

been successful in obtaining fully funded research opportunities at other institutions during their summer breaks. In fact, in the past five years, more than 12 JSU political science undergraduates have secured research fellowships with programs and institutions including Howard University, Princeton University, Purdue University, Harvard University, University of California, Irvine, University of California, Berkeley, Michigan State University, Ralph Bunche Institute, Leadership Alliance, and McNair Scholars Program. Upon completion of these programs, students are given the opportunity to apply their research by presenting at various conferences, such as JSU's Center for Undergraduate Research conference and the Pi Sigma Alpha annual undergraduate conference. These opportunities are important for continuing to cultivate students' research interests and training, which prepares them for graduate school. Securing these competitive fellowships also demonstrates to students that they have the potential to pursue a doctoral degree and an academic career conducting independent research on topics that interest them. These summer programs also provide students with information regarding the graduate school application process, the elements and requirements of doctoral programs, and insight on tenure-track academic careers. More importantly, many of these programs provide students with graduate school application-fee waivers to offset the financial burden that impacts how many and to which doctoral programs students are likely to apply. Given the important resources and information that students typically acquire during participation in summer fellowships, JSU students become better prepared to apply to doctoral programs, receive admission, and successfully complete the program.

### Conclusion

Our experiences, along with those of many other JSU political science alumni who have obtained political science doctoral degrees or are currently enrolled in a political science doctoral program, highlight the transformative work that is done by Professor Orey and other JSU faculty to build the political science pipeline. The placement of JSU undergraduates in political science programs speaks to the effectiveness of JSU's initiative to build the pipeline to serve as a practical model that other undergraduate programs could follow.

For instance, during Professor Orey's 10 years as a faculty member at JSU, nine of his former undergraduate students and four graduate students are currently enrolled in political science doctoral programs. Three have already obtained their doctoral degree in political science, and one currently serves as an assistant professor. Given the fact that African Americans comprise only 4% of APSA's membership, the diversity-pipeline initiatives occurring at JSU illustrate the need to allocate resources to building the pipeline at historically black universities and other minority-serving institutions. Other programs can examine JSU's political science undergraduate program for strategies that will encourage undergraduate students of color to pursue doctoral degrees and diversify the discipline. Increasing diversity within political science not only increases the sense of belonging of current faculty and graduate students of color; it also fundamentally shapes the research questions that we ask as a discipline and helps us to offer better knowledge and solutions to mitigating sociopolitical issues that we currently face in society. ■

### THE COLLABORATIVE MULTIRACIAL POST-ELECTION SURVEY (CMPS): BUILDING THE ACADEMIC PIPELINE THROUGH DATA ACCESS, PUBLICATION, AND NETWORKING OPPORTUNITIES

Lorrie Frasure-Yokley, *University of California, Los Angeles*

Janelle Wong, *University of Maryland, College Park*

Edward Vargas, *Arizona State University*

Matt Barreto, *University of California, Los Angeles*

DOI: 10.1017/S1049096519001185

The Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey (CMPS) is changing the way high-quality survey data are collected among racial and ethnic groups in the United States. Through collaboration and inclusiveness, the CMPS also broadens the scope of who has access to high-quality survey data in academia and beyond. In spring 2016, scholars around the country were invited to join a cooperative to self-fund the survey through the purchase of question content by contributors. Led by co-Principal Investigators Matt Barreto (UCLA), Lorrie Frasure-Yokley (UCLA), Edward Vargas (Arizona State University), and Janelle Wong (University of Maryland–College Park), the 2016 CMPS represents the first cooperative, multi-racial, multiethnic, multilingual, post-election online survey in race, ethnicity, and politics (REP) in the United States. All questions were generated through funding contributions from a national team of more than 85 researchers from 55 colleges and universities across 17 academic disciplines.

More than producing a unique national-survey dataset, the CMPS builds a diverse academic pipeline of scholars in political science and the social sciences more broadly. In the two years after the launch of the 2016 CMPS, we brought together through research collaborations, workshops, and writing retreats a diverse and multidisciplinary group of more than 150 researchers at varying stages of their academic career. What sets the CMPS project apart from other cooperative surveys? First, we focus on obtaining a diverse sample representing a range of racial and ethnic groups, using an in-language survey format (including several Asian languages). Second, and most important, the project is dedicated to recruiting and supporting collaborators from non-R1 universities, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Tribal Colleges and Universities, and Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI).

For the 2016 CMPS, we queried 10,145 people in five languages: English, Spanish, Chinese (simplified and traditional), Korean, and Vietnamese. The 2016 CMPS included large and generalizable samples of blacks ( $n=3,102$ ), Latinos ( $n=3,003$ ), Asian and Pacific Islanders ( $n=3,006$ ), and whites ( $n=1,034$ ), which allowed for an individual racial group analysis or comparative analysis across groups. The result of the project was a unique survey that included a broad range of survey questions emanating from a diversity of disciplines, including political science, sociology, psychology, public health, American studies, Latino studies, African American studies, and Asian American studies. Our article, "Best Practices in Collecting Online Data with Asian, Black, Latino, and White Respondents: Evidence from the 2016 Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey," describes our sampling methods, including a stratified listed/density quota-sampling approach to multilingual

surveys with large racial/ethnic minority samples (Barreto et al. 2018).

In addition to individual-level data, contributors received several data enhancements (e.g., aggregate-level contextual data) to merge into the 2016 dataset. A full list of contributors from 2016, access to topline results, and other materials are available via a public website developed to share information and publications using the CMPS ([www.cmpsurvey.org](http://www.cmpsurvey.org)).

All of the contributors and their coauthors share the entire dataset—including access to all 394 questions—to promote dynamic collaborations through coauthorships and research opportunities, particularly for undergraduate and graduate students, post-docs, and junior and senior faculty.

Our 2016 CMPS contributors and their coauthors have published more than 15 academic articles and research-oriented opinion pieces using 2016 CMPS data, with many others in the pipeline. With questions that focus explicitly on race/ethnicity, public policies, public opinion—and the inclusion of large samples of racial and ethnic groups, US- and foreign-born respondents, and voters and nonvoters—the 2016 CMPS provides essential empirical information on the state of modern politics in an increasingly diverse United States.

*With questions that focus explicitly on race/ethnicity, public policies, public opinion—and the inclusion of large samples of racial and ethnic groups, US- and foreign-born respondents, and voters and nonvoters—the 2016 CMPS provides essential empirical information on the state of modern politics in an increasingly diverse United States.*

### **Expanding the Academic Pipeline in REP through Workshops, Writing Retreats, and Networking Opportunities**

In the summers of 2017 and 2018, a diverse group of more than 100 scholars gathered at UCLA for a two-day CMPS Summer Research Workshop and Planning Meeting. This meeting also served as a research, professional-development, and networking opportunity for REP scholars and community leaders outside of academia. The CMPS Workshop was funded by the American Political Science Association's (APSA) Centennial Center, the National Science Foundation and other cosponsors.

Among attendees who submitted a postworkshop evaluation form, the majority were from underrepresented minority backgrounds. More than half identified as first-generation college graduates, meaning that they are the first in their family to earn a degree from a four-year university. Of the attendees that responded, 22% had attended an HBCU or HSI and almost one in four currently teach at a predominantly minority-serving institution.

In addition to the UCLA workshops, in June 2018, Lorrie Frasure-Yokley and Tyson-King Meadows (University of Maryland–Baltimore County) hosted a two-day writing retreat for the “Collaborative Writing and Publishing Working Group in the Study of Black Politics” using 2016 CMPS data at APSA headquarters in Washington, DC. By securing funding from the APSA Edward Artinian Fund for Publishing, the organizers brought together an intergenerational group of 22 scholars who worked in research teams using data from the 2016 CMPS. This writing-retreat format serves as a model for other research

groups using the CMPS data to meet, collaborate, and guide their projects to publication.

### **Preparing for The 2020 CMPS**

The 2020 CMPS will continue and expand the highly successful, groundbreaking 2016 CMPS, which broadened the scope of access to high-quality national-survey data with large and generalizable samples of racial and ethnic groups in the United States. The 2020 CMPS aims to increase the sample size from 10,000 to an estimated 20,000 cases, including but not limited to the following groups: Latinos, African Americans, Asian Americans, whites, Muslim Americans, black Caribbean immigrants, black African immigrants, Native Americans, and Native Hawaiians.

The 2020 CMPS will continue to invest time and resources in the professional development of an inclusive group of scholars—particularly women, underrepresented minority and first-generation students, junior faculty, and postdoctoral fellows—through conferences and workshops, as well as sustained mentorship, research, and publishing opportunities. These efforts build on the proven success of the 2016 CMPS and will continue to help scholars meet their full potential as the next generation of data innovators and researchers. ■

### **REFERENCE**

Barreto, Matt A., Lorrie Frasure-Yokley, Edward D. Vargas, and Janelle Wong. 2018. “Best Practices in Collecting Online Data with Asian, Black, Latino, and White Respondents: Evidence from the 2016 Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey.” *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 6 (1): 171–80. Available at DOI: [10.1080/21565503.2017.1419433](https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2017.1419433).

### **POLITICS, GROUPS, AND IDENTITIES AND NEW PATHWAYS TO REP PUBLISHING IN POLITICAL SCIENCE**

**Nadia E. Brown**, *Purdue University*

**Valeria Sinclair-Chapman**, *Purdue University*

**Kristen Smole**, *Purdue University*

DOI: [10.1017/S1049096519001136](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096519001136)

Journals are mirrors to a discipline. One of their important functions is reflecting how a discipline perceives itself. Editors are both gateways and gatekeepers. They not only evaluate what is fit to print but also which topics are to be addressed in the annals of disciplinary scholarship. The theories, data, and findings of a discipline are displayed in the pages of journals. *Politics, Groups, and Identities (PGI)*—not unlike its peers *Journal of Race, Ethnicity and Politics*, *National Political Science Review*, and *Politics & Gender*—performs an important function in the discipline, which fundamentally alters that reflection. . These subfield-specific journals emerged in response to scholarly demand for more visible and accessible scholarship, making the discipline of political science more inclusive of a range of research topics, scholars, and methodologies.