014; Mulder, Ramos, and Marti 2017; Ramos, Martí, and Mulder 2022), and Latinx Pentecostals (Barba 2022b; 2022a; Busto 2005; Sánchez-Walsh 2003). Additionally, there is already some great work started by sociologists, including the work of Aida Isela Ramos, Gerardo Martí, Ma, Cecilia Menjívar, Jonathan Calvillo, Edward Orozco Flores, María Del Socorro Castañeda-Liles, and Jacqueline Hagan.³

One avenue where Latinx religion could benefit from the sociological study of religion is its intersection with politics and social movements. As the narrative of the “sleeping giant” continues to loom over Latinx politics, religion appears to be a key element in explaining certain dynamics of Latinx policy preferences, political behavior, and mobilization. For the 2020 presidential election, numerous studies and news articles focused on religion as one of the key

³ The list of names provided throughout this paragraph is not an all inclusive list, and should be considered as a starting point to the immense literature available in the study of Latinx religion.

demographic dividers in Latinx politics (Jackson 2020), a trend that could continue to appear in the 2024 presidential elections. Within this intersection, there is a growing body of literature exploring the relationship of faith and politics among the US Latinx community (Espinosa, Elizondo, and Miranda 2005; Hinojosa, Elmore, and González 2022; Hinojosa 2022).

Within sociology, some of this work includes how religion shapes Latinx Americans public policy preferences. For example, Bartkowski, Ramos, and Ellison (2012) examined how religion shapes Latinx Americans attitudes towards abortion, where they find that devout conservative Latinx Protestants tend to show more significant opposition to abortion than their Catholic and religious none counterparts. Another example is Ellison, Acevedo, and Ramos' (2011) study which explore show religion shapes Latinx attitudes towards same-sex marriage, where they find Latinx evangelicals tend to oppose same-sex marriage more than their Catholic (including devout) and religious none counterparts. On immigration, scholars have highlighted the difference in splits by religion when considering Latinx people's support for a pathway to citizenship, hearing clergy speak about immigration, and having their churches participate in immigrant rights activism (see Mulder, Ramos, and Marti 2017). However, there is still much to sociologically explore within the intersection of religion and politics among the US Latinx community (see Jones-Correa, Al-Faham, and Cortez 2018 and Wilde and Tevington 2017).

FUTURE SUGGESTIONS

This survey of published articles on the sociology of religion over the last ten years demonstrates the lack of scholarly attention given to the religious experiences of Latinx Americans. The survey also demonstrated how dominant White religious experiences are in the publication of sociology of religion scholarship, and how whiteness continues to be maintained as the normative experience that non-White ones must be compared to. As discussed, the

religious experiences of Latinx Americans are complex and carry much variation within itself, and it is disservice to not provide space for conversations to flourish over this topic through academic journals. I argue that sociology of religion needs to further reflect on its current conceptualization of race and ethnicity within its paradigm, and how it improve itself to be more inclusive of non-White religious experiences. Sociologists of religion need to recognize that there is much to explore within each racial and ethnic group, and to not always relegate non-White groups to be compared to whiteness.

What comes next? Even though solving this matter of exclusion may seem like an arduous task, I suggest one starting point to reflect on sociology of religion's relationship with the study of race and ethnicity. Since this survey primarily focused on the methodology sections of articles, I believe sociologists of religion should reflect critically over their methodological practices. Through this study, I came to the conclusion that the sociological study of religion suffers from white logic and white methods (Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008). Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva describe white logic as the "the context in which White supremacy has defined the techniques and processes of reasoning about social facts," and white methods as, "the practical tools used to manufacture empirical data and analysis to support the racial stratification in society" (18). The prevalence of white religious experience and the practice of placing them as the normative group to be compared to is a result of white racial logic's influence upon the sociology of religion. One instance of how this white racial logic appeared through articles was in qualitative projects that failed to provide a racial and ethnic breakdown of their sample, or at times use a White/non-White binary to do so. Another instance would be quantitative project's use of "nationally representative samples" where, due to their long history as the dominant group in the US racial hierarchy, White non-Latinx people represent at least well over 60% of the

sample. To improve this, ASR and JSSR should require qualitative projects to always include a thorough racial and ethnic breakdown of their sample. Also, quantitative scholars should consider the use of other data sets that provide more representation of racial and ethnic minority groups, such as the Cooperative Election Study or the Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey.

Lastly, I urge this scholarly community to not allow this article to suggest a special issue on Latinx religion as the best solution. The best solution is one that regularly promotes and creates space for works on US Latinx religious experiences and other similarly underrepresented stories to be a part of the scholarly dialogue within the sociology of religion. The scholars and work are there, but we must do better in bringing them into the conversation. This problem of exclusion is a structural one that requires solutions at every stage of the knowledge production process from coursework, mentoring, and journal article publication. With this article, I do not come with the goal to undermine the previous contributions and conversations within the subfield. Instead, I am making an attempt to improve our process of knowledge production by expanding the experiences we choose to theorize and empirically study.

REFERENCES

- Barba, Lloyd. 2022a. *Sowing the Sacred: Mexican Pentecostal Farmworkers in California*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
<https://login.proxy.library.nd.edu/login?url=https://academic.oup.com/book/43900>.
- . 2022b. “Latina/o Pentecostalism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Latinx Christianities in the United States*, edited by Kristy Nabhan-Warren, 0. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190875763.013.7>.

- Bartkowski, John P., Aida I. Ramos-Wada, Chris G. Ellison, and Gabriel A. Acevedo. 2012. "Faith, Race-Ethnicity, and Public Policy Preferences: Religious Schemas and Abortion Attitudes Among US Latinos." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 51 (2): 343–58.
- Bender, Courtney, Wendy Cadge, Peggy Levitt, and David Smilde, eds. 2012. *Religion on the Edge: De-Centering and Re-Centering the Sociology of Religion*. New York: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199938629.001.0001>.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2017. "What We Were, What We Are, and What We Should Be: The Racial Problem of American Sociology." *Social Problems* 64 (2): 179–87.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spx006>.
- Busto, Rudy V. 2005. *King Tiger: The Religious Vision of Reies López Tijerina*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
<https://login.proxy.library.nd.edu/login?url=https://hdl.handle.net/2027/heh.30608.0001.001>.
- Cadge, Wendy, Peggy Levitt, and David Smilde. 2011. "De-Centering and Re-Centering: Rethinking Concepts and Methods in the Sociological Study of Religion." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50 (3): 437–49.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1986. "Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought." *Social Problems* 33 (6): S14–32. <https://doi.org/10.2307/800672>.
- Cooper, Anna J. 1892. *A Voice from the South*. Xenia, OH: Aldine Printing House. https://search-alexanderstreet-com.proxy.library.nd.edu/view/work/bibliographic_entity%7Cbibliographic_details%7C3584905.
- Crary, David. 2020. "US Hispanic Catholics Are Future, but Priest Numbers Dismal." *AP NEWS*, March 14, 2020, sec. Europe. <https://apnews.com/article/az-state-wire-phoenix-tx-state-wire-race-and-ethnicity-in-state-wire-0cd91a02ad1bfe947d77c3e1a2c313a8>.
- Dolan, Jay P., and Allan Figueroa Deck, eds. 1994. *Hispanic Catholic Culture in the US: Issues and Concerns*. Notre Dame History of Hispanic Catholics in the US ; v. 3. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

- Dolan, Jay P., and Gilberto Miguel Hinojosa. 1994. *Mexican Americans and the Catholic Church, 1900-1965*. Notre Dame History of Hispanic Catholics in the US ; v. 1. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Dolan, Jay P., and Jaime R. Vidal, eds. 1994. *Puerto Rican and Cuban Catholics in the US, 1900-1965*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press. https://onesearch.library.nd.edu/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=ndu_aleph001102530&context=L&vid=NDU&lang=en_US&search_scope=malc_blended&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&tab=onesearch&query=any,contains,Puerto%20Rican%20and%20Cuban%20Catholics%20in%20the%20U.S.,%201900-1965&offset=0.
- Edgell, Penny. 2012. "A Cultural Sociology of Religion: New Directions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 38 (1): 247–65. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145424>.
- Ellison, Christopher G., Gabriel A. Acevedo, and Aida I. Ramos-Wada. 2011. "Religion and Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Marriage Among US Latinos*: U.S. Latino Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Marriage." *Social Science Quarterly* 92 (1): 35–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2011.00756.x>.
- Emerson, Michael O., Elizabeth Korver-Glenn, and Kiara W. Douds. 2015. "Studying Race and Religion: A Critical Assessment." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1 (3): 349–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649215584759>.
- Espinosa, Gastón. 2008. "History and Theory in the Study of Mexican American Religions." In *Mexican American Religions*, edited by Gastón Espinosa and Mario T. García. New York: Duke University Press.
- Espinosa, Gastón, Virgilio Elizondo, and Jesse Miranda, eds. 2005. *Latino Religions and Civic Activism in the United States*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195162271.001.0001>.
- García, Mario T. 2022. "Religion and Chicano/Latino Studies: A Major Omission and Challenge." *Aztlán* 47 (1): 159–66. <https://doi.org/10.1525/azt.2022.47.1.159>.

- Go, Julian. 2020. "Race, Empire, and Epistemic Exclusion: Or the Structures of Sociological Thought." *Sociological Theory* 38 (2): 79–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275120926213>.
- Gorski, Philip S., and Ateş Altinordu. 2008. "After Secularization?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 34 (1): 55–85.
- Hinojosa, Felipe. 2014. *Latino Mennonites: Civil Rights, Faith, and Evangelical Culture*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. <https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/1/monograph/book/28756>.
- . 2020. "Latina/o Religious Studies Since the 1970s." In *The Oxford Handbook of Latino Studies*, edited by Stevens Illan. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- . 2022. *Apostles of Change: Latino Radical Politics, Church Occupations, and the Fight to Save the Barrio*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Hinojosa, Felipe, Maggie Elmore, and Sergio M. González, eds. 2022. *Faith and Power: Latino Religious Politics since 1945*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jackson, Nathalie. 2020. "Religion Divides Hispanic Opinion in the US" *PRRI* (blog). November 17, 2020. <https://www.ppri.org/spotlight/religion-divides-hispanic-opinion-in-the-u-s/>.
- Jones-Correa, Michael, Hajer Al-Faham, and David Cortez. 2018. "Political (Mis)Behavior: Attention and Lacunae in the Study of Latino Politics." *Annual Review of Sociology* 44 (Volume 44, 2018): 213–35. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112411>.
- Kim, Rebecca Y. 2011. "Religion and Ethnicity: Theoretical Connections." *Religions* 2 (3): 312–29. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel2030312>.
- Krogstad, Jens Manuel, Joshua Alvarado, and Besheer Mohamed. 2023. "Among US Latinos, Catholicism Continues to Decline but Is Still the Largest Faith." Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2023/04/13/among-u-s-latinos-catholicism-continues-to-decline-but-is-still-the-largest-faith/>.
- Krogstad, Jens Manuel, Jeffrey S. Passel, and Luis Noe-Bustamante. 2022. "Key Facts about US Latinos for National Hispanic Heritage Month." *Pew Research Center*, September 23, 2022.

- <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2022/09/23/key-facts-about-u-s-latinos-for-national-hispanic-heritage-month/>.
- Matovina, Timothy. 1995. *Tejano Religion and Ethnicity: San Antonio, 1821-1860*. 1st ed. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- . 2011. *Latino Catholicism Transformation in America's Largest Church*. Princeton: University Press.
- <http://proxy.library.nd.edu/login?url=http://site.ebrary.com/lib/ndlib/docDetail.action?docID=10519762>.
- May, Matthew, and David Smilde. 2018. "Does Funding Impact Our Research? Causality, Normativity, and Diversity in 40 Years of US Sociology of Religion." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 57 (3): 432–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jssr.12536>.
- Medina, Lara. 2004. *Las Hermanas: Chicana/Latina religious-political activism in the US Catholic Church*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Molina, Alejandra. 2020. "Latino Protestants More Conservative, Supportive of Trump than Latino Catholics, Poll Finds." In *Religion News Service*. Religion News Service. <https://religionnews.com/2020/12/01/latino-protestants-more-conservative-supportive-of-trump-than-latino-catholics-poll-finds/>.
- Morris, Aldon. 2015. *The Scholar Denied: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology*. First Edition edition. Berkeley: University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520960480>.
- Mulder, Mark T., Aida I. Ramos, and Gerardo Marti. 2017. *Latino Protestants in America: Growing and Diverse*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Nabhan-Warren, Kristy. 2022. *The Oxford Handbook of Latinx Christianities in the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190875763.001.0001>.
- Pedraza, Silvia. 2000. "Beyond Black and White: Latinos and Social Science Research on Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America." *Social Science History* 24 (4): 697–726.

- Pew Research Center. 2019. "In US, Decline of Christianity Continues at Rapid Pace." *Pew Research Center's Religion & Public Life Project*. <https://www.pewforum.org/2019/10/17/in-u-s-decline-of-christianity-continues-at-rapid-pace/>.
- Poulson, Stephen C., and Colin Campbell. 2010. "Isomorphism, Institutional Parochialism, and the Sociology of Religion." *The American Sociologist* 41 (1): 31–47.
- Ramos, Aida Isela, Gerardo Martí, and Mark T. Mulder. 2022. "Latino/a Protestantisms: Historical and Sociological Overviews." In *The Oxford Handbook of Latinx Christianities in the United States*, edited by Kristy Nabhan-Warren, 0. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190875763.013.6>.
- Riesebrodt, Martin. 2010. *The Promise of Salvation: A Theory of Religion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Romero, Robert Chao. 2020. *Brown Church: Five Centuries of Latina/o Social Justice, Theology, and Identity*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
<http://proxy.library.nd.edu/login?url=https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ndlib-ebooks/detail.action?docID=6181864>.
- Sánchez-Walsh, Arlene Sánchez. 2003. *Latino Pentecostal Identity: Evangelical Faith, Self, and Society. Religion and American Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.7312/sanc12732>.
- Smilde, David, and Matthew May. 2010. "The Emerging Strong Program in the Sociology of Religion." *SSRC Working Papers*, February. <https://mk0tifssrcorg0hy6thb.kinstacdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/02/Emerging-Strong-Program-TIF.pdf>.
- . 2015. "Causality, Normativity, and Diversity in 40 Years of US Sociology of Religion: Contributions to Paradigmatic Reflection." *Sociology of Religion* 76 (4): 369–88.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/socrel/srv045>.
- Smith, Christian. 2008. "Future Directions in the Sociology of Religion." *Social Forces* 86 (4): 1561–89.

- . 2010. “Five Proposals for Reforming Article Publishing in the Social Scientific Study of Religion (Especially Quantitative): Improving the Quality, Value, and Cumulativeness of Our Scholarship.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 49 (4): 583–95.
- Smith, Christian, Brandon Vaidyanathan, Nancy Tatom Ammerman, José Casanova, Hilary Davidson, Elaine Howard Ecklund, John H. Evans, et al. 2013. “Roundtable on the Sociology of Religion: Twenty-Three Theses on the Status of Religion in American Sociology—A Mellon Working-Group Reflection.” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 81 (4): 903–38.
- Treviño, Roberto R. 2006. *The Church in the Barrio: Mexican American Ethno-Catholicism in Houston*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wilde, Melissa J., and Patricia Tevington. 2017. “Complex Religion: Toward a Better Understanding of the Ways in Which Religion Intersects with Inequality.” In *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1–14. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Winter, Meaghan. 2021. “The Fastest-Growing Group of American Evangelicals.” *The Atlantic*, July 26, 2021, sec. Culture. <https://www.theatlantic.com/culture/archive/2021/07/latinos-will-determine-future-american-evangelicalism/619551/>.
- Zuberi, Tukufu, and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. 2008. *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*. Blue Ridge Summit, UNITED STATES: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Incorporated.