

# The Michigan, then National, then American National Election Studies<sup>1</sup>

*To Warren*

8.15.06

Nancy Burns  
Warren E. Miller Professor of Political Science  
Director, Center for Political Studies  
University of Michigan



*Philip Converse, Warren Miller, and Angus Campbell, Designing the Michigan Election Studies.<sup>2</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> I am tremendously grateful to Erik Austin, Joanne Lound, and, especially, the tremendously talented ANES staff – David Howell, Patricia Luevano, Kelly Ogden-Schuette, Laurie Pierson, Angela Pok, and Laurie Winslow – for building the ANES historical archives. Don Kinder gave crucial advice on an earlier draft of this chapter.

<sup>2</sup> I would like to thank the Bentley Historical Library for allowing me to include this picture. Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Photo #bl005607.

In 1948, under the direction of Angus Campbell and Robert Kahn, the Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Michigan, with financial support from the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), carried out what it viewed as a pilot study of the national electorate. As Campbell and Kahn noted in their 1952 summary of that study, Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet (1944) showed the power of the systematic survey for understanding political behavior with their study of Erie County, Ohio, carried out around the 1940 election. The 1948 study was the national, scientific application of the method.<sup>3</sup> This study interviewed 577 respondents twice, once before and then, again, after the election. The respondents were drawn using probability sampling. The bulk of the questions were open-ended, a hallmark of SRC studies.<sup>4</sup>

In many respects, the emergence of this first study was accidental. The pre-election study was intended to be a study of attitudes towards foreign policy. Embedded in this study were two questions about intended vote. After the election and the debacle of the polls that year—polls confidently predicting a Dewey victory – Angus Campbell took the opportunity of this national probability sample to refocus the study. He secured funding from the Social Science Research Council<sup>5</sup> to go back to these respondents and ask questions that would allow Campbell and Kahn

- (1) To analyze the crystallization of the vote from October intentions to November decisions.
- (2) To record the personal, attitudinal, and demographic characteristics of voters and non-voters, Republicans and Democrats, and
- (3) To assess the influence of various psychological, sociological, and political factors on the determination of the vote (quote, Campbell and Kahn 1952, 3).

The explanatory variables in the study were largely demographic, the hypotheses largely based on intuition, and the instrumentation overwhelmingly exploratory. With its use of area probability sampling for a national sample and with its focus on political behavior, the study provided an important pilot for the future.

---

<sup>3</sup> Paul Lazarsfeld worked with NORC to develop a national study of the 1944 presidential election, but only a dissertation and a thesis ever came of that work (Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes 1960, p. 15; Converse 1987: 363; Converse and Kinder 2004 )

<sup>4</sup>On SRC and open-ended questions, see Warren Miller, interview with Lloyd Johnston, ANES Archives.

<sup>5</sup>SSRC was especially interested at the time in the value of the survey method, and the polls' mistakes in predicting the election were cause for concern; the SRC study was one of the few studies in the field using a probability sample. For a discussion of these polls, see Mosteller et al. 1949. Instead of a landslide for Dewey, the small SRC study in the field before the election predicted a near-draw, with Dewey slightly ahead of Truman (Campbell and Kahn 1952:9). Local lore is that researchers at SRC kept a chalkboard tally of the votes as surveys came in and fully expected a tighter race (or "an exceptionally tight Presidential race," as a February 1, 1960 press release put it (U of M News Service; ANES Archives)) than the other national polls suggested (personal conversation, Jean Campbell, April 6, 2006). SSRC was keen to help foster a scientific study of politics, with surveys as the instrument for science, and so had a serious stake in the reputation of the method (Mosteller et al. 1949). See, too, Converse 1987 and Converse and Kinder 2004.

1948 provided the trial for the method. 1952 took that trial, embedded contending theoretical frameworks in the study and fine-tuned measurement. Under the intellectual leadership of Angus Campbell and then Syracuse graduate-student Warren Miller, this 1952 study was designed to compare to the past, to 1948, and, remarkably, to compare to the future, so that the value of any cross-section for scientific understanding of American political behavior would increase over time. In the first draft of his dissertation proposal (for the project that was the 1952 election study!) and in a series of project memos, Miller outlined the theoretical foundations for the study.<sup>6</sup> He wanted a study that drew its conceptual tools and measurement strategy from psychology, that spoke to but departed from what he saw as the largely demographic analyses that had come before, and that was carried out on similarly constructed area probability samples to enable serious comparison over time. In their 1971 review, Prewitt and Nie felt the Michigan Election Studies had succeeded: “Indeed, insofar as we have psychological as well as sociological propositions about political behavior, much of what we know must trace its antecedents to [these]... studies of voting participation” (494).

In his memos to the 1952 project team, Miller considered whether the study should be national or local, arguing eventually that the study would have a larger constituency if it were national. He wondered whether there should be a pre-election interview.<sup>7</sup> He wondered who should be interviewed in the post-election. While he wanted to build a comparison to 1948, his main goal was forward-looking. He imagined comparisons with similarly designed and collected data into the future.<sup>8</sup> The memos are remarkable. They show paths not taken, paths that, in hind sight, would have made the study fleeting. They also put Miller’s ambitions on display. As a graduate student, he imagined a study that would provide tools to revolutionize the study of politics long into the future.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The project memos are housed in the ANES archives at the University of Michigan. The Miller dissertation materials are housed in the Bentley Historical Library, Miller Collection, University of Michigan, Box Number 1, folder on education and doctoral thesis.

<sup>7</sup> These memos led to conversations among the members of the SSRC Committee on Political Behavior. The Committee on Political Behavior agreed that the major interview would have to come before the election; otherwise, “the objective of studying issues and perceptions of candidates would be jeopardized. The results of the election would alter the respondent’s perceptions and attitudes” (Notes from the Meeting of the SSRC Committee on Political Behavior, 1952 Project File, ANES Archives). The committee also hoped the study would have a substantial post-election interview, in order to tap campaign effects.

<sup>8</sup> Margin notes in the Miller memos, ANES Archives, the University of Michigan (see, especially, “Some Problems,” April 17, 1952). Angus Campbell’s proposal to the Rockefeller Foundation seeking support for the 1956 study describes the value of repeated measures for social science: “It is scarcely necessary to emphasize the importance of cumulative data to students of behavior. Social science has clearly suffered from the fact that so many of its research undertakings are episodic in character and do not have time depth” (Campbell, 1956, 4, 1956 Project File, ANES Archives). See also Sapiro’s interview with Converse in 1998: “It quickly became clear to the participants that part of the value of the study would derive from the repetition of questions over time” (Sapiro 1999, 10). Robert Lane said: “I can remember in 1954 arguing that this had to be an ongoing series (an interruption being like an interruption in heart-function (a little melodramatic, perhaps))” (Lane letter to Miller, October 13, 1976, 1977 Proposal File, ANES Archives, University of Michigan).

<sup>9</sup> Of course, he was also imagining a study that would require him to build new funding coalitions every two years for the next 25 years.

The early publications from these pieces vibrate. In their 1971 review of the first two decades of these studies, Kenneth Prewitt and Norman Nie concluded,

Most of our systematic, empirical understanding of voting and elections in the U.S. can be directly traced to studies by this group. Indeed, so many of their insights and findings have been absorbed into conventional wisdom that it is difficult to imagine the condition of our theories about American politics if we were to factor out their contribution. Few sectors of the discipline have failed to benefit from the several thousand pages of analysis and data Campbell and his associates have provided (Prewitt and Nie 1971: 479).

These studies made possible a move away from aggregate analysis and towards the study of individuals (Prewitt and Nie 1971:481; Rossi 1959).<sup>10</sup> An obvious legacy of this move is Political Science's overwhelming focus on the individual.

By 1971, Prewitt and Nie could point to tremendous advances in the understanding of politics due to the first twenty years of the study. They highlighted the Michigan Election Studies' contributions to understanding

- ❖ the relationship between class, religion, race, and age and turnout and vote choice, and the reasons for this relationship;
- ❖ the nature and consequences of citizens' views on issues, parties, and candidates;
- ❖ the notion that partisan identification could have a psychological component, apart from a citizens' record of behavior; that is, that partisan identification could be thought of in terms similar to religious affiliation;
- ❖ the formation and maintenance and change of partisan identification;
- ❖ the place of information and ideology in shaping opinions and choices;
- ❖ the place of "political efficacy, citizen duty, political interest and awareness, and concern over the election outcome" in voting (Prewitt and Nie 1971, 494);

---

<sup>10</sup> Of course, individual-level analysis went hand-in-hand with computational infrastructure. Miller recalls that they first used a computer for data analysis about 1958. Before that: "we had earlier gotten Les Kish interested, and he had his minions in the Sampling Section with hand calculators do an 11-variable multiple regression analysis by hand" (Warren Miller Interview with Lloyd Johnston, ANES Archives).

- ❖ the ways individual behavior added up to affect the party system (surge and decline, the normal vote, etc.).

In their 2004 review of the intellectual contributions of the Michigan (and, then, National) Election Studies, Converse and Kinder (2004) add to this list new tools for understanding

- ❖ candidate-centered voting,
- ❖ retrospective voting,
- ❖ third-party voting,
- ❖ campaigns as persuasive tools,
- ❖ the role of groups in shaping public opinion,
- ❖ the role of principles in public opinion,
- ❖ collective public opinion, and
- ❖ political mobilization.

The questions dreamed up and added to the study with each new installment enabled generations of scholars to build a science studying public opinion and action.<sup>11</sup> The first major study in the series contained open-ended questions on parties and candidates that, carried forward to the present, allow scholars to chart the language of politics in the vernacular. By the end of the 1950s, there were measures of partisan identification, efficacy, political interest, media attention, political mobilization, political information, trust in government, and electoral participation, measures that are the staples of any modern study of political action. In the 1960s, years before fleshed-out accounts of retrospective voting, the Michigan Election Studies incorporated measures of retrospective economic assessments that would prove so valuable in that work. In the 1960s, the team invented the “feeling thermometer” for the evaluation of groups and individuals.<sup>12</sup> In the early 1970s, the Michigan studies expanded their understandings of political principles, adding explicit measures of political ideology. They introduced new measures to understand the role of groups in political thinking – the measures of closeness to groups and the measure of support for women’s equality. They introduced seven-point scales allowing party and candidate issue placements. In the late ‘70s and early ‘80s, the then National Election Studies broadened its treatment of issues. They expanded their focus on Congress. They invented new approaches to the study of religion and politics. They added new ways to understand the role of principles in political thinking. The late 1980s saw the introduction of measures of racial resentment, the expansion of measures of media attention and political information, an increased focus on social issues in politics. More recently, the studies have expanded their tools to study political action, added a focus on foreign policy, provided new ways to study social trust and economic inequality. In addition, under the direction of Steven Rosenstone, NES founded a comparative data collection effort between election studies around the world, the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES). This

---

<sup>11</sup> For a helpful discussion of some of these changes, see Miller 1977.

<sup>12</sup> Miller 1977, p. 52.

comparative effort centered on a core module, designed by an international team, carried worldwide, enabling scholars to investigate the consequences of political institutions in a way never before possible.<sup>13</sup> All the while, scholars working on NES were building the longest time series on individual political thought and action in the world.

The systematic construction of the time series enabled scholars to understand political context in a way that would have been impossible otherwise. Comparable measures, comparable samples, comparable implementation, and comparable data preparation enabled scholars to be serious about the effects of context – that is, of politics. This comparability is crucial. It rules out alternative explanations and allows scholars to understand how politics – institutions, campaigns, and the like – matter in individual lives. It allows scholars to understand continuity and change in American history. As Chris Achen put it in his letter to Miller in 1976:

I am particularly concerned with comparability over time....[Without strict comparability,] Researchers often fall back on statistically dangerous procedures...Unfortunately, no matter what statistical manipulations are performed, precise comparisons are hopeless when the relationship of two different wordings or formats is unknown.<sup>14</sup>

Sidney Verba echoed this theme in his letter to Heinz Eulau the same year:

Those of us who have worked on these data from a longitudinal point of view know how valuable is the continuity in the studies – there is almost nothing comparable in the social sciences.<sup>15</sup>

The series, Austin Ranney argued, “is by far the best instrument we have for measuring attitudinal and therefore social change, and that instrument must not be allowed to disappear in favor of any root-and-branch changes in concerns, questions, or methodology in general.”<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> There were earlier efforts to forge international collaborations. These earlier efforts helped spread election studies around the world. In fact, the Prewitt and Nie piece was written as a guide to international scholars of the results of the Michigan Election Studies. By 1971 when the Prewitt and Nie piece was published, the Michigan team had been involved already in election studies in Great Britain, France, and Norway (Prewitt and Nie 1971: 480). International scholars (Stein Rokkan, Henry Valen, Jorgen Westerstahl, Georges Dupeux, and David Butler, for example) came to Ann Arbor to study the election studies with an eye to building similar studies in their own countries (Converse and Kinder 2004).

<sup>14</sup> Letter from Christopher Achen to Warren Miller, October 14, 1976, ANES Archives, 1977 Proposal File. See, too, the letter from Jack Citrin to Warren Miller, October 15, 1976, ANES Archives, 1977 Proposal File. See, too, Ray Wolfinger’s letter to Richard Fenno, October 25, 1976, ANES Archives, 1977 Proposal File, and Wolfinger’s letter to Warren Miller, September 24, 1976, ANES Archives, 1977 Proposal File.

<sup>15</sup> Letter from Sidney Verba to Heinz Eulau, October 19, 1976, ANES Archives, 1977 Proposal File.

<sup>16</sup> Letter from Austin Ranney to Warren Miller, September 14, 1976, ANES Archives, 1977 Proposal File.

From the early days, the study achieved comparability, in part, through serious micromanagement of the data collection process. As Miller put it:

In part, I always did that from the beginning because I thought sampling was the cat's meow. And so from the very beginning once we knew we were going to do something, I would work directly with Les [Kish] or Irene [Hess] on the sample design. I would always be involved in all of the pretesting. The notion [that]...some study directors simply turn over the questionnaire design to the field staff and say here are the objectives...well the notion that anything like that would be appropriate has simply never crossed our minds. I have always presumed that a decent study director is on top of every single phase of the enterprise and is engaged in and is the one who does the question construction, the one who actually does some interviewing in the pretest phase and who sits in on all the debriefings, who works directly with coding in setting up codes, and who lays out the specs for study documentation for ultimate analysis.

The into-the-details micromanagement and planning – along with the professional staffing necessary to carry this out – enabled a long-run program of electoral research.<sup>17</sup>

As soon as there was more than one year of data to analyze, scholars used the data to isolate the effects of political context. The release of the Cumulative File – a file that collected hundreds of variables across the studies into common variable names and coding – in the early 1980s made that work much easier.<sup>18</sup>

Early on, the Michigan team augmented the emerging time series with other data collections. They carried out panels covering important moments in American history:

- ❖ 1956-58-60, partisan redefinition;
- ❖ 1972-74-76, Watergate;
- ❖ 1990-91-92, the Gulf War; and

---

<sup>17</sup> As Miller pointed out in his 1977 proposal, “[S]ince the last study conducted by the Lazarsfeld group in Elmira, New York, in 1948, no other academic research group has maintained a program of electoral research. Indeed, only one non-Michigan national election study, a University of North Carolina study in 1968, has been completed since 1944” (1977, p. 9).

<sup>18</sup> Information on the creation of the cumulative file (Personal communications, Patricia Luevano, 4.10.06); the creation was on the original recommendation of then-graduate-student, Merrill Shanks (Personal communication, Steven Rosenstone, 4.06.06). Until 1970, only a handful of published works used more than one year of the data at a time. By the end of the 1980s, as many as 70 works a year used more than one year of the data. More recently, some one hundred pieces a year use more than one year of the data.

- ❖ 2000-2002-2004, the 2000 election,<sup>19</sup> the terrorist attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup>, the war in Afghanistan, and the war in Iraq.

In 1958, the Michigan Election Studies carried out what has come to be seen as the standard for studies of legislative representation.<sup>20</sup> The Michigan studies included Black over-samples as early as 1964. In 1978, the first National Election Study used the Congressional District as a “stage in the sampling process.”<sup>21</sup> In the early 1980s, NES carried out a rolling cross-section. In the early 1990s, NES developed state-representative samples in the Senate Election Study. Regular pilot studies were the sites for the development and testing of new instrumentation.

From the first serious study in 1952, the Michigan Election Studies provided a site for theoretical perspectives to meet. In the earliest days, Campbell and Miller carried out these conversations with the SSRC Committee on Political Behavior, chaired by V.O. Key.<sup>22</sup> When Miller was in Berkeley in the mid-1950s, his letters home offered a running commentary on his conversations about the study with scholars in the Bay Area.<sup>23</sup> In 1954 and 1958, Michigan hosted scholars from other universities – including Heinz Eulau, Robert Lane, and Lester Milbrath – giving them access to data and computational power and creating a workshop around the studies.<sup>24</sup> In a departure from standard practice at the time, the Michigan scholars shared their data with other scholars from the beginning.<sup>25</sup> V.O. Key wrote his classic work on public opinion while in residence with the Michigan team (Key 1964). The Center for Political Studies funded outreach efforts in 1971, organizing planning sessions and carrying out a survey of social scientists to solicit ideas for the 1972 study.<sup>26</sup> Very early on, the conversation was national, a remarkable achievement for a private study. That conversation

---

<sup>19</sup> The U of M News Service’s Press Release of May 8, 1960 reported: “As one person told an SRC interviewer: ‘I don’t know much about either candidate; just so long as one of them wins it will be all right.’” The 2000 election tested that wisdom.

<sup>20</sup> See the discussion in Converse and Kinder 2004.

<sup>21</sup> Warren Miller interview with Lloyd Johnston., Oral History of ISR.

<sup>22</sup> See the discussion of this conversation in the 1952 Proposal, ANES Archives, 1952 Proposal File. See, too, the minutes from a meeting of the SSRC Committee on Political Behavior, on the subject of the 1952 study, 1952 Proposal File, ANES Archives.

<sup>23</sup> Miller project documents, ANES Archives, University of Michigan. His letters talk about his conversations with scholars in a range of social science departments in the Bay Area, and they comment on conversations with scholars visiting the Bay Area. Letter after letter describes the hours Miller spent in Herbert McClosky’s office, trying to extract scales.

<sup>24</sup> Converse Interview with Erik Austin, ISR 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Oral Histories. Miller, 1977, Proposal for Long-term Support, p. 55. Converse and Kinder 2004.

<sup>25</sup> The sharing of data was an explicit goal of the researchers, made clear as early as the proposal for the 1952 study: “It is hoped that the information gathered in this study would provide empirical data for analysis and publication for all of the participants who might wish to exploit this source. It is hoped that once the data were punched on IBM cards they could be made available to any interested and qualified scholar” (Proposal for the 1952 study, ANES Archives, p. 6).

<sup>26</sup> Miller 1977, p. 76.



**Table 1**  
**Funding the Studies**

---

**Michigan Election Studies (1948-1976)**

1948	University of Michigan Survey Research Center and the Social Science Research Council
1952	Carnegie Corporation Grant to the Political Behavior Committee of the Social Science Research Council to Michigan
1956	The Rockefeller Foundation and IBM Corporation
1958	The Rockefeller Foundation and SSRC
1960	The Rockefeller Foundation
1962	University of Michigan Survey Research Center
1964	The Carnegie Corporation
1966	National Science Foundation (grant to Walter Murphy at Princeton and Joseph Tanenhaus at the University of Iowa)
1968	The Ford Foundation
1970	The National Science Foundation
1972	The National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Mental Health, the Center for Political Studies, plus a coalition of buy-ins
1974	The Carnegie Corporation, the John and Mary Markle Foundation, The National Science Foundation, and the Social Science Research Council
1976	The National Science Foundation

**National Election Studies (1977-2005)**

1977-1998	NSF National Resource, the National Science Foundation
2000	The National Science Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, the University of Michigan (Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research, Office of the Provost, Political Science Department, and Survey Research Center)
2002	The Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), the Russell Sage Foundation, the University of Michigan (Institute for Social Research, Office of the Provost, Office of the Vice President for Research, Department of Political Science)
2004	The Carnegie Corporation of New York, the National Science Foundation, the University of Michigan (Center for Political Studies, Office of the Provost, Political Science Department, Survey Research Center)

**American National Election Studies (2005-Present)**

Present	The National Science Foundation, the University of Michigan (Center for Political Studies, Office of the Provost, and Department of Political Science), and Stanford University (IRIS)
---------	--

Sources: Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes, 1960. Miller, 1977, p. 67.

expanded dramatically with the proposed transformation of the Michigan Election Studies into the National Election Studies.<sup>27</sup>

Every two years, the Michigan team constructed the funding coalition for the study anew, largely drawing on private foundations (**Table 1**). But, by the 1970s, these private foundations were growing reluctant to fund a series that was clearly becoming part of the nation's social scientific infrastructure.

On advice from the National Science Board, NSF, under the direction of David Leege,<sup>28</sup> temporarily solved this problem by making the studies a national resource and declaring the Michigan Election Studies to be the National Election Studies.<sup>29</sup> With this transformation, NSF aimed to put the studies on more secure funding, with more ability to engage in long-term planning and more ability to incorporate a national team of scholars in the development and planning of the studies. The proposal for this transformation was crafted by Miller, in collaboration with a national team of researchers, chaired by Heinz Eulau at Stanford (**Table 2**).

**Table 2**  
**The First National Election Studies Advisory Board**

---

Heinz Eulau, Chair, Stanford  
Kristi Andersen, Ohio State  
James Davis, Dartmouth  
Richard F. Fenno, Jr., Rochester  
Benjamin I. Page, Chicago  
David O. Sears, UCLA  
J. Merrill Shanks, Berkeley  
John Sprague, Washington University  
Edward R. Tufte, Princeton

In the process, they engineered two additions to the budget of the Political Science Program at the National Science Foundation: the first was an increase in the Political Science budget to cover the costs of the National Election Studies, and the second was a near-doubling of the Political Science base budget. As Leege put it, “[I]n effect, NES was in for 33% of the money, and the rest of the

---

<sup>27</sup> The effort around the 1977 proposal to establish NES as a national resource clearly marked a step up in the level of the collective conversation. As Morris Fiorina wrote in his letter to Miller and members of the Advisory Committee: “The four of you accounted for the bulk of my first class mail this past month, and while I am grateful to you for keeping my mailbox full, I fear that if I try to respond to each letter singly, I will not get beyond the first one or two” (Fiorina letter, October 19, 1976, 1977 Proposal Project File, ANES Archives). The extensive underlining and margin comments on the letters to the NES Advisory Committee make clear how much these letters contributed to the study.

<sup>28</sup> Miller letter, September 7, 1976, ANES project file on the 1977 proposal for long-term support. Miller, 1977, p. 2. See, too, Miller's comments in his interview with Lloyd Johnston, ANES Archives.

<sup>29</sup> The National Science Board recommendations built on earlier recommendations from the National Academy of Sciences and the Social Science Research Council.

discipline got a 100% increase in [non-NES] funding largely because of the National Election Studies coming to the program.”<sup>30</sup>

The resulting National Election Studies drew on the expertise of a national team of scholars – the NES Board of Overseers. The Board and the Principal Investigators met regularly, argued vigorously, and engaged in the immensely rewarding work of nurturing a national resource.

Miller built studies with scientific value that increases over time, studies that continually draw new scholars anxious and honored to do the work necessary to sustain and enhance the studies, in good funding environments and bad (**Tables 3 and 4**). That the studies are public goods, that they are carried out with professional staffing and micromanagement necessary to enable serious comparison, that some 10,000 people a year download these data, that more than 5,000 published works use ANES data, and, of course, that these data exist at all, is a tremendous testament to Warren Miller – to his intellectual vision, to his organizational genius.<sup>31</sup> Over their history, the studies have provided the tools to create and sustain the systematic study of elections, public opinion, and political action. In their attention to comparable samples, comparable questions, comparable, micro-managed survey administration, and professional data preparation and dissemination, the studies have allowed social scientists to understand the impact of politics on individuals.

**Table 3**  
**Chairs of the Board of Overseers**

---

1977-1982	Heinz Eulau
1983-1986	Raymond Wolfinger
1987-1990	Morris Fiorina
1990-1993	Thomas Mann
1994-1997	David Leege
1998-2000	Larry Bartels
2001-2002	Laura Stoker
2003-present	John Mark Hansen

---

<sup>30</sup> Leege interview with Sapiro. Sapiro, 1999, p. 19.

<sup>31</sup> Of course, Miller’s intellectual vision and organizational genius are also clear in the two other major social science institutions he imagined, constructed, and sustained: the International Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) and the Center for Political Studies.

**Table 4**  
**Principal Investigators**

---

**Michigan Election Studies (1948-1976)**

1948	Angus Campbell and Robert Kahn
1952	Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, and Warren Miller
1956	Angus Campbell, Philip Converse, Warren Miller, and Donald Stokes
1958	Angus Campbell, Philip Converse, Warren Miller, and Donald Stokes
1960	Angus Campbell, Philip Converse, Warren Miller, and Donald Stokes
1962	Warren Miller
1964	Warren Miller
1966	Warren Miller (in coalition with Walter Murphy at Princeton and Joseph Tanenhaus at Iowa)
1968	Warren Miller
1970	Warren Miller
1972	Warren Miller and Arthur Miller
1974	Warren Miller, Arthur Miller, and F. Gerald Kline
1976	Warren Miller and Arthur Miller

**National Election Studies (1977-2005)**

1978	Warren Miller
1980	Warren Miller
1982	Warren Miller
1984	Warren Miller
1986	Warren Miller
1988	Warren Miller
1990	Donald Kinder and Steven Rosenstone
1992	Donald Kinder and Steven Rosenstone
1994	Steven Rosenstone
1996	Steven Rosenstone
1998	Virginia Sapiro
2000	Nancy Burns and Donald Kinder
2002	Nancy Burns and Donald Kinder
2004	Nancy Burns and Donald Kinder

**American National Election Studies (2005-present)**

Present	Jon Krosnick and Arthur Lupia
---------	-------------------------------

## References

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Campbell, Angus, and Robert L. Kahn. 1952. *The People Elect a President*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Converse, Jean M. 1987. *Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence 1890-1960*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Converse, Philip E., and Donald R. Kinder. 2004. "Voting and Electoral Behavior." In James S. House, F. Thomas Juster, Robert L. Kahn, Howard Schuman, and Eleanor Singer, eds. *A Telescope on Society: Survey Research and Social Science at the University of Michigan and Beyond*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press. Chapter 3.
- Key, V.O. 1964. *Public Opinion and American Democracy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard R. Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet. 1944. *The People's Choice*. New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce.
- Miller, Warren E. 1977. *Long-Term Support for the American National Election Studies*. Proposal to the National Science Foundation. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Mosteller, Frederick, Herbert Hyman, Philip J. McCarthy, Eli S. Marks, and David B. Truman. 1949. *The Pre-Election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts*. New York: The Social Science Research Council.
- Prewitt, Kenneth, and Norman Nie. 1971. "Election Studies of the Survey Research Center." *British Journal of Political Science* 1(4, October):479-502.
- Rossi, Peter H. 1959. "Four Landmarks in Voting Research." In Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck, eds. *American Voting Behavior*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press. Pp. 5-54.
- Sapiro, Virginia. 1999. "Fifty Years of the National Election Studies: A Case Study in the History of 'Big Social Science'." Paper prepared for delivery at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia. Corrected version, October, 1999.