Fifty years of...
State of the I

With so many exciting projects and events on the horizon, 2011 is shaping up as one of the best years in ISR history. On a personal level, this is especially gratifying since this year marks the start of my second term as ISR Director. Leading this remarkable institution has not only been a great honor but also a considerable challenge. The growing uses of biometric, biological, and environmental data along with an increase in both national and international collaborations have changed both the nature and the scope of social science research. And these changes are the impetus behind our coming physical expansion.

This year marks the start of construction on this project, which has been made possible thanks to an ARRA grant from the National Institutes of Health. Expanding ISR’s physical facilities has been one of my top priorities, and I hope that all of you will plan to join us at a pre-construction celebration planned for the afternoon of June 21, 2011, here in Ann Arbor. We will be providing details soon about this important event, but in the meantime, please save the date.

Other celebrations will be happening this year as well. The ISR Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) will kick off its 50th Anniversary celebration at its biennial meeting of official representatives from member institutions October 5-7 in Ann Arbor. ICPSR is also planning a series of anniversary events throughout the year. Check the ICPSR website for the latest information: http://www.icpsr.umich.edu.

The ISR Population Studies Center is also celebrating its 50th Anniversary, with a celebration scheduled for October 20-23 in Ann Arbor. Again, the program details are still being developed, but you will find the latest news about the PSC 50th celebration on the web at http://www.psc.isr.umich.edu/fifty.

Together, these two anniversaries have inspired our cover story examining changes in the field of population research over the last half century, and exploring what’s to come. Also in this issue, you’ll find profiles of two senior faculty who have joined ISR recently, and stories about some of the vital Next Generation of social scientists we’re committed to supporting.

Throughout our history, ISR has thrived because of our research faculty’s ability to earn federal grant dollars. But these federal funds do not allow us to support the independent work of graduate students and junior faculty. And so we launched our first annual fund solicitation of ISR’s friends this past winter. We were deeply gratified by the response, which has provided vital dollars enabling our Centers to enhance their awards to emerging scholars. On behalf of the Next Generation, my heartfelt thanks to all of you.

“On a personal level, this is especially gratifying since this year marks the start of my second term as ISR Director. Leading this remarkable institution has not only been a great honor but also a considerable challenge.”

—James Jackson

ISR hosted its annual celebrations for retirees and donors this past November. Above, Bob and Bea Kahn visit with Gerald Gurin, and Next Generation researchers Igor Grossmann and Rona Carter talk about their research.

FOLLOW US

Stay in touch and get all the news about ISR people and events.

Join in the conversation and let us know what you think about ISR research.

facebook
http://facebook.com/umisr

twitter
http://twitter.com/umisr

YouTube
http://youtube.com/umisr

ABOUT THE COVER:
The cover is a word cloud generated from the article on page 4. For more information, go to http://www.tagxedo.com.

This magazine is printed on Rolland Enviro100, a Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)-certified and 100 percent post-consumer fiber paper that is chlorine-free and manufactured using biogas energy.
Fifty years ago, when the ISR Population Studies Center was founded, the burning issues in population studies looked starkly different from today. Rising birth rates—coupled with increased longevity—were raising widespread fears that the world’s resources would be overwhelmed. The *Population Bomb* was still seven years away; in it, biologist author Paul Ehrlich famously declare that “hundreds of millions of people will starve to death” by the 1970s. But researchers, policymakers, and foundations were already searching for ways to avert what many feared would be a broad humanitarian disaster. The worry was that poor countries would be unable to feed their people; it was that growing populations would mime those countries in perpetual crisis and poverty.

Spurred by these concerns, the Ford Foundation approached Michigan demographer Ronald Freedman in 1961 about setting up a population studies center—one of a series of university-based centers that the foundation would fund nationwide. The main goals: to train international students, develop demographic expertise around the world, study birth rates in developing countries, and study and evaluate family planning programs. In the years that followed, Michigan’s Population Studies Center (PSC) helped lead the charge in all those areas. “Fifty years ago, the main topic in demography was fertility,” says George Alter, demographer and acting director of the ISR Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), which is also celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. (See the back page for details on the two celebrations.)

Fertility work accelerated through the 1970s. The National Institute of Child Health & Human Development (NICHD), founded in 1962 to investigate human development throughout life, began funding research of American students. As censuses and surveys revealed the profound shift taking place, research funding priorities also shifted. Fertility research didn’t stop, but the National Institute on Aging (NIA) drove the push to understand more about the nature and challenges of aging, leading to the launch of ISR’s Health and Retirement Study in 1992, as well as many other studies. That a main preoccupation of population studies could change so suddenly might seem jarring. But PSC researchers say the transition from Population Bomb to the Graying of the World just shows how dynamic and responsive the field is. At its core, demography is the study of the three ways populations change: fertility, mortality, and migration. Although the focus of research has shifted in response to world events—and funding agencies have remained central to the field—what has changed over the last five decades is the breadth, depth, and sophistication of the research: the technology and methods used; and the degree of research collaboration required.

That deepening has taken population studies beyond just fertility, mortality, and migration. As sociologist and former PSC Director Albert Hermalin says, “If I have arthritis, is that related to anything that happened to me when I was 20 years old? So then you start to incorporate a life course perspective.” In this broader context, the research goals of NIA and NICHD often were not so different. Other areas of research—from families and marriage to inequality—deepened and evolved. Alter cites immigration studies as an example. Back in the 1960s, American researchers studying Mexican immigration to the United States left the country; now much such work would not be considered valid without corresponding research in Mexico. The cross-border work, Alter says, led researchers to understand that migration streams have a strong circular pattern, and that some government policies designed to deter immigrants actually stop people from returning to their countries of origin.

In all areas of demography, research has become better at reflecting the world as it really is. A 1955 fertility study by Freedman looked only at married white women; the predecessor to the National Survey of Family Growth soon expanded to include Black women and single mothers, and has become increasingly inclusive in the decades that followed. Many of the larger demographic surveys now use oversampling to study populations neglected in the past.

International work also is more important than ever, and U.S. researchers routinely collaborate with counterparts overseas. In fact, collaboration has become a hallmark of the field. “The diversity of populations we’re looking at and changes in society itself make demography look different now and will continue to change it in the future,” says Pamela Smock. The questions have stayed rather consistent, but how we examine them have become much more complicated.”

*The diversity of populations we’re looking at and changes in society itself make demography look different now and will continue to change it in the future.*

—Pamela Smock

This increased sophistication and complexity is apparent in the datasets used by demographers. Those downloaded most tend to be larger longitudinal surveys—like ISRS’s Health and Retirement Study and the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, which are archived at ICPSR—that scholars can adapt to many areas of research. “Demographers once worked from census counts and disease classifications, but are now asking much more sophisticated questions about the biology of diseases,” Alter says. “The richness of the data is totally different.” Another striking example of the field’s expansion: The program for the Population Association of America’s annual meeting has mushroomed from 10 pages in 1965 to 457 in 2010.

In the decades ahead, the broadening and deepening that has characterized the last 50 years is bound to continue, researchers agree. Alter expects to see new kinds of collaborations between demographers and geneticists—particularly since the mapping of the genome has raised as many questions as it has answered. “Genes express themselves differently in different environments,” Alter says, “so there are likely to be a number of studies coming out of a new partnership between social science and genetics as we try to untangle what seems to be a lot more complicated than people expected.”

By Susan Rosegrant

If I have arthritis, is that related to anything that happened to me when I was 20 years old? So then you start to incorporate a life course perspective.” In this broader context, the research goals of NIA and NICHD often were not so different.

Alter recalls Ron Freedman returning from a trip to Indonesia and talking about the importance of blue jeans and motorcycles. Parents told Freedman they were recalculating the expense of raising a large family now that their kids wanted trendy new clothing and expensive toys. “Ron saw those growing demands for consumer goods as one of the things that would lead to falling fertility,” Alter says.

“Fifty years ago, when the ISR Population Studies Center was founded, the burning issues in population studies looked starkly different from today. Rising birth rates—coupled with increased longevity—were raising widespread fears that the world’s resources would be overwhelmed. The *Population Bomb* was still seven years away; in it, biologist author Paul Ehrlich famously declare that “hundreds of millions of people will starve to death” by the 1970s. But researchers, policymakers, and foundations were already searching for ways to avert what many feared would be a broad humanitarian disaster. The worry was that poor countries would be unable to feed their people; it was that growing populations would mime those countries in perpetual crisis and poverty.
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Revealing the Roots of a Riot

by Susan Rosegrant

In July 1967, an early morning police raid of an unlicensed bar—or blind pig—on 12th Street in Detroit set off looting, fires, and shooting that soon escalated out of control. By the time the civil disturbance ended six days later, 43 people were dead, hundreds were injured, more than 7,000 people had been arrested, and entire blocks of East and West Detroit had been consumed by fire.

The Detroit Free Press and the Detroit News threw every resource they had into covering the uprising. And as the disturbance died down, journalists and commentators, most of them white, struggled to understand who the rioters were and why they had taken to the streets. One theory was that those who looted and burned buildings were on the bottom rung of society—rippers with no money and no education. A second theory speculated that rioters were recent arrivals from the South who had failed to assimilate and were venting their frustrations on the city.

But for many, those theories rang false. Philip Meyer, a national correspondent for the Knight Newspapers—parent company of the Free Press—flew into Detroit to help the exhausted Free Press staff. In a brainstorming session the day after federal troops left the city, Meyer proposed that the Free Press do a survey to delve into the identities and attitudes of the rioters. It was a bold idea. Louis Harris had published survey results in a representative sample of 437 Black residents; each day’s completed interviews were sent to Ann Arbor to be quickly transcribed and analyzed.

Meyer fired off an emergency proposal to the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) asking for funding to study the uprising. At about the same time, Meyer called an old grad school friend at ISR to see who might be willing to work with him on a fast but accurate survey for the Free Press. Caplan and Meyer met and quickly agreed to collaborate.

With the sponsorship of the Detroit Urban League and funding from area foundations and Henry Ford II, the survey team went to work. In one week, Meyer and Caplan drafted the questionnaire—pulling some questions from the Watts survey—and trained and about 30 interviewers from a group of Black Detroit school teachers who fortuitously had just finished a nearby enrichment training program. Meanwhile, ISR researcher John Robinson, recruited by Caplan, used the city directory to draw a random probability sample of 454 addresses in the riot area. The next week, interviewers spread out through the stricken neighborhoods, reaching a representative sample of 437 Black residents; each day’s completed interviews were sent to Ann Arbor to be quickly transcribed and analyzed on computer cards. The third week, Meyer and Caplan analyzed the data, and Meyer began to write.

On Sunday, August 20, a month after the uprising began, the Free Press’s special survey report took the city—and the nation—by storm. Among the findings: There was no correlation between economic status and participation in the disturbance. College-educated residents were as likely as high school dropouts to have lost their jobs. Finally, the rioters were a distinct subgroup and did not reflect the overall attitudes of area residents. “The survey helped define the situation by showing how much good will there was in the Black community,” Meyer says.

The staff of the Detroit Free Press won a Pulitzer Prize for its coverage of the riot. That, plus Meyer’s publication a few years later of Precision Journalism: A Reporter’s Introduction to Social Science Methods, changed media practices forever by inspiring newspapers to embrace the blending of social science and journalism.

What to do with all the data

Early this year, ICPSR Acquisitions Director Amy Pienuta conducted a webinar on creating a data management plan, and more than 500 researchers from all over the world participated. “Data management plans are now a hot topic among the research community,” said Pienuta, noting that the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health now require such plans as part of grant applications on projects that will produce data. Other national organizations also endorse the need for sharing and archiving data, in order to maximize the impact and benefit of research dollars.

To meet the need, ICPSR has launched a new blog titled ICPSR Guidance on Data Management Plans. The blog features ICPSR staff answers to questions ICPSR receives about how to write an effective data management plan. “We see the blog as a starting point for community discussion about writing data management plans,” says Pienuta. Visit the blog at http://datamanagementplans.blogspot.com.
Many U.S. women have children by more than one man

“I was surprised at the prevalence,” says demographer Cassandra Dorius, a postdoctoral fellow at ISR’s Population Studies Center. “Multiple partner fertility is an important part of contemporary American family life, and a key component to the net of disadvantage that many poor and uneducated women face every day.”

While previous studies have examined how common multiple partner fertility is among younger women, or among women who live in urban areas, the new research by Dorius is the first to assess prevalence among a national sample of U.S. women who have completed their child-bearing years.

For the study, Dorius analyzed data on nearly 4,000 U.S. women who were interviewed more than 20 times over a period of 27 years, as part of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth. She found that having children by different fathers was more common among minority women, with 59 percent of African American mothers, 35 percent of Hispanic mothers, and 22 percent of White mothers reporting multiple partner fertility. Women who were not living with a man when they gave birth and those with low income and less education were also more likely to have children by different men.

But she also found that multiple partner fertility is surprisingly common at all levels of income and education and is frequently tied to marriage and divorce rather than just single parenthood.

“I was a year into this project before I realized that my mother was one of these women,” says Dorius. “We tend to think of women with multiple partner fertility as being only poor single women with little education and money, but, in fact, at some point, most were married, and working, and going to school, and doing all the things you’re supposed to do to live the American Dream.”

The first national study of the prevalence of multiple partner fertility shows that 26 percent of all U.S. women with two or more children have children by more than one man. The study was presented April 1 in Washington, D.C., at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America.
Monitoring the Future Study identifies 2010 teen drug use and smoking trends

Marijuana use is rising, ecstasy use is beginning to rise, and alcohol use is declining among U.S. teens, according to the 2010 Monitoring the Future Study of a nationally representative sample of American teens.

The IRS survey also found that smoking—which had been declining since the mid-1990s—showed signs of increasing among younger teens. Since its inception in 1975, the survey has been funded under a series of research grants from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, one of the National Institutes of Health. In 2010, more than 46,000 8th, 10th, and 12th graders, enrolled in nearly 400 secondary public and private schools, participated in the study.

According to Lloyd Johnston, the study’s principal investigator, smoking behavior among younger teens is particularly important because it is predictive of their smoking behavior as they become older teens and young adults. “Smoking is a habit that tends to stay with people for a long time, leading to ongoing differences between different graduating classes of students that persist into adulthood,” he said.

All grades now have rates of smoking that are far below their peak rates in 1996 or 1997, Johnston points out. For example, 30-day prevalence is down by two thirds (66%) among 8th graders, by over half (55%) among 10th graders, and by nearly half (48%) among 12th graders.

“These are extremely important changes that will carry very substantial consequences for the health and longevity of this generation of young Americans,” states Johnston. “But there are still significant proportions of teens putting themselves at risk for a host of serious diseases and a premature death because they are taking up cigarette smoking.”

Smoking in the 30 days prior to the survey was reported by 7%, 14%, and 19% of 8th, 10th, and 12th graders, respectively. Rates of daily smoking during the past 30 days are 3%, 7%, and 11% in the three grades, respectively. And based on the experience of previous 12th-grade classes, quite a number of the lighter smokers will become daily smokers after they leave high school.

Cigarettes: Percentage who used in last 30 days

Scientists call it a cohort effect, and it occurs largely because cigarette smoking is so addictive.”

Peak smoking levels among teens were reached around 1996 among 8th and 10th graders and in 1997 among 12th graders. In the five or six years immediately following those peak levels, smoking among teens fell sharply. This likely was due in large part to increased public attention to the issue as well as to sharply rising prices, caused in part by new state sales taxes on cigarettes.

The study, published in Social Forces, was funded by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the National Institute on Aging, and the Sloan Foundation. Burgard analyzed time-diary data from approximately 20,000 working parents from 2003 to 2007, drawn from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Time Use Survey. She found that the gender gap in sleep interruptions was greatest during the prime childbearing and child-rearing years of the twenties and thirties.

Among dual-career couples with a child under the age of one, for example, 32 percent of women reported sleep interruptions to take care of the baby, compared with just 11 percent of men. The proportion reporting interrupted sleep declined with the age of the child, with 10 percent of working mothers and 2 percent of working fathers with children ages 1 to 2 reporting sleep interruptions, and just 3 percent of working mothers and 1 percent of working fathers with children ages 3 to 5.

“What’s really surprising,” Burgard said, “is that gender differences in night-time caregiving remain even after adjusting for the employment status, income and education levels of each parent. Among parents of infants who are the sole breadwinner in a couple, for example, 28 percent of women who are the sole breadwinner report getting up at night to take care of their children, compared to just 4 percent of men who are the only earner in the couple.”

“The prime childbearing years are also the time when earnings trajectories are being established,” Burgard says, “and career advancement opportunities could well be foregone if women reduce their paid work time or see their workplace performance affected because of exhaustion. As a result, sleep interruption may represent an under-recognized ‘motherhood penalty’ that influences life chances and well-being.”

The findings also have implications for public health interventions to improve sleep. “Generally, these interventions target individual behaviors, such as the use of alcohol, caffeine or tobacco,” said Burgard. “Or they focus on nightly routines that help people to relax and fall asleep or stay asleep more successfully. But for parents of young children, the best approach might be discussions and negotiations about whose turn it is to get up with the baby tonight.”

Read more about the findings at http://www.monitoringthefuture.org.

―Lloyd Johnston

―Sarah Burgard

Watch a video interview with Burgard on ISR’s YouTube channel: http://youtu.be/7jvrujqovwM.

Read more about the findings at http://www.monitoringthefuture.org.
Rona Carter
2010 Libby Douvan Junior Scholar in Life Course Development

In fact, her research shows that the actual age of onset appears less important than how a girl interprets the event. That, Carter says, is influenced by how her parents and peers react, but perhaps most importantly by how she herself perceives her timing relative to her peers. Girls who mature early can face a range of pressures, including awkwardness with friends and come-ons from suddenly interested older boys. Girls who mature late may feel left out, unpopular, and depressed.

Carter, who had a nomadic childhood as the youngest of four daughters of a military man, hopes that her research may someday result in improved programs to help girls navigate their coming-of-age years with less stress and depression and fewer negative outcomes.

“We can maybe change those trajectories for them,” she says. She also hopes some day to serve as a mentor to university students. “I didn’t know Libby [Douvan],” Carter says, “but I’ve read about her.” Among the characteristics that impressed her, Carter says, was Douvan’s “dedication to mentoring—to advising the next generation of researchers.”

That kind of mentoring made all the difference in Carter’s own life. As an assistant back at the PACE Center, she wasn’t sure what her long-term goals should be. But the then director took her in hand. “She said, ‘Let’s make a plan. Let’s do this! You want to do psychology? You can do a Ph.D.’” Carter adds: “I wouldn’t be here without bumping into people. That’s what’s really been helpful in moving me forward in my research, and helping me come to the realization that I can become a professor.” Her advice to other young scholars? “Bump into people. Try to be visible.” She adds: “You never know which person you bump into is going to help you move forward.”

To help put herself through Florida International University while earning her undergraduate degree in psychology, Rona Carter took a job at the Miami-based PACE Center for Girls, a non-profit school targeting 12- to 18-year-old at-risk girls. Carter was an administrative assistant, but she got to know some of the students well—students who were struggling with truancy, depression, delinquency, and other problems. Sometimes she took girls on field trips purely for fun. But she also recruited them to help her write stories and take photos for the school newsletter. Others she escorted on college tours, hoping to light a spark of possibility. “I wondered what happened to these girls, why are they here?” Carter recalls.

Those early questions pointed Carter towards the research she’s now doing at ISR. As a post-doc and the first Libby Douvan Junior Scholar, Carter is investigating how biological and physical changes associated with puberty influence girls’ behavioral and psychological adjustments. At the PACE Center, Carter says, some of the girls who were having a hard time had hit puberty early, and had larger breasts and other physical developments that set them apart from their peers. “Someone could look as if she was a woman, yet she was still the same age as someone who looked like a child,” she says. “Someone could look as if she was a woman, yet she was still the same age as someone who looked like a child.”

Girls who mature late may feel left out, unpopular, and depressed.

Researchers, and junior faculty in a range of disciplines. Following are two profiles, written by Susan Rosegrant, that capture some of the innovative work being undertaken by recent award winners.

Sasha Killewald
2010 Marshall Weinberg Research Fellow

Housework—a domestic burden borne disproportionately by women—lies at the heart of many family conflicts. But despite its undeniable impact on family dynamics, housework hasn’t always been regarded as a topic worthy of research.

“Everyone does housework, it’s so ordinary, we don’t really care about it, why should we study it?” asks Alexandra Killewald, who recently received her Ph.D. in public policy and sociology from the University of Michigan. “But I think that it’s precisely because these are events that affect so many people that it’s important to understand what’s going on with them, in particular from the perspective of fairness.”

In a paper published in the November 2010 issue of Social Science Research, Killewald takes on two contrasting theories of housework: the autonomy perspective, which predicts that the amount of housework women do will fall steadily as their earnings increase; and the compensatory gender display theory, which says wives’ housework hours will fall until they start earning more than their husbands, at which point the amount of housework they do will increase. The latter theory, Killewald says, may strike people unfamiliar with the literature as absurd: “It’s a particularly interesting theory, because it suggests that more money can make you worse off, which is not how we think money works in any situation.”

Killewald believed both theories fell short, and she set out to provide a more nuanced understanding of housework hours using data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics. What she found is that the relationship between earnings and housework is not strictly linear. Wives may be happy to bring in a clearer or eat some meals out, Killewald says, but no matter how much they earn, they are unwilling or unable to delegate all of these chores: some may lack good outsourcing options; others may see home cooking as an essential expression of love. As a result, the autonomy perspective fails to explain wives’ ability—or inability—to buy a pass from housework.

But husbands don’t feel the same responsibility for or emotional connection to housework. “...there is something about the experience of being a wife, as opposed to a husband, that causes even high-earning wives to spend considerably more time in housework than their husbands, even when they out-earn them,” Killewald wrote. It is this gender difference, combined with wives’ inability to outsource all housework, that leads high-earning women to keep making dinner, and that led some researchers to see a compensatory gender reaction, Killewald claims.

Killewald, who grew up in Ann Arbor in a two-career household, has social science in her blood: Her father, political scientist Christopher Achen, was a researcher at ISR’s Center for Political Studies before going to Princeton in 2005. Her mother Tena, a University of Michigan development officer, is now in charge of major gifts for the Eastern States Region. “ISR was the place I had to go drive to pick up my dad from work,” Killewald recalls. With dissertation in hand, Killewald has settled with her physicist husband in the Cambridge area, and is working as a human services researcher at Mathematica Policy Research.

Killewald says her mother has followed her research on housework closely, having had to manage the balance between work and family herself. “As for her father? If my phone rings and it’s my dad, he’s definitely calling about the Michigan football game,” she says dryly. “There’s no way he’s talking about social science.”
As spring yard sales pop up where snow piles recently sat, you might notice a barrel-chested man with silvery hair and a quick slanting smile expertly evaluating the items on display. He’ll likely be decisive, but ready to stop if an interesting object—or comment—catches his attention. John Garcia, who joined ICPSR last summer as director of the Resource Center for Minority Data, became expert at prowling yard sales during his 38 years as a political scientist at the University of Arizona in Tucson. For Garcia, 66, finding hidden value among other people’s castoffs is both a pleasing process and a source of sudden joy.

It isn’t too much of a stretch to compare Garcia’s agility at treasure-picking with his ability to pick and choose among interests to create a rich—if sometimes unconventional—academic life. Garcia is well established as an expert in Latino political science, more broadly, his research looks at the relative access different groups in American society have to resources, power, and influence. But within that genre, Garcia has done everything from mainstream political science research to studies on dental utilization and cervical cancer screening among minority populations. Add to that his interests outside academia—poetry, calligraphy, essay writing, music—and you begin to get a sense of the man.

At ICPSR, Garcia’s diverse skills suit his roles. He is expanding the collection of the Resource Center for Minority Data, in part by cultivating in favors from his research colleagues, increasing the archive’s visibility, for example, by hosting workshops and looking for new funding sources. Garcia is also ICPSR’s director of community outreach, a new position created for him. He’s still defining the job, but sees it as a way to cut across divisions to pursue broader goals, such as trying to get community colleges and more diverse institutions to sign up as ICPSR members. “From the organization’s point of view, it’s making use of what’s there,” Garcia says. Ann Arbor’s yard sales so far haven’t yielded the same riches as Tucson’s. But Garcia is starting to feel settled. Although he spent most of his life in Texas and the Southwest, Garcia has history in Michigan going back to the 1960s; he has friends in Battle Creek, worked as a camp counselor at Interlochen, and came to U-M in 1979 as a visiting associate professor and SRC researcher, the first in a series of university appointments. In a strange sense, Garcia says, moving here was like coming home.

In recent years, researchers in more than 40 countries have run surveys based on Miller’s core set of questions—questions that remain relevant, he says, by focusing on basic constructs of science, such as viruses, DNA, and galaxies, rather than on the hot button scientific issues of the day.

The good news, Miller says, is that the understanding of science in the U.S. is increasing. According to his surveys, 28 percent of the adult population was scientifically literate in 2008, compared to 10 percent in 1988. Younger people are doing even better. Miller credits the uptick and the U.S.’s second place ranking in scientific literacy from 34 comparison countries to the general education approach of U.S. colleges, which compels students to take some science courses; the U.S. is the only country with such a requirement.

Now that Miller is at ISR, two of his long-term efforts, the International Center for the Advancement of Scientific Literacy and the Longitudinal Study of American Youth, have found permanent homes. For Miller, the move is a profound change, but a good one. “It’s the first time I’ve ever worked in a building where there are 200 people who do surveys,” he says, with a laugh.

“Often, I was the only one.”

Profiles by Susan Rosegrant
Celebrating 50 years

ISR INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL AND SOCIAL RESEARCH

The Next 50 Years: Innovation in a Data-Driven World
October 5-7, 2011 - Ann Arbor - Launch of 50th Anniversary

A series of exhibits and receptions will be held from November 2011 through May 2012 in Boston, Chicago, Ann Arbor, and San Francisco.

Closing Event: June 7, 2012 - Ann Arbor
Speaker: Elinor Ostrom, winner of the Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences


ISR POPULATION STUDIES CENTER

Honoring the Past & Preparing for the Future
October 20-23, 2011 - Ann Arbor

A reunion and celebration with professional and social gatherings will be held in Ann Arbor.

Opening Reception: October 20
Formal Program: October 21-22
Poster Session: October 22
Formal Banquet: October 22

For more information or to RSVP go to: http://www.psc.isr.umich.edu/fifty.
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