

**Article: “Untangled Web: Internet Use during the 1998 Election”**  
**Author: David A. Dulio; Donald L. Goff; James A. Thurber**  
**Issue: Mar. 1999**  
**Journal: *PS: Political Science & Politics***



***This journal is published by the American Political Science Association. All rights reserved.***

---

APSA is posting this article for public view on its website. APSA journals are fully accessible to APSA members and institutional subscribers. To view the table of contents or abstracts from this or any of APSA's journals, please go to the website of our publisher Cambridge University Press (<http://journals.cambridge.org>).

This article may only be used for personal, non-commercial, or limited classroom use. For permissions for all other uses of this article should be directed to Cambridge University Press at [permissions@cup.org](mailto:permissions@cup.org).

# Untangled Web: Internet Use during the 1998 Election\*

David A. Dulio, American University<sup>1</sup>

Donald L. Goff, American University

James A. Thurber, American University

During the 1996 election cycle, candidates for public office began to use the Internet as a campaign tool (Browning 1996; Casey 1996; Rash 1997). As Internet use grew among the general population, it was reasonable to expect that the 1998 election cycle would see increased use of this new medium by political candidates, and new methods and techniques developed to exploit its capabilities.

In increasing numbers, House and Senate candidates campaigned along the information superhighway in 1998. While very few candidates had web sites in previous elections (Browning 1996), by October 1998 more than two-thirds of the candidates for U.S. Senate and for U.S. House open seats had established

web sites. In the past, candidate web sites were little more than digital yard signs (Casey 1996). In 1998, candidates made use of their sites to solicit small-dollar contributions however better, particularly by using them.

Like it or not, the Internet is now a campaign tool that many campaigns employ. Therefore, we believe the manner in which it is used needs to be investigated. In this article we pay particular attention to candidates' solicitation of campaign contributions over the Internet. Our analysis is mostly descriptive as we try to summarize the Internet activity of candidates in a sample of Senate and House races during 1998.

We entered the analysis with some expectations. With the costs of campaigns continuing to climb, we anticipated that campaigns would increasingly use the Internet to solicit and process contributions. We also expected to see campaigns borrowing the best practices from the commercial sector in order to obtain the greatest return from their investment in a web site and the hardware and software associated with it.

Between October 5 and October 16, 1998, we conducted an interactive content analysis of the web sites employed by all the candidates for the U.S. Senate (N=68) and for open seats for the U.S. House of Representatives (N=65).<sup>2</sup> Our analysis was designed to evaluate the ways candidates used their web sites to solicit contributions, and to judge the accessibility of those sites. To find the sites, we used the Alta Vista search engine ([www.altavista.com](http://www.altavista.com)) and the convention of the last name of the candidate plus the word "senate" or "house," depending upon the office sought.<sup>3</sup> If that method failed, we searched via party links. We used a list of 24 questions to

evaluate sites with respect to the presence or absence of solicitations for contributions, disclaimers, and whether filters were present to assure that online contributions were secure, valid, and verified.<sup>4</sup> Finally, we evaluated the political nature of the sites to determine sophistication in the use of the medium. Screening for contributions from foreign nationals was taken as evidence of a high level of sophistication.

Overall, more than two-thirds of the 1998 congressional candidates in our sample, 92 of 133, had operating web sites (see Table 1). For the Senate, 75%, or 51 candidates, had web sites. This constituted a dramatic increase from the June figure of 29% (44 of 153 candidates<sup>5</sup>) reported by Kamarck (1998). For House open seats, it was 64%, or 41 of 65 candidates.

Web sites for specific campaigns were hard to find. While the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC) provided a link to each of their candidates' home pages ([www.dssc.org](http://www.dssc.org)), the National Republican Senatorial Committee (NRSC) limited itself to descriptions of incumbents ([www.nrsc.org](http://www.nrsc.org)). On the House side, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC) provided links to only 51 candidate sites ([www.dccc.org](http://www.dccc.org)), while the National Republican Congressional Committee (NRCC) linked to 155 ([www.nrcc.org](http://www.nrcc.org)), significantly less than the total number of candidates each party fielded. Groups not officially affiliated with either party, but using the party name, such as GOPNet ([www.gopnet.org](http://www.gopnet.org)), provided more links than the parties themselves. Generally, state party organizations were the most useful for finding candidates from either party in a given state, though the state party sites are by no means

---

**David A. Dulio** is a doctoral candidate in the department of government at American University. He is a senior research assistant with the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies and on the "Improving Campaign Conduct" project. His research interests include campaigns and elections and Congress and the presidency.

**Donald L. Goff** is a research associate with the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies at American University. A former lobbyist and PAC director, Capitol Hill staffer, and campaigner, he holds a Ph.D. in telecommunications from Northwestern University. He has over 25 years experience in the political process. He teaches information technology and politics.

**James A. Thurber** is professor of government and director, Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies, at American University. He also directs The Pew Charitable Trusts study on "Improving Campaign Conduct." He is author of several books and articles on Congress and the presidency including *Rivals for Power*, and *Remaking Congress*. He is also coeditor of *Campaigns and Elections* American Style.

**TABLE 1**  
**Frequency Distribution of**  
**1998 Candidate Web Sites**

	N	Percent
Candidate Web Site Present	92	69.2
No Candidate Web Site Present	41	30.8
Total	133*	100

\*68 Senate candidates; 65 House candidates.

uniform in the information they contain or the information they convey (see, e.g., [www.va-democrats.com](http://www.va-democrats.com); [www.gagop.org](http://www.gagop.org)). The Republican National Committee (RNC) did not link at all ([www.rnc.org](http://www.rnc.org)), but the Democrat National Committee (DNC) opened a links page in August 1998 to most of their candidates and to their state central committees ([www.democrats.org](http://www.democrats.org)). In sum, we concluded that the national party committees were not the best way for a constituent to find the candidates in his or her district or state. Aldrich (1995) describes an evolution of the parties toward a "party in service," away from the components of Key's (1964) tripartite model, but providing links to candidate sites is apparently not yet part of this service agreement.

Often, the search engine did not return a candidate's campaign web site among the top search results. References to the candidate in the news media, official House or Senate sites, and public interest group symposia generally elicited more hits, and appeared to the search engine to have a higher probability of matching our selection criteria. The few conventions we found for domain names (see note 3) were inconsistently applied. Our interpretation is that domain names are dependent upon availability and the image the campaign consultant wanted to convey.

As an aside, we also looked for counters on the web site, which would indicate how many hits the sites were receiving. Most sites had removed their counters, not installed

them, or hidden them. The few remaining counters indicated Senators were receiving hits in the range from three to six thousand. House sites received substantially fewer hits. One campaign manager lamented that his candidate's site had been accessed only 26 times—13 of them by the candidate looking to see how many hits there were.<sup>6</sup> While this is nothing more than anecdotal data, from which we do not pretend to draw any conclusions, it provides further evidence that the Internet has not yet become a major medium for campaigning.

The parties varied little in candidates' overall use of the Internet. Just over 71% of Democrats were on the web compared to 68.2% of Republicans. This finding runs contrary to the conventional wisdom that Republicans are better organized and more technological than Democrats. Incumbents were most frequent users, with 75.9% having sites; challengers established sites 69% of the time. In open seat races, candidates established web sites 67% of the time.

Following election day, we coded candidates with web sites as winners or losers and added these data to our analysis. We discovered little difference in Internet campaigning between winners and losers. While we found no evidence the Internet is currently a medium that can help determine the outcome of an election, we did find that candidates' web sites may have an effect on other campaign activities, such as fundraising, management, and internal communication.

Upon visiting a site, we conducted a content analysis to determine whether the candidate's campaign used the site to solicit campaign contributions. Nearly 73% of candi-

dates with web sites solicited contributions from visitors in some way.

An interview with the staff of Robert Torricelli (D-NJ) provided insights into the issues we included in our content analysis. Of the 1996 candidates for national office whom we could identify as having operated a campaign web site, only Torricelli employed a secure online connection to allow for credit card contributions. Results were meager, especially in light of the expenses incurred in encoding and processing the contributions.<sup>7</sup>

Campaigns solicited contributions from web site visitors online in four ways: (1) inviting the contributor to send in a contribution by mail;

(2) inviting the donor to download, print, and complete a form, and send in a contribution by mail; (3) asking the donor to pledge to contribute; and (4) encouraging the donor to contribute online.<sup>8</sup> Table 2 reports the use of these four techniques in the 1998 elections. Each technique has its particular strengths and weaknesses.

The first, and simplest, method merely asks the donor/constituent to mail a check into the candidate's headquarters and provides a surface or "snail" mail address for the

campaign. The disadvantage to this system is that donors may not provide information required for Federal Election Commission (FEC) reporting, particularly employer and occupation information, which is commonly omitted from reports. An additional disadvantage is that the campaign does not debit the money to its account until the check is received, posted, and cleared by drawing from the bank, a process that continues for weeks after the donor visited the site. Despite these procedural difficulties, slightly more than

**While we found no evidence the Internet is currently a medium that can help determine the outcome of an election, we did find that candidates' web sites may have an effect on other campaign activities, such as fundraising, management, and internal communication.**

**TABLE 2**  
**Types of Web Site Solicitation Techniques**

	N	Percent
1. Web site requests donor to mail in a contribution. E.g., "Support Smith for Congress by mailing a donation to . . . ."	36	53.7
2. Solicitation requests the donor to print and send, fax, or email contributor information to the campaign as a pledge. E.g., "Become a member of the Thomas for Congress campaign by donating ___ \$5 ___ \$10 ___ \$25 ___ \$50"	32	47.8
3. Campaign requires donor to first contact the campaign, which then sends a solicitation by regular mail. E.g., "Join Senator Jones's reelection campaign by making a campaign contribution. Send your name, address and phone number and we will send you a pledge form."	22	32.8
4. Online solicitation. E.g., "Help Bob Williams become a U.S. Senator by making a contribution on our secure Internet site. Click here."	21	29.9

half of the candidates who solicited contributions, 54%, used this method.

The second method asks the donor to download and print a form to be filled out in long hand and mailed to the headquarters with a check. This format helps solve the missing information problem by having donors supply all the required information on an easily completed and processed form. But the delay in processing and debiting the contribution remains. In one variation, a donor can write in his or her name, address, credit card number and its expiration date, and other information, which the campaign then processes when received (either by surface mail, fax, or email). In this variant, the time from receipt to debit is dramatically reduced, since the campaign can debit the credit card transaction the day of receipt and does not have to wait for a check to clear. A third of the campaigns, 32.8%, used this technique.

The third method of collecting online contributions amounts to taking pledges. In this version, donors fill out an online screen with the necessary name, address, and phone and email information, and the amount pledged. The pledge is then

only fulfilled by mailing a check or a credit card number and signature to the campaign. This method allows campaigns to capture a commitment and to at least anticipate cash flow for the coming weeks based upon the commitment. As with all pledge drives, however, a substantial question remains regarding whether pledges taken via the web will ever be collected in great volume. The method allows campaigns to collect important information, however, including the email address of the donor. Nearly half of the campaigns soliciting contributions, 47.8%, used this method.

The fourth method takes advantage of secure transaction technology, known as a secure socket layer (SSL), to collect online contributions using a credit card. An SSL is generally indicated by the letter "s" inserted in the familiar hypertext prefix to a web address, or universal resource locator (URL) (e.g., https://). A "pop-up," or secondary,

window usually appears in the browser indicating a secure transaction is about to take place and reappears following the transaction when the donor returns to an unsecure connection. Using this device usually relieves donors' anxiety about posting credit card information on the Internet. The donor enters all the information requested by the donation form and sends it by clicking on a reply button. Often there is a screen on which donors are asked to verify the information they provided. Even though this is, in our opinion, by far the best option, only 30% of the campaigns seeking online contributions used this technique. Nearly 62% of the web sites that permitted online contributions employed a secure connection. However, this summary statistic should not cloud the fact that, of the 133 candidates' web sites investigated, this only amounts to 13. Therefore, we can conclude that this technology, widely used by other e-commerce solicitors, is underused by campaigns.

**As with all pledge drives, a substantial question remains regarding whether pledges taken via the web will ever be collected in great volume.**

The programs campaigns did use to collect secure online contributions were exclusively commercial off the shelf products (COTS), developed for familiar forms of electronic commerce, such as retail book sales. For the most part, campaigns did not

customize these programs. Consequently, the net effect of using these COTS solutions ranges, in our judgment, from, at best, potentially useful to, at worst, potentially illegal.

Use of commercial applications for handling online contributions may facilitate illegal corporate giving because they do not automatically discriminate with regard to the type of credit card used. That is, the software does not screen for whether the card used is corporate or personal. In the commercial world, the issue of using corporate funds to make a purchase remains an issue between the user of the credit card

**TABLE 3A**  
**Party Differences in Information Gathering on Campaign Web Sites that Solicit Contributions: Occupation**

		Democrats	Republicans
Does the web site require compilation of, or provide a disclaimer regarding, FEC-required information about occupation?	Yes	60% (21)	79.3% (23)
	No	40% (14)	20.7% (6)
	Total	100% (35)	100% (29)

Pearson  $\chi^2 = 2.752$   
d.f. = 1  
p = 0.097  
Fisher's Exact Test p = .112 (2-tail)

**TABLE 3B**  
**Party Differences in Information Gathering on Campaign Web Sites that Solicit Contributions: Employer**

		Democrats	Republicans
Does the website require compilation of, or provide a disclaimer regarding, FEC-required information about employer?	Yes	57.1% (20)	78.6% (23)
	No	42.9% (15)	21.4% (6)
	Total	100% (35)	100% (29)

Pearson  $\chi^2 = 3.214$   
d.f. = 1  
p = 0.073  
Fisher's Exact Test p = .106 (2-tail)

and the corporation which issued the card or authorized its use. In politics, the use of a corporate credit card is illegal if corporate funds are used to pay the debt. That is, corporate contributions are illegal; using a corporate credit card gives an appearance that the donation is an illegal contribution. Campaigns must therefore bear a burden to show, if challenged, that the contribution is in fact legal. Even if it provides disclaimers about the illegality of corporate contributions, the campaign runs a risk of having donors confuse the issue. The smart campaign, consequently, will ask the donor to make an affirmative statement that the card is personal and not corporate.

Even those campaigns that do not solicit online contributions have to worry about illegal corporate contributions. For example, those that ask

the donor to simply send in a pledge with a signature and a credit card number (category 3 in Table 2) also must be sure that they do not accept corporate credit card donations if they want to stay within the law. Therefore, we investigated whether or not campaign web sites screened for corporate information in any way at all. This would include screening for corporate credit cards and requiring information about the contributor's occupation and employer to be submitted with any online contribution,<sup>9</sup> for this information to be present on a pledge form that was to be sent (or faxed or emailed), or providing a disclaimer about illegal corporate contributions on the contribution page.

We found, in the aggregate, that only two-thirds of all web sites that solicited contributions required, or even provided a disclaimer regard-

ing, information about the donor's employer (68.8%) or occupation (66.7%). There were no differences across candidate type (incumbent, challenger, or open seat) or type of race (House or Senate). However, Republicans were slightly more likely to ask for information on occupation or employer than Democratic candidates (see Tables 3A and 3B).

A wise campaign will validate credit card numbers before processing them. Given that most credit card processing requires the payment of a batch processing fee, filing false credit card information that has been posted to a campaign web site could potentially impose a large cost to the campaign. But, by using the validation methods that already exist, much like those at the gas pump, the campaign can virtually eliminate this potential nuisance. Yet only three campaigns bothered to validate and verify credit card information submitted online.<sup>10</sup>

Controlling for party, type of race (House or Senate), and type of candidate (incumbent, challenger, or open seat) provided interesting results. Similar to the finding reported above that indicated little difference between Republicans and Democrats in their proclivity to have a web site, we found little difference between the number of Democrats and Republicans that solicited campaign contributions on their web sites—78.7% of Democrats and 66.7% of Republicans. This again contradicts the conventional wisdom that Republicans have more money in campaigns, appeal to the higher socioeconomic status voters (i.e., those who use the web), and are more organized and technological than Democrats. However, the difference cannot be distinguished from zero, so we cannot draw any conclusions. More Senate candidates (78.4% of them) had web sites that solicited contributions than did House candidates (65.9%). Slight differences ( $\chi^2 = 4.52$ , d.f. = 2, p = .104) appear between types of candidates who solicit contributions online; 86.4% of incumbents, 80% of challengers, but only 64% of open seat candidates who had a web site

solicited contributions through their pages.

There is no sure way to systematically determine the success or failure of the solicitation of campaign contributions online. Given the relatively few numbers of acknowledged hits on web sites and the general difficulty in finding them, there were probably few funds raised this year. Comments in the popular press about the race for California's U.S. Senate seat indicated that Barbara Boxer (D), the successful incumbent candidate, raised about \$25,000 online and her opponent, Matt Fong (R), raised about \$30,000 (Komarow 1998). If accurate, these figures represent a very small percentage—less than 1%—of total spending in the race.

The election of 1998 was the first time a high percentage of campaigns developed web sites, and the first time a number of important campaigns began to experiment with soliciting online contributions. The campaigns in our sample had little experience with the medium. They adopted existing technologies and applications with little or no adaptation to the political environment. Instead, they used the new medium of the Internet to fight the same ground war they have in the past. If the results were not all they hoped, it will be no surprise if they write the medium off as somehow ineffectual. Campaigns must experiment and learn, and then, in the next iteration, use the medium more fully if they are going to reap all of the benefits this technology potentially affords them. As one example, campaigns can use key words to identify themselves more readily to search engines, thus increasing traffic to their site.

Campaigns can also begin to generate email lists of potential supporters whom they might solicit for support or contributions. When they do, they will be able to reduce the cost of their mailings and solicitations dramatically (Bonchek 1996). For example, a first-class solicitation that can cost \$3.50 to mail can be sent for only pennies in an email; and information packs sent to PACs, currently costing up to \$7.00 apiece—and frequently discarded without being read by PAC adminis-

## Appendix

### Evaluation criteria used at each site

- |                                                                                                                                                        |     |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| 1. Is there a campaign web site?                                                                                                                       | yes | no |
| 2. If so, does it solicit campaign contributions?                                                                                                      | yes | no |
| 3. If so, does it request the donor to contact the campaign (either by mail or email) in order to send the donor more information about contributions? | yes | no |
| 4. Does it request the contributor mail in a contribution?                                                                                             | yes | no |
| 5. Does it request the donor to print a form from the web site and then mail in a contribution?                                                        | yes | no |
| 6. Does it permit online contributions?                                                                                                                | yes | no |
| 7. Does it provide for a secure connection to protect the contributor (i.e. https://)?                                                                 | yes | no |
| 8. Does it screen for corporate credit cards?                                                                                                          | yes | no |
| 9. Does it screen for foreign contributors?                                                                                                            | yes | no |
| 10. Does it require FEC reporting information regarding employer (either on screen or in the form the donor has to fill out)?                          | yes | no |
| 11. Does it require FEC reporting information regarding occupation (either on screen or in the form the donor has to fill out)?                        | yes | no |
| 12. Does it link to the national party site?                                                                                                           | yes | no |
| 13. Does the national party site link to the candidate site?                                                                                           | yes | no |
| 14. Does it link to the state party site sites or vice versa?                                                                                          | yes | no |
| 15. Does the state party site link to the candidate site?                                                                                              | yes | no |
| 16. Does it link to other candidates sites?                                                                                                            | yes | no |
| 17. Does it link to special interest sites or vice versa?                                                                                              | yes | no |
| 18. Do special interest sites link to specific candidate sites?                                                                                        | yes | no |
| 19. Is there a disclaimer regarding the deductibility of the contribution present?                                                                     | yes | no |
| 20. Is there a disclaimer regarding illegal corporate contributions on the screen?                                                                     | yes | no |
| 21. Is there a disclaimer about foreign contributions on the screen?                                                                                   | yes | no |
| 22. Does it bounce back invalid or incomplete information?                                                                                             | yes | no |
| 23. Does it validate credit card numbers?                                                                                                              | yes | no |
| 24. Is there a minimum contribution?                                                                                                                   | yes | no |

trators—can be digitally scanned and also sent for a few cents via email.

Additionally, candidates and field staff on the road may communicate with headquarters and retrieve docu-

ments anywhere there is a laptop and dial up connection. For example, campaigns can solicit potential supporters at, say, the county fair by logging them into the database and processing a credit card all at once, without delay, additional handling, or missing data. Safeguards built into the software can also help prevent potential political gaffes, like failing to report required FEC information, by highly motivated but poorly trained volunteers.

Finally, search engines can now sort, and in a few cases, merge email with physical addresses. The availability of this technology from the search engine companies makes it far more likely that a campaign will be able to identify, with considerable accuracy, a potential district voter, contact that voter, and tailor a message precisely to the identified interest of that voter.<sup>11</sup>

The problem is not the medium. The problem lies with those who know how to manage campaigns using such traditional methods as tele-

vision advertising, direct mail, and telemessaging but do not yet know how to fully utilize the power of the Internet to reduce costs, identify key supporters regardless of geography, and entice them into visiting a campaign web site. Campaign managers do not, generally, drive traffic to their candidates' sites. Neither do they use the flexibility and mobility that the Internet offers to support the campaign process. They have benchmarked the web against their traditional campaign practices and, in so doing, often found it lacking. Many have criticized the web as "too passive" (Casey 1996).

The Internet offers new ways to manage and improve campaigns. Many of these innovations help make the process more accurate, legal, and democratic. For example, the World Wide Web effectively removes the constraint of distance. Yet campaigns still think largely in terms of geography; in terms of one of Fenno's (1978) four constituencies of intimate, primary, reelection,

or geographic. The Internet may add a new category, "virtual political communities," to these time-tested definitions of constituency. For example, the links many southern Republican party and candidate sites provide to groups like the Christian Coalition (e.g., Republican Party of Virginia, [www.rpv.org/links.htm](http://www.rpv.org/links.htm)), illustrates that there is an Internet network that links interest groups and campaigns in virtual communities that might make a difference in some future races (Rash 1997; Browning 1996).

In 1998, congressional candidates generally underutilized the full potential of the medium of the Internet. A relatively few campaigns began to experiment with new applications, including inviting online solicitations and interactive communication among campaign volunteers and voters, but there is no evidence in our study that its use provided a winning margin in any congressional race.

## Notes

\* Funding for this research was provided, in part, by a grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts to American University's Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies and Campaign Management Institute in a grant focused on "Improving Campaign Conduct."

1. Names of authors appear in alphabetical order.

2. Candidates for Senate and open House seats were chosen for the competitive nature of the races. We felt that these races would permit us to investigate candidates that were of similar quality, had similar budgets, and were competitive. While this obviously does not hold true for all races or candidates, we feel this strategy is better than the alternatives. We feel this provides for a more objective measure of competitiveness than any "list of competitive races" (such as those found in the Cook Report or the Rothenberg Report).

3. When neither of these techniques produced any results, we tried a few common frames that were part of other site names, such as [smithforcongress.org](http://smithforcongress.org), [jones4senate.com](http://jones4senate.com), or [thomas98.org](http://thomas98.org). We stopped looking for campaign sites after the first 50 sites identified by the search engine on the assumption that if we could not find the site after this amount of searching, a con-

stituent would not look any further either.

4. The evaluation criteria were limited to objective measures in order to limit any bias that could have influenced a subjective analysis. Most of the survey items could be answered yes or no: Does the candidate have a web site? Does the web site solicit campaign contributions? See the Appendix for a complete list of questions.

5. Kamarck's study, conducted in June 1998, included all primary candidates.

6. Interview with Chris Esposito, campaign manager, Dennis Moore for Congress Campaign, October 9, 1998, Kansas City, KS.

7. Successfully managing the transaction fees associated with credit card use will be a major problem for campaigns for two reasons. First, banks negotiate the rate for the credit card debtor based upon experience. Since campaigns usually lack experience, they pay at the highest rates. Second, fees for batch processing are assessed regardless of the amount of the contribution. A daily batch processing fee of \$50 may therefore be more than a single contribution processed that day. Interview with James P. Fox, chief of staff for Senator Robert Torricelli, May 19, 1998.

8. These categories are not mutually exclusive; many sites incorporated two or more of

the methods described. However, we found no additional variants and believe the four methods are an exhaustive list.

9. To complete the analysis, we entered spurious information that matched the entry format. For example, when prompted to provide a credit card number, name, address, phone number, occupation, or employer, we entered "John Doe" data. We could then determine whether the site would accept this invalid information and process it, or whether it would attempt to verify and reject it.

10. By illustrating these points we do not intend to provide or endorse online tricks that campaigns might use to undermine or derail, legally or financially, each others' campaigns.

11. Privacy is an important issue imbedded in the use of this technology. Many Internet service providers and content providers are trying to sort out privacy issues with respect to the use of their existing data bases. Currently, senders must determine whether potential recipients are willing to accept such messages prior to their being sent. "Spamming," the practice of sending mass emails on an unsolicited basis, is regarded both as a major breach of Internet etiquette and as likely to be counterproductive to the sender.

## References

Aldrich, John A. 1995. *Why Parties?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
Bonchek, Mark S. 1996. "Grassroots in

Cyberspace." Harvard University Political Participation Project. Manuscript.  
Browning, Grahame. 1996. *Electronic De-*

*mocracy: Using the Internet to Influence American Politics.* Wilten, CT: Pember-ton Press.

Casey, Chris. 1996. *The Hill on the Net: Congress Enters the Information Age*. Boston: AP Professional.  
 Fenno, Richard F. 1978. *Homestyle: House Members in their Districts*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.  
 Kamarck, Elaine. 1998. "Campaigning on the Internet in the Off Year Elections of

1998." *Visions of Governance in the Twenty-First Century* <[www.ksg.harvard.edu/visions/agenda.htm](http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/visions/agenda.htm)>. December 23, 1998.  
 Key, V.O. 1964. *Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups*. New York: Thomas Crowell.  
 Komarow, Steve. 1998. "Politicians Take

First Steps into Medium that May Hold Huge Potential in Elections." *USA Today*, November 4.  
 Rash, Wayne Jr. 1997. *Politics on the Net: Wiring the Political Process*. New York: W.H. Freeman.

## THE DIRECTORY OF WOMEN OF COLOR IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

A joint project between the Women's Caucus for Political Science and APSA's Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession, the directory was designed to assist graduate students in their search for mentors. Nearly 300 APSA members are included in the directory, with their addresses, telephone, e-mail and fax numbers. Each listing includes the member's current position, institution and date of highest academic degree, as well as fields and subfields of specialization and membership in Organized Sections.

### -----ORDER FORM-----

Enclosed is payment for \_\_\_ copies of the Directory of Women of Color in Political Science at the rate of \$3.50 for each copy. ALL ORDERS MUST BE PREPAID

CHECK ATTACHED  VISA/MASTERCARD

No. \_\_\_\_\_

EXP. DATE \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY/STATE/ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

PHONE ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_

MAIL TO: PUBLICATIONS/APSA, 1527 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW, WASHINGTON, DC 20036-1206  
 OR FAX YOUR ORDER TO (202) 483-2657