multidisciplinary group of researchers in varying stages of their academic career. Using the collaborative, inclusive model of resource-sharing that we developed in 2016 and 2020, the 2024 CMPS will continue to expand research and professional-development opportunities for faculty; undergraduate and graduate students; and postdoctoral scholars from large research institutions, smaller liberal arts colleges, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and Hispanic Serving Institutions. This inclusive research and data-collection model will continue to highlight the voices of underrepresented groups in society and politics and also foster community among scholars in the social sciences and beyond.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors acknowledge the support of the National Science Foundation Award No. 1918510.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The 2020 Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey is available at the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR39096.v1).

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no ethical issues or conflicts of interest in this research. ■

REFERENCES

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. DOI:10.1080/21565503.2017.1419433.

Mercer, Andrew. 2016. "Oversampling Is Used to Study Small Groups, Not Bias Poll Results." Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/10/25/oversampling-is-used-to-study-small-groups-not-bias-poll-results.

INTRODUCING THE 2020 CMPS MENA/MUSLIM SAMPLE

Karam Dana, *University of Washington Bothell, USA*
Nazita Lajevardi, *Michigan State University, USA*

DOI:10.1017/S1049096524000180

Why Study American Muslims?

For many years, American Muslims have experienced heightened scrutiny due to widespread societal apprehensions about Islam. Research has documented the discrimination against Muslims by the public, elites, and masses (Lajevardi 2020; Oskooii, Dana, and Barreto 2021) as well as the impact of this hostile environment on Muslims themselves (Dana et al. 2019; Sediqe 2020). Overall, findings indicate that whereas American Muslims face challenges akin to other racial and immigrant groups, they also grapple with gaining acceptance and being recognized for their positive contributions to America's diverse society.

Within this context, Muslims face unique challenges that raise particular questions about their democratic inclusion. Moreover, the diversity and heterogeneity of the US Muslim population across numerous markers—including race, denomination, nativity, age, socioeconomic status, sexual and gender identity, and religiosity—all matter for shaping whether and how intensely they have encountered such challenges, as well as their responses. A comprehensive understanding of their experiences, and how these compare to those of other American groups, requires extensive samples of both Muslim and non-Muslim individuals, along with detailed questioning on a broad range of sociopolitical issues.

Fortunately, the 2020 Collaborative Multiracial Postelection Survey (CMPS)—a national survey of voters and non-voters that oversamples racial and ethnic minorities on political and social issues—provides a unique opportunity to delve deeper into the experiences of US Muslims compared to other minoritized groups. The 2020 CMPS consisted of large samples (~4,000) of white, Latino, Black, and Asian respondents. Importantly, given the salience of other socially stigmatized communities, the 2020 CMPS also included oversamples of LGBTQ+ Americans, Native Americans, Native Hawaiians, Afro Latinos, African Immigrants, and Muslim Americans. With the CMPS, for the first time, researchers can thoroughly investigate Muslim experiences in the areas of politics, identity, housing, employment, law enforcement, immigration, media, education, and environmental concerns.

Complications of Collecting Survey Data on Muslims

Studying US Muslims presents unique challenges, which distinguishes it from research on other marginalized groups. Typically, researchers use demographic details such as group size, composition, and location when they study marginalized populations (e.g., racial and ethnic minorities). This rich dataset is notably lacking for Muslims, making study design difficult. The following three main issues hinder comprehensive survey data collection about US Muslims:

1. The US Census does not query religious identification. Although certain groups, such as Hispanics and Asian Americans, may be inferred from census-recorded surnames, there is no analogous method for Muslims due to the absence of a reference list (Barreto and Dana 2019). This data gap limits accurate estimations of religious populations nationwide (Barreto and Dana 2019).
2. Muslims are incredibly diverse in their racial backgrounds. Although a substantial proportion have roots in the Middle Eastern/North African (MENA) region, using MENA populations for rough estimations is problematic because the US Census currently groups MENA Americans under the "White" category, which obfuscates specific national origins (d'Urso 2022).
3. Alarmingly, some US Muslims perceive survey-recruitment efforts as a potential surveillance method, which heightens their anxiety, lowers response rates, and possibly biases responses due to social desirability (Calfano, Lajevardi, and Michelson 2019).

Findings From The 2020 CMPS

This section describes our sampling challenges and provides a preview of our sample.

Sampling Challenges

Achieving a fully representative Muslim sample is challenging due to inherent difficulties. However, we used benchmarks from the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096524000180 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1

MENA/Muslim Sample in the 2020 CMPS

	Non-MENA	MENA	Totals
Non–Muslim	16,750	203	16,953
Muslim	490	89	579
Totals	17,240	292	17,532

Pew Research Center's 2017 survey on US Muslims to establish race and nativity quotas, which assisted in the weighting of our Muslim sample.[1]

Our primary limitation in developing the Muslim oversample was that we did not pose a screener question about religion at the beginning of the survey. Respondents first answered questions related to race and were not asked about their religious identification until Question 58. Moreover, when they were queried about their religious affiliation, respondents were permitted to "check all that apply."

Ultimately, the 2020 CMPS included 579 self-identified Muslims and 292 MENA respondents.[2] The CMPS directors combined these two groups for two reasons: (1) low response rates in the Muslim sample; and (2) a burgeoning interest in the MENA American population, especially in light of the likelihood of including a new racial category for MENA Americans in the 2030 US Census. Nevertheless, as other research argues (d'Urso 2022) and as shown in table 1, it is crucial for users of these data to recognize that not all Muslims are MENA and vice versa. Although a single oversample indicator for a combined MENA/Muslim sample appears in the 2020 CMPS dataset and in the public documents, we recommend that users treat MENA and Muslim as distinct categories, disaggregating these two groups into their own analyses. Relatedly, the provided oversample weights by the 2020 CMPS are a rough estimate, complicated by the fact that there is no true underlying population to which we can weight. We advise researchers (of Muslims) to formulate their own weights relying on the Pew Research Center's Muslim surveys, considering variables such as race, nativity, and age.

Multiple approaches were taken to recruit Muslims for the sample and from these myriad approaches, we have learned several beneficial lessons. First, flagging religion initially led to a higher proportion of Muslim respondents in the survey. Second, the 2020 CMPS turned to multiple sources to recruit respondents for the survey, including survey panels, the random-recruit-to-web (RRW) method,[3] community samples cultivated by sample directors, and non-voter lists. Analyses indicated that the approximately 10 survey panels relied on to recruit respondents for the instrument all produced similar—and rather poor—results for recruiting Muslims into the 2020 CMPS. Third, of all the sources used, the non-voter list that the CMPS purchased for Muslims yielded significant results (i.e., 29% of all of those who started the questionnaire and who made it to Question 58 for the purchased non-voter list identified as Muslim), and most efforts tried to maximize completions from that source. Fourth, the RRW sample also performed well: of those who identified as Muslim, 39% identified as Muslim at Question 58. Fifth, in the limited community sample that we were able to cultivate (N=20), our contact rate for Muslim respondents was 100%.

Sample Preview

Overall, using all of the approaches taken to recruit Muslims for the sample, a total of 782 respondents took the survey and identified as either Muslim or MENA in the 2020 CMPS. Of these respondents, 579 identified as Muslim, 89 as MENA/Muslim, and 203 as MENA/non-Muslim (see table 1). Although we did not recruit 1,000 Muslims as originally planned, the robust and wide-ranging questions about which respondents were queried makes this sample an invaluable resource to learn more than ever before about the US Muslim population (Dana and Lajevardi 2024).

Discussions with the 2020 CMPS principal investigators throughout the recruitment process piqued our interest in those flagged Muslim respondents in the RRW and non-voter lists who ultimately did not subsequently identify as Muslim in Question 58. Fortunately, in addition to asking respondents about their own religious affiliation, the 2020 CMPS asked which primary religion, if any, that respondents' families practiced or followed when they were being raised. As shown in table 2, 552 respondents indicated that they were raised in a Muslim household, with most still identifying as Muslim (N=462, 82.94%). Nevertheless, 95 respondents (i.e., 17.06% of those who indicated they were raised in a Muslim household) did not identify currently as Muslim. We refer to these individuals as "Muslim by Heritage" and, moving forward, we argue that one best-practice lesson is to query respondents early in the survey about the faith group in which they were raised *and* their current beliefs. Table 2 also reveals that 117 respondents were not raised in a Muslim household but currently identify as Muslim. Most likely, these are Muslim converts; descriptive analyses reveal that the majority identify as Black (~51%) or Latino (~22%). This reinforces findings that racial and ethnic minorities are the fastest-growing segments of the US Muslim population.

Table 3 lists basic descriptive statistics comparing the Muslim, MENA, and Muslim by Heritage samples to the primary oversample groups. The table displays means across the samples for indicators including US Born; LGBTQ+; Voted in the 2020 Presidential Election; 2020 Trump Support; and Perceived Discrimination with Respect to Race, Skin Color, Gender, Sexuality, Immigration Status, Religion, and Accent. Three noteworthy trends are illustrated in the table. First, self-identified Muslims reported the greatest levels of religious discrimination; however, Muslims by Heritage and non-Muslim MENA respondents also were more likely to report higher levels of religious discrimination

Table 2

Finding Respondents Who Are "Muslim by Heritage" in the 2020 CMPS

	Raised in a Muslim Household	Not Raised in a Muslim Household	Totals
Non-MENA	456	16,797	17,253
MENA	101	191	292
Non-Muslim	95	16,858	16,953
Muslim	462	117	579

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096524000180 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Muslim Mean	Muslim Non-MENA Mean	Muslim MENA Mean	Muslim By Heritage Mean	Non-Muslim MENA Mean	Non-Muslim Black Mean	Non-Muslim Asian Mean	Non-Muslim Latino Mean	Non-Muslim White Mean
US Born	50.97%	51.37%	48.99%	66.08%	68.7%	88.43%	31.77%	55.46%	87.6%
LGBTQ+	8.78%	8.76%	8.92%	10.13%	15.65%	6.3%	2.15%	7.88%	16.85%
Voted in 2020	30.6%	30.7%	30.1%	29.45%	48.71%	57.6%	53.97%	42.9%	64.21%
Trump 2020 Support	19.27%	20.30%	14.2%	15.95%	25.44%	9.52%	28.23%	23.93%	44.18%
Discrimination: Race	27.81%	25.05%	41.39%	37.53%	40.15%	39.06%	35%	27.31%	14.99%
Discrimination: Skin Color	21.87%	22.56%	18.5%	34.32%	24.02%	41.89%	19.77%	20.46%	13.63%
Discrimination: Gender	16.25%	15.52%	19.8%	23.80%	29.73%	17.15%	11.41%	11.62%	17.23%
Discrimination: Sexuality	6.61%	5.14%	13.82%	12.86%	12.4%	5.76%	2.76%	5.94%	8.08%
Discrimination: Immigrant Status	6.52%	5.71%	10.5%	16.99%	7.54%	2.7%	5.46%	6.69%	1.5%
Discrimination: Religion	24.19%	21.28%	38.49%	15.42%	18.55%	4.33%	4.22%	4.55%	6.63%
Discrimination: Accent	7.59%	6.66%	12.17%	15.39%	14.82%	6.49%	13.27%	10.48%	5.88%
Observations	579	490	89	95	203	4,672	3,733	4,493	5,348

Note: These figures represent weighted averages.

than non-Muslim Black, Asian, Latino, and white respondents. Second, Muslim, MENA/non-Muslim, and Muslim by Heritage respondents also reported high levels of racial, skin color, and gender discrimination, similar to other non-Muslim minorities. Third, the Muslim, MENA/non-Muslim, and Muslim by Heritage are many whose attachment to Islam may be cultural rather than religious in nature. Therefore, those individuals should be asked whether they consider themselves "cultural" or "secular" Muslims as researchers consider how to treat Muslims by Heritage.

Given how Muslims have been central to discourse in American politics, and given how much discrimination they face along numerous markers, the data reconfirm the need for a Muslim survey in 2024 and beyond.

categories had low turnout rates in the 2020 election (hovering around 30%)—lower than any of the other oversample populations. When they were queried, however, respondents reported low levels of Trump support.

Lessons Learned and Future Avenues for 2024

Given how Muslims have been central to discourse in American politics, and given how much discrimination they face along numerous markers, the data reconfirm the need for a Muslim survey in 2024 and beyond. This data-collection effort also yielded several lessons in best practices, as follows:

- Respondents' religion should be queried as a screener sooner in the survey.
- Respondents should be asked about the faith group in which they were raised. Future surveys should recognize that there
- The most successful means of recruiting Muslim respondents for the 2020 CMPS was using RRW off the non-voter list and by developing a community sample through "snowball" sampling.
- Users should disaggregate the MENA/Muslim subgroups.
- The 2020 CMPS survey weights for the MENA/Muslim sample were rough estimates; therefore, users should create their own weights.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the editor and the anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful and constructive feedback. We also thank participants at the 2023 CMPS National Advisory Board Meeting and the Michigan State University Muslim Studies Program 2024 Annual Conference, "Researching Muslim America," who together provided exceptional suggestions and insights. Finally, we thank

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096524000180 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lorrie Frasure, Janelle Wong, Edward Vargas, and Matt Barreto for including Muslim and MENA Americans in the 2020 CMPS, and for helping us to think through sampling at every stage of the process. We are forever grateful.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Research documentation and data that support the findings of this study are openly available at the *PS: Political Science & Politics* Harvard Dataverse at https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/SZBQJN.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no ethical issues or conflicts of interest in this research. ■

NOTES

1. Although the Pew Research Center has conducted only three surveys of American Muslims to date (i.e., 2007, 2011, and 2017), they are widely recognized as the most comprehensive of their type. This is due primarily to the substantial investment in and strategic approach of gauging Muslim populations by county. See www.pewresearch.org/religion/2017/07/26/appendix-b-survey-methodology.
2. Although the survey was fielded in other languages, only five respondents opted to take it in Arabic and only one chose to take it in Farsi.
3. RRW is a method pioneered originally by political scientists Matt Barreto and Gary Segura in public opinion research on Latino voters. As Barreto et al. (2018) described, RRW uses the official voter file of registered voters, a percentage of which contain email addresses either volunteered or matched through external databases. From these millions of records of email addresses, a random selection is invited to take a survey.

REFERENCES

Barreto, Matt, and Karam Dana. 2019. "Best Practices for Gathering Public Opinion Data Among Muslim Americans." In *Understanding Muslim Political Life in America*, ed. Brian Calfano and Nazita Lajevardi. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 202–214.

Barreto, Matt, Lorrie Frasure-Yokley, Edward 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.

Calfano, Brian, Nazita Lajevardi, and Melissa Michelson. 2019. "Trumped up Challenges: Limitations, Opportunities, and the Future of Political Research on Muslim Americans." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 7 (2): 477–87.

Dana, Karam, Nazita Lajevardi, Kassra A. R. Oskooii, and Hannah L Walker. 2019. "Veiled Politics: Experiences with Discrimination Among Muslim Americans." *Politics and Religion* 12 (4): 629–77.

d'Urso, Amanda Sahar. 2022. "A Boundary of White Inclusion: The Role of Religion in Ethnoracial Assignment." *Perspectives on Politics* 1–18.

Lajevardi, Nazita. 2020. *Outsiders at Home: The Politics of American Islamophobia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lajevardi, Nazita, and Karam Dana. 2024. "Replication Data for 'Introducing the CMPS 2020 MENA/Muslim Sample.'" *PS: Political Science & Politics.* Harvard Dataverse DOI:10.7910/DVN/SZBQJN.

Oskooii, Kassra A. R., Karam Dana, and Matt Barreto. 2021. "Beyond Generalized Ethnocentrism: Islam-Specific Beliefs and Prejudice Toward Muslim Americans." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 9 (3): 538–65.

Sediqe, Nura A. 2020. "Stigma Consciousness and American Identity: The Case of Muslims in the United States." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (4): 674–78.

TAKING ACCOUNT OF BLACKNESS AMONG LATINOS: AFRO-LATINO OVERSAMPLE

Danielle Pilar Clealand, *University of Texas at Austin, USA*

DOI:10.1017/S1049096524000611

Measuring the role of racial identity among US Latina/o/x communities is an ongoing challenge for scholars in the social sciences. Several datasets, including the US Census, demonstrate that self-identified Black Latinos are lower on socioeconomic indicators, homeownership, and poverty levels than the rest of the Latino population (Aja et al. 2019; Holder and Aja 2021; Martinez and Aja 2021; Ortiz and Telles 2012), despite higher high school and college graduation rates (Aja et al. 2019). Darker-skinned Latinos also have been found to experience higher discrimination at the workplace (Espino and Franz 2002). Racial differences among Latinos matter, and these gaps necessitate analysis. How do we measure racial identification among a multiracial population?

The Afro-Latino oversample of the Collaborative Multiracial Post-Election Survey (CMPS) represents an important step in upending the idea that Latinos are part of one "brown" category. It recognizes that they are racially diverse and must be studied with the same attention to race and racialization as other US racial and ethnic groups. Within the country's racial hierarchy, Latinos do not occupy one space but instead fit according to a person's race and skin color. Analyzing Latinos as brown—or what I term the "browning effect"—homogenizes Latinos into a singular position in our nation's hierarchy (often in a position between Black and white Americans) without disaggregating by race, which invisibilizes Black and Indigenous populations.

Data-Collection Challenges

Compiling a sample of Afro-Latinos presents many challenges that likely are different than any other oversample in the CMPS. To collect data on Afro-Latinos, we needed to establish who is part of this population; self-identification as Black is not as straightforward as it may be with other Black populations. In Latin America, racial frameworks vary, and separate categories exist for those of mixed race that would be considered Black in the United States. Those of mixed race, therefore, often identify with these middle or intermediate categories, including *mulato*, *pardo*, *mestizo*, and *moreno*, rather than Black.[1] As a result, if we add only those respondents who identify as both Black and Latino to the oversample, we omit a significant percentage of the Afro-Latino population. Moreover, national narratives in Latin America that emphasize racial mixing, or *mestizaje*, suggest that all people have a mix of European, African, and Indigenous ancestry to foment unity. This leads to challenges in making determinations about (1) who is Afro-descendant; (2) whether Afro-Latino is different than Black self-identification; and (3) whether we should include those who are not racialized as Black or even Latino but who self-identified as Afro-Latino in the survey.

Sample Demographics and Findings

In the 2020 CMPS Afro-Latino oversample (N=1,145), respondents were divided between the choice of Black and Hispanic/Latino as their primary race: 45% each. The CMPS used the term "Afro-Latino" in its screening question for the oversample, asking whether respondents identified as having Black and Latin American ancestry. They had the choice of self-identification, a parent who identified, and/or a grandparent who did. Respondents represented 48 states with the largest percentage from New York and New Jersey (17%), followed by Florida and California at 12% from each state. Among those who classified as Latino as their primary race/ethnicity, we were able to capture their national origin: 23.0% were Mexican, 22.0% were Puerto Rican, 11.5% were Dominican, and 6.4% were Cuban (Clealand 2024) Table 1 showst the oversample had higher levels of Democratic support (59%, including support for President Biden) than the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096524000180 Published online by Cambridge University Press