Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports

1999

Politicians and the Internet

Melody Kay Gwilliam
West Virginia University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Gwilliam, Melody Kay, "Politicians and the Internet" (1999). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 895.

<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/895>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Politicians and the Internet

Melody K. Gwilliam

Thesis submitted to the
Perley Isaac Reed of Journalism
at West Virginia University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Science in Journalism

Ralph E. Hanson Ph.D., Chair
Kurt E. Schimmel Ph.D.
Roger Ivan Pinnell Ph.D.
Gerald M. Pops Ph.D.
Department of Journalism

Morgantown, West Virginia
1999

Keywords: Politicians, Internet, Websites, Senators
Copyright 1999 Melody K. Gwilliam

ABSTRACT

Politicians and the Internet

Melody K. Gwilliam

The topic for this thesis examines the utilization of senatorial websites by United States Senators as a new communication tool. Three different areas of content will be examined: informational content, interactive content and audio-visual content. Those three areas will be used to examine the differences between Senators in several different ways: gender and race, party affiliation, length of service in the senate, region of the country they represent, urban and rural states, and age of the Senators. The results showed 6 significant findings in the areas of content: Democrats had more informational content; Northern Senators had the best and Midwestern Senators had the least audio-visual content; newer Senators in the senate had more informational content; and younger Senators had more informational, interactive, and total content.

Acknowledgements

I thank Professors Hanson, Schimmel, Pinnell, and Pops for their suggestions, support, and time. The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without their help. Also, I appreciate all of the help that so many friends and family members so generously gave, especially Dr. Joseph Marshall.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables and Figures	v
 I. INTRODUCTION.....	 1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	
1.) A Change Is Happening.....	5
2.) History	7
-Election of 1996	9
3.) Audience Size.....	12
-Who's Online?.....	15
4.) Uses of the Internet.....	19
-Political Accountability.....	19
-Unlimited Political Access	20
-Harnessing the Internet	22
-Getting Rid of the Middleman.....	25
-Local and Regional Concerns	26
-E-mail	27
5.) Hip Politicians	28
6.) New Communications Medium.....	30
-Closing the Gap.....	30
-Two-Way Communication	31
-New Political Issues.....	33
7.) Websites	35
8.) Future of Politicians on the Internet.....	39
-Evolution of Microdemocracy.....	41
 III. METHODOLOGY	 42
List of Variables	44
Research Questions.....	53
 IV. FINDINGS.....	 58
V. CONCLUSION.....	62
REFERENCES.....	65
References Not Cited.....	68

Tables

Table	Page
1. Census Regional Division Map	69
2. Informational Content based on Political Party.....	70
3. Informational Content based on Length of Service in the Senate.....	71
4. Audio-Visual Content based on the Census Regions.....	72
5. Interactive Content based on the Age of the Senators.....	73
6. Informational Content based on the Age of the Senators.....	74
7. Total Content based on the Age of the Senators	75
8. Mean, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation of Variables.....	76
9. Results	77
10. List of Informational, Interactive, and Audio-Visual Content Items.....	78
11. List of data	79

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past, newspapers, radio, and television have been very important communications tools for politicians. Since the Internet is becoming a more important communications tool, there is a need to examine how it is being used by politicians. The focus of this thesis is to investigate the websites of all 100 United States Senators and examine each for content.

The literature review centers on topics regarding internet audience, uses, and purpose. The first area to be discussed concerns how the Internet is evolving as an important communications tool. The following area is an examination of the history of politicians on the Internet. This should show how the Internet has slowly been accepted into the world of politics and political campaigning.

Politicians must know the available audience on the internet, therefore this was an important area to examine. In the literature review emphasis was placed on what kind of people frequent the Internet and the size of this audience.

Through the literature review several uses of the Internet as a political tool became apparent. One of these deals with the idea of constituents using the Internet websites to hold politicians more

accountable. Another deals with constituents having unlimited access to published information about the politicians. The Internet can provide a great advantage to politicians that learn how to utilize it well.

Constituents will be better able to get information directly from the politicians, rather than receiving the information through a middleman, since politicians can use their websites to deal with local and regional issues. In addition, E-mail provides politicians with a more personal and detailed means of communication with constituents than traditional mail communication.

Another issue the literature review briefly discusses is how some politicians are using the Internet to appear modern and up to date. Next the literature review examines how the Internet, like a lot of other communication mediums of the past, has a way of bringing people closer together. There is also hope that the Internet will foster better two way communication between politicians and their constituents. The Internet appears to have created new issues to be put on the political agenda. The actual contents of the political websites are discussed in the literature review and there is a brief discussion of what possible changes are expected in political websites.

This thesis will examine how politicians are using the Internet to communicate with the public. A large number of politicians have their own websites, but they vary greatly in quality. Where some politicians have elaborate webpages listing information about the politician and what he/she is doing in government, along with links to federal and state sites, others have very basic websites that only provide a brief biography and e-mail address.

A central question of this thesis is what United States Senators are choosing to put on their senatorial websites. There are three categories of contents on the websites: informational, interactive, and audio-visual. A comparison was done to see if there were any differences based on gender and race, party affiliation, length of service in the senate, region of the country they represent, urban and rural states, and age of the Senators.

The questions which are asked in this thesis are:

1.) Is there a difference between the senatorial websites of white male senators and non white male senators?

2.) Is there a difference between the senatorial websites of Democrat and Republican Senators?

3.) Is there a difference between the senatorial websites based on the number of years the Senators have spent in the senate?

4.) Are there any significant differences between senatorial websites based on the region of the country the senators represent?

5.) Is there a difference between the senatorial websites of senators from urban states and rural states?

6.) Are there differences between the senatorial websites based on the age of the senators?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.) A Change Is Happening

With all the different mass media choices available today it is difficult for any medium to have dominance over the market. The Internet is slowly changing the way our society communicates in many different areas. Despite this, the Internet has quickly become part of the economic and social culture in developed countries (Willock 1997). One area of interest is the way politicians are utilizing this new communications medium. In recent years, Americans have been flocking to the Internet for information, so it is only logical that the Internet could be used to gain information about politicians. Slowly digital politics are changing the political process.

Modern democracy isn't very participatory. Hal Berghel, a professor of computer science at the University of Arkansas, stated in an article published in *Communications of the ACM* that the way to change this requires time, energy, and commitment. Also, it requires believing that participation could have beneficial results. With nearly half of U.S. citizens failing to vote in elections, the Internet may become a tool that could help alter those percentages for the better (Berghel 1996).

The Internet has become a platform for democracy. It provides people with a wide variety of ideas, opinions, and information (Berman and Weitzner 1997). Cyber politics involves information dissemination, communication exchange, and the development of electronic political coalitions across the Internet. This includes E-mail, webpages, discussion groups, Internet databases, and online news (Willock 1997).

The Internet has developed into a resource tool that could be used to improve the connection between voters, politicians, and their issues (Berghel 1996). The digital democracy in cyberspace may lead politicians to know and work precincts like they did in the past, with a personal touch without actual physical contact. In the world of cyberspace, politicians will need to play to citizens by what they choose to access. The idea that leaders and followers, through the Internet, will know each other more intimately than ever before, without really meeting each other face to face is astounding (Fineman 1995). This is the basic idea of what the Internet will do for political communications between politicians and their constituents.

2.) History of Politicians on the Internet

David Gelernter, a computer science professor at Yale, writes that the Internet has existed in one form or another since the 1960's (Gelernter 1997). It was during the late 1970's that personal computers first appeared (Browning 1997). By the mid-1980's the Internet began to handle large volumes of traffic. Then, in the 1990's the World Wide Web brought underlying technology to an even larger public (Gelernter 1997).

Millions of Americans had personal computers in their homes by the 1992 election. During the 1992 election, the Internet wasn't considered a major factor in the political campaigns. Since the World Wide Web was still in its infancy in 1992, very few people were actually using the Internet and few Americans had modems fast enough to make practical use of collecting political information on the Internet (Browning 1997).

While the number of Internet users was small it was still able to change the future of politics. Norman Matloff, a former software developer in the Silicon Valley, then a professor of computer studies at the University of California, stated that in 1992 American politics was transformed by the Internet (Matloff 1997). By 1992 the Internet was being used in political elections to hold electronic town hall meetings and the term "information superhighway" was being used by the Clinton-Gore

campaign (Willock 1997). Since 1992, the Internet has been playing an active role in politics. Bill Clinton's 1992 campaign for President was the first to systematically post its position papers and speeches on the Internet (Fineman 1995). Clinton continued to post papers and speeches once he was elected. Starting in January 20, 1993 he posted press releases and general information over the Internet. This shows that Clinton and other politicians began recognizing the importance of the information superhighway (Willock 1997).

During the campaign for President in 1995, Lamar Alexander used satellite uplinks, CD-ROM's and the Internet as tools to gain support. This is an example of a new type of political campaigning that has been created in and by cyberspace (Fineman 1995).

The first senator with a World Wide Web homepage was Ted Kennedy. He has a graphically inviting, easy to use website. His homepage contains many of his speeches and information about politics in Massachusetts. When the website was first established, Kennedy was not using the Internet. His presence online was very helpful in countering his image as an out-of-touch baron who reeked of Old Politics. Also, it was an impressive website, making the homepage good strategy (Fineman 1995).

The political Internet seemed unbelievable during the 1992 campaign, when candidates first talked about online politicking, because it was such a new concept. Now more and more politicians have ventured into cyberspace. Both houses of Congress, as well as various state and local governments, developed Internet addresses where the public can check out position papers and legislative records (Kantrowitz and Rosenberg 1994).

Election of 1996

During the 1996 campaign, online journalists began to declare it the last election of the Industrial Age. 1996 brought many dramatic changes. The web was growing at very fast rates each month. During the 1996 political campaigns the Internet proved to be a mass scale of conveying political information. It placed a mass of political information at the convenience of the users. Although it was not performing very well, it showed promise for the future (Willock 1997).

1996 became the year that politicians rushed to establish a presence on the Internet. Phil Nobel, a political consultant specializing in the Internet, felt most of the political websites didn't do much more than create brochures. Despite this, 1996 political candidates on the Internet were in abundance (Willock 1997).

It became clear that the Internet was becoming part of the political campaign during the 1996 elections. In 1994 about 40 local, state, and congressional candidates had e-mail addresses, but by 1996 there were more than 170 state and local candidates utilizing the web (Browning 1997). Many strategists saw the 1996 elections as more of a testing ground for the Internet than an important part of the campaigns (Willock 1997).

1996 was also the year that the World Wide Web truly emerged as a new medium of communication. It exhibited more potential than actual impact. In a postelection poll 6% to 10% of the people stated they had accessed information about the election from a political website (Pomper 1997). During the 1996 political campaigns, the Internet became an enhancing tool. Evan Witt, the executive editor of Internet websites for ABC News, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, Newsweek, and Politics Now, said that this election was a landmark occasion since it was the time that the Internet became a mass medium (Willock 1997). 1996 proved to be a landmark year for politics on the Internet. There was a dramatic increase in both Internet users and in political websites. Also, the Internet was beginning to show, although minor, an impact on election results.

Politics Now, a political website operated by the Washington Post, ABC News, the Los Angeles Times, and the National Journal, suffered a breakdown 20 minutes after the first election results were posted due to thousands of users logging on simultaneously. Other websites lagged up to ten minutes because of the overload from Internet users looking for election results. Fifty million Internet users visited CNN's political website "All Politics" on election night. Many of political consultants agree that the Internet played a role at all levels of the 1996 campaigns. Some candidates attributed their success in the 1996 elections to their websites, and a few politicians predicted that the Internet will be a major political battleground in 2000 (Browning 1997).

3.) Audience Size

One problem politicians face is the perception of a small audience of people using the Internet. According to the Webmaster for the 1996 Dole campaign, Andrew Weinstein, there are currently not enough people online to be able to have a major effect on American politics (Carey 1996).

According to an article from Newsweek in its September 12, 1994 issue, only a third of all American homes had computers, and only about 5 percent were online (Kantrowitz and Rosenberg 1994). That, of course, has quickly changed in the past few years. An estimate of the Internet audience in 1996 found that over 77 million people were on the Internet with close to 700 thousand websites (Willock 1997).

According to Louise Harris and Associates Inc., a well known polling firm, nearly one in five Americans over the age of 18 (approximately 35 million people) are using the Internet for many things including gathering political information. A survey by Goddard Clausen / First Tuesday, a Sacramento, California based public affairs firm, found that almost one million California voters gathered political information on their computers before voting (Browning 1997). The American Internet User Survey of 1996 found 6.4% of American households have one or more Internet users. This number of users is growing each year. In 1995 the

American Internet User Survey found that more than half of the people questioned said they had begun using the Internet during that year (Willock 1997).

A poll conducted by Wirthlin Worldwide, a well respected Virginia based political research firm, found that 9% of American voters, 8.5 million people nationwide, said they were influenced in their vote by information they found on the Internet. Another study about the effects of the Internet on the 1996 election, conducted by Pew Research Center for People and the Press, found that 12% of 1,000 people surveyed around election day said they used the Internet to gather political information (Browning 1997).

The Media Studies Center found that only 6% of the people surveyed had ever visited a political website of the 1996 presidential campaign early in the campaign. Those numbers significantly changed a few months later. By election night there were 10 times as many people online than usual (Willock 1997).

According to an article printed in Mediaweek, the number of Internet users grows by about 10 percent each month (Mundy 1995). Once Clinton was elected in 1993, it was unknown who would retrieve the data from the White House website. Within a year they found 40,000 people either

received documents daily through an e-mailing list or they retrieved them several times a week from servers, news groups, and bulletin boards (Hurwitz and Mallery, 1994).

There doesn't need to be an enormous number of people on the Internet for it to be an effective tool for politicians (Fineman 1995). Even a small audience on the Internet in 1996 is still historically significant. When television was first used as a political tool, only one party utilized it when the audience was only 4-5% of the American public. After four years, the audience had grown to 45% and both parties were advertising. By 1960 the audience was over 85% and was significant in its impact on the political elections. Given the past history of other mass mediums, the Internet has the potential to aid political campaigns (Willock 1997).

One of the things that attracts politicians to the Internet is that the overall cost of being on the Internet is relatively small compared to television ads. While the number of people cruising the superhighway is currently small, it has the potential to become extremely busy in the years ahead (Berger 1995). There is clearly an audience that wants access to public information and our governments leaders (Willock 1997). Therefore, audience size does not appear to be the only significant factor.

Perhaps a more significant factor is the potential for campaign cost reduction.

Who's online?

Of the 9.5 million Americans on the Internet, 8.5 million of them are adults, and they are part of a very important group: wealthy, educated, professionals (Willock 1997). It is clear from the results of surveys that these people are the ones most politicians want to reach, the reason being that these people who are on the Internet tend to be upper income, better educated, independent voters who use the Internet to become better informed. Often these people are opinion leaders who are likely to influence others (Browning 1997).

Roger Hurwitz and John Mallery, research scientists at the MIT Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, conducted a study of the people who receive information from the White House website and found that 85% are under 50 years of age, 80% are male, 50% have advanced degrees and are affiliated with universities, government institutions, or high-tech companies (Hurwitz and Mallery 1994).

A unique thing the Internet does is to attract an educated audience regardless of socioeconomic status. However, studies do show that people with a limited education are often not users of the Internet . The 97% of

the upper income users and 98% of the other users have had some college education. This is likely due to the way the Internet has been introduced to society. When television was first being introduced to society, the sets were often in places where people gathered. The Internet has mainly been introduced to society through educational institutions and was designed for educational purposes. So the way the Internet has been introduced to society has had an impact on the audience to use it first. The Internet may continue for some time to miss a large segment of its potential audience due to this factor. The Internet is very different from traditional media, giving it a very different target audience (Willock 1997).

Internet users are active information gatherers. They are less likely to depend on a single source of information and are likely to seek a variety of news sources. Internet users typically are heavy users of all media; even the heavy users of the Internet depend on information from other mass media forms (Willock 1997).

A survey conducted by AT&T World Net Service in the summer of 1996 found that over 65% of voters contacted were interested in using the Internet to find out about politicians. A third of the people surveyed said they would follow the next election on the Internet. Other studies have found that people who use the Internet are more likely to vote. According

to Roger Hurwitz, a researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a census study in 1994 found that people who own modems, thus own a personal computer, were twice as likely to vote than people without modems (Browning 1997).

Access to the Internet does require a moderate investment in equipment and a discretionary income. In addition education level is probably an important factor as well. Of course with more public libraries providing free access to the Internet and computer prices becoming more affordable to everyone, the profile of users may begin to change.

An exit poll by the Voters News Service surveyed 70,000 voters nationwide after the 1996 election. They found that 26% of those voters called themselves regular users of the Internet (Browning 1997). If Internet use continues to develop at its current rate, this percentage in 1996 could be nearly doubled in ten years making the Internet an essential tool for the twenty-first century politicians.

Farai Chideya, a CNN commentator and Media Studies Center member, stated that the one thing the Internet is doing successfully is reaching young people, 18-29 years old. This is something that traditional media has not been successful at. Only 15% of these voters follow the campaigns and have been unlikely to vote (Media Studies Center 1996). Since they are

attracted to the Internet, it is a way of making them politically active (Willock 1997). Part of the reason strategists are having difficulty reaching adults under 30 is the fact that they don't use traditional news outlets and rely less on print sources and more on interactive media. These strategists see the Internet as the best way of reaching this audience (Willock 1997).

Another very important group to politicians are the late deciders, but reaching them is difficult. Strategists are exploring new ways of reaching them via the Internet and giving them specific information (Willock 1997).

4.) Uses of the Internet

Political Accountability

As Internet use continues to increase, the variety of political uses will also widen (Matloff 1997). One of the things the Internet will likely create is a new political accountability (Jacques and Ratzan 1997).

The Internet will give new power to opposition research. The opposition will be better able to point out inconsistencies in politics. Everything the politician does will be on the record and quickly accessible to the public:

"It will pop up fast. Nobody can hide. Most of the Internet conversations and information are available to anyone. The enemy can usually read over your shoulder and butt in. You have to be very aware that the whole world can listen in to what you are saying says lobbyist Jim Deutsch" (Fineman 32, 1995).

The Internet websites are not a congenial place for traditional party politicians (Fineman 1995). Voters are able to use the Internet to gather more information and hold politicians accountable by being able to quickly compare sources (Kern 1997). The public can use the Internet to access information on how a politician has voted. This would give the public the opportunity to examine and react to a bill that is going to be voted on

before it is too late. With an electorate that might become less forgetful, it would make it difficult for politicians to enjoy the kind of anonymity they have had in the past (Berghel 1996).

The possibility of an increase of political memory through digital recall could make politicians more wary of their decisions. Of course many citizens are not likely to monitor political performance, but reporting would be able to have better scope and depth. Journalistic efficiency along with political accountability work together in this regard (Berghel 1996).

Unlimited Political Access

The Internet has also created a new set of potential problems. One is that there is not a "fairness doctrine" governing the amount of time candidates get, like there is in TV and radio campaigning. Political access to television and radio is structured to set aside space for political candidates, due to the scarcity of channels. The Web on the other hand doesn't require that a number of websites be set aside (Berman and Weitzner 1997). In this aspect the Internet is superior to print advertisements and articles.

Another potential problem with online appearances could force the Federal Election Commission, which watches funding, to take action. If a

candidate is offered free time on the Internet, it could be viewed as a contribution in kind, which can't be accepted by politicians from corporations (Kantrowitz and Rosenberg 1994).

There is a justified worry that government online sites could give an unfair advantage to incumbent candidates. The Senate dealt with the problem during the 1994 elections. Senators who were up for reelection were not allowed to use their taxpayer supported Internet sites for 60 days before the election. So, if a senator wanted to stay online, he or she would have to set up another website for that period of time (Kantrowitz and Rosenberg 1994). A potential problem with this is that it could be confusing to people who have frequently visited the politician's other site before.

It is probable that the Internet will increase superficial and manipulative political communication. There is also some worry that people accessing the politician's government sites will expect to find unbiased information (Kantrowitz and Rosenberg 1994).

One of the limits of the Internet is that messages found there are indeed "filtered". The websites are packaged and wrapped by professional spinmeisters. The Internet user download only what the candidate wants him or her to download. There are no reality checks from the opponents to

keep the candidates honest. Another drawback is that the messages deal mostly with generic topics (Mundy 1995).

Harnessing the Internet

Digital democracy may change party conventions and network news, causing them to decline or even disappear. In the digital world every unchecked fact is all too available and every opinion equal (Fineman 1997). According to John H. Carey, currently the political Internet is viewed more as an entertainment than a useful political tool (Carey 1996). Yet there is an enormous opportunity for politicians who can figure out how to harness interactivity in the Internet, like group conversations about political ideas that could be rebutted, refuted, or rejoined depending on the issue to make the Internet into a highly useful tool. Being able to harness this requires considerable technical skills and an investment of time and money (Berghel 1996).

The Internet is already proving itself to be a great way for new politicians to gain the public's attention. A good example of this is a candidate for lieutenant governor in Massachusetts, Bob Massie, who was relatively unknown at the time. He introduced himself to many voters by posting his E-mail address on an America Online bulletin board

(Kantrowitz and Rosenberg 1994). At the very least, this helped him to build name recognition.

Cyber politics of 1996 also gave voters the opportunity to access more information on a wide variety of candidates (Willock 1997). Voters could thus use the Internet to find information about independent candidates. This enabled voters to gather information on lesser known candidates that didn't receive much attention from the mainstream media (Kern 1997).

For candidates who can not afford to advertise on the traditional mass mediums such as television, radio and newspaper, the Internet is very helpful. The main problems the lesser known politicians face is that the audience is still small and not many people know how to use the Internet well even today (Willcock 1997).

Some fear that the Internet will be used as a propaganda vehicle. Berghel lists three potential problems that could occur from using the Internet as a propaganda vehicle. The first is the additional proliferation of cyber junk mail. The second potential problem is that as the cyber population grows, canned tailored responses could be crafted for individuals and groups of all sizes with less human involvement. Individuals and groups would hear their customized version of the party

line, elevating spin doctoring to a new higher level. "Noise factor," in the form of more speech and press releases, is listed as the third potential problem. Berghel believes that an increase of political rhetoric for its own sake is likely to work against the common good. Dialog, not declamation, is needed in politics. It is easier to produce large amounts of rhetoric than actual compelling argumentative information (Berghel 1996).

The Internet might counter some of the problems of television, like commercialization and costly advertisements (Kern 1997). The Internet provides a way for politicians to communicate without spending large amounts of money. It isn't time consuming, making the Internet a cheap and more efficient way for politicians to propagandize through E-mail, web documents, and interactive forms (Berghel 1996). This is a cost effective way for politicians to avoid the increasing pressures of campaign spending limits.

People could use the Internet in 1996 to retrieve the full text of speeches, press releases, and information on the party platforms from some political websites. One of the reasons political strategists used the Internet was to get this information to journalists. The idea was that these journalists would then use the information from the politicians'

websites in traditional media. By the end of the 1996 election, press releases were routinely sent to journalists either directly from the politicians' homepage or directly to their E-mail addresses (Willock 1997).

The Internet allows the public more direct access to the politicians than ever before. People are able to get information on what the politician is currently doing and find out where he stands on certain issues. The Internet provides a kind of democracy, because for every point of view that is supportive of one idea on a website, there are other websites that take the opposing view (Schmitt 1997).

Getting Rid of the Middleman

The Internet offers the greatest opportunity for those seeking to swerve around the mainstream media roadblocks (Berger 1995). By 1996, the Internet was viewed as a way for politicians to get "unfiltered" information to the public and to be able to respond to an opponent's charges (Browning 1997).

Mike Murphy, who ran Lamar Alexander's campaign for president, called the Web a rare opportunity for voters to get the candidate's views unchanged by the media. When people hear things about politicians, it has usually gone through a middleman. The Internet gets rid of the middleman

and goes directly to the public uncensored. Eric Davis, of Berkeley Internet, claimed that the web is capable of getting voters directly in touch with the candidates (Mundy 1995).

Another thing helping politicians is that some Internet services, like Prodigy, can provide a series of debates online in which as many as 20,000 subscribers could line up with questions (Kantrowitz and Rosenberg 1994). An additional advantage, according to Chief lobbyist for the NRA, Tanya Metaksa, is that things move so fast in politics that the Internet helps in keeping track of what is going on throughout politics (Fineman 1995).

Local & Regional Concerns

Many strategists have tried to improve feedback from constituents and their elected officials. The Internet is being explored as one way to provide better feedback to representatives on issues of concern in their own district (Willock 1997).

Some politicians use their websites to deal with local and regional concerns of their constituents. Senator Ernest Hollings of South Carolina has a link on his website to information from the National Hurricane Center. Another example of a politician using a website to deal with local and regional concerns is Senator Barbara Boxer of California who has a

site about El Nino and climate changes affecting Californians (Schmitt 1997).

E-mail

E-mail had been used primarily as an internal communication medium by politicians and their staffs. After the digital explosion of the early 1990's, E-mail from constituents began to flood into politicians offices (Berghel 1996). More than 2,000 e-mail messages a day are sent to President Clinton (Willock 1997).

Most members of Congress can't handle the flood of E-mail that comes into their offices. Some even reject having E-mail (Meeks 1997). According to Richard Brody, professor emeritus of political science at Stanford University, politicians lack time to answer any kind of mail let alone e-mail. Heather Irwin, writer for "Netizen" Hot Wired's political column, told the Associated Press that e-mail to politicians is just being printed out and put into the snail mail pile (Browning 1997).

Virtually all of the politicians' websites list an E-mail address, but don't hold your breath waiting for a reply. The New York Times on the Web found during a survey of 261 House and Senate members that only 12 of the politicians respond to E-mail within 24 hours and that fewer than 25 percent respond to an E-mail message within two weeks (Schmitt 1997).

5.) Hip Politicians

The Internet is easily abused by candidates who are searching for a cheap way to show they're hip (Fineman 1995). So, of course, a majority of the politicians have rushed online. One of the major political benefits of going online seems to be avoiding the label of technophobe (Carey 1996).

The Internet still has a long way to go before it becomes a powerful communications tool like television and newspapers, but politicians today are quickly learning that they shouldn't ignore cyberspace, because it could be dangerous to their electoral health (Kantrowitz and Rosenberg 1994). Politicians could be hurt more by not having a Web site than helped by having one (Carey 1996).

While there are political websites that contain lots of useful information for their constituents, many politicians put up very disappointing websites that are uninformative. An example of a user friendly website is Washington state Representative Rick White's. It is one of the most user friendly websites in Congress (Schmitt 1997).

A few politicians have received praise for holding electronic town meetings (Carey 1996). While many politicians may have websites, many of those with them do not actually use the Internet personally. They have

members in their staff who work on the website. Of course there are some politicians like Congressman Sam Coppersmith who travel with a powerbook and read e-mail. Coppersmith feels that being online has given him a whole new constituency outside his district (Kantrowitz and Rosenberg 1994). Yet according to Senator Patrick Leahy, who has one of the most extensive websites for a congressman, many senators really don't understand the Internet or even use computers. Leahy's website deals with such issues as breast cancer, land mines and protecting the Internet. Still, many politicians' websites don't contain information on important issues that they are working on. Senator Daniel Coats introduced the Communications Decency Act before Congress recently, but his website doesn't mention it. Also Senator Orrin Hatch doesn't mention on his website about the antitrust hearings against Microsoft that may be held (Schmitt 1997).

6.) The New Communications Medium

Closing the Gap

One of the biggest things the Internet has been able to do is defeat geography, diminishing the significance of distance and physical separation. From the start of the Industrial Revolution to the present, modern technology has tried to undermine geography (Gelernter 1997). The Internet eliminates geographical constraints (Berghel 1996).

The Internet is like other major technology breakthroughs, such as radio and television, that have changed the character of modern life (Gelernter 1997). Throughout time each new communications medium in America was able to elevate leaders who could use it. The leaders who use the new medium, understand the issues it generates and embody the new zeal it creates and benefit greatly (Fineman 1997).

In the 1960's, 90% of households in America had televisions. President Kennedy understood how to use this new medium and used it to help him win the election. The same thing is expected to happen with the Internet, those who know how to use it will be greatly benefited by it (Browning 1997). Throughout history we have had politicians who have utilized the new communications mediums: Washington and Jefferson used parchment, cheap pamphlets and primitive newspapers; Lincoln was a

brilliant wordsmith of public speeches; Teddy Roosevelt invented the political publicity stunt to occupy the metropolitan tabloids; FDR had his radio fireside chats; Kennedy and Reagan used television. Now there is the opportunity for politicians to master the Internet (Fineman 1997).

Two-Way Communication

The Internet offers good reason to be optimistic about the impact of the new interactive digital media on our culture and political life (Berman and Weitzner 1997). Currently many websites only offer one way communication, from the candidate to the interested voter. This is not bringing government closer to the public the way some hoped it would (Browning 1997).

Traditional media, radio and television, have been affordable and easily available across the country, but don't allow full democratic participation due to their limitations. The Internet allows users to exchange views and information that is impossible for the other communications mediums (Berman and Weitzner 1997).

The Internet allows the user to request information and participate in a dialog of sorts (Willock 1997). The Internet's interactivity capability

lets users give feedback to their legislatures, instead of one-way communication from politician to voter (Berman and Weitzner 1997).

The two way communication that the Internet supplies is a valuable component for politicians. This new media enables politicians to relate to people as partners instead of as targets. Politicians would have to listen to the online masses, not just pollsters or well connected constituents. This threatens to alter the traditional tactics of politics (Carey 1996).

Berghel states that politicians need to realize that the potential of the Internet is in interactivity and increased individual participation in the political process (Berghel 1996). Most of the campaign websites of the 1996 election included the same material that is usually handed out in print form, television advertisements, including speeches, photographs, position papers, sound bites, news releases, and clips from broadcast coverage. Some, however, had sites with an interactive format. They asked people to e-mail comments and questions. Others with interactive websites asked supporters to be on guard and notify them of opponent's claims or the website has moving headlines with updated information on the campaign (Browning 1997).

Many politicians have been using the Internet to gain support from the public. An example of this was done by several House Republicans: they

posted IRS horror stories on their home pages asking for constituents to send them stories of their problems with the IRS. They received almost 3,000 negative responses about the IRS, and the bill passed (Schmitt 1997).

During the 1996 election Mark Warner, a U.S. Senate candidate, developed a well-made website. His website contained snappy graphics, constantly updated news releases, and audio and video clips like other well designed campaign websites. The difference was that his website included an interactive twist: he asked supporters to e-mail the campaign headquarters if they heard, saw, or read of an attack against him that wasn't rebuked within 24 hours. This allowed him to save money and develop a priceless new network of interested and informed voters at the same time. Mark Warner showed that he understood the potential of the Internet in a political context, more than other candidates in the 1996 elections (Browning 1997).

New Political Issues

Cyberspace has created new issues and forced them onto the political agenda. Some of the new issues deal with free speech on the Internet and free Internet access (Fineman 1997). Both issues should be important to politicians, especially free Internet access. It is very

important for politicians to have websites that are accessible to any web user, no matter what kind of computer the user has or what net service they are using. In some cases, the websites are developed without taking into consideration the power level of the average computer using the Internet.

7.) Websites

All House and Senate offices have websites that allow them to keep in touch with their constituents, lobbyists, and reporters. A majority of these political websites contain biographies, news releases, speeches, information on tourism in Washington D.C., and information on how to obtain a flag flown over the Capital. Congressional committees have the entire text of bills posted along with summaries on websites (Schmitt 1997).

One major problem the 1996 political websites faced was that unless the user had a fast enough modem, downloading material was very slow. There weren't enough websites that provided links to sources with more depth on important issues. This election year, however, will be known for being the first time the Internet was used for such a broad range of tasks (Willock 1997).

Some politicians have hired young computer experts to custom design intricate websites that contain video and audio clips, but most other politicians seem to be struggling to keep up (Schmitt 1997). Some of these political websites were poorly put together, only listing biographies and little information on the candidates (Browning 1997). Although a

majority of the political candidate websites have been disappointing, it has been shown that "cyber precincts" can be created (Kern 1997).

Politician's home pages are personally designed for the senator and can range from the very simple to the very intricate. One of the biggest effects, aside from offering an unedited view of the person or the issue, is the ability to link readers to related information (Berger 1995). Several senators have webpages that contain links to federal and state websites.

The appearance of some of the politicians websites resembles the look of an advertising billboard, which it is in a way (Carey 1996). The websites are a kind of advertisement of the politician- what they have accomplished, key issues they support etc. Also, websites like THOMAS, created by the Library of Congress, were created to make government appear more accessible. THOMAS provides a great deal of information about governmental legislation. The political websites had interesting logos, but the amount of information on the websites was not extensive. It was the users who pushed the web designers to provide more substantial information (Willock 1997).

Bruce Gronbeck, a communications theorist, examined more than 200 websites during the 1996 presidential election. He found that the political

websites provided three major functions: information, persuasion, and solidarity. The majority of the content of these websites was provided either by mass media or major political candidates. The Internet may have the potential to change and reinforce the status of middle to upper income and educated voters who happen to be the predominate users now. Like two of Gronbeck's areas, information and solidarity, the Internet has the potential to surpass television in some aspects due to its interactive abilities to build links with informal and solidarity functions (Kern 1997).

A large number of the winners in the 1996 election utilized Internet websites. More than a third of the 74 newcomers to the House of Congress used websites during their campaign, as did 7 of the 15 candidates who won seats in the Senate. Some of these winners credited their success in the election to their websites. No one is sure exactly what role the Internet played in these elections, but candidates facing tight races can no longer overlook the Internet as a part of their campaign strategy (Browning 1997).

Most legislators use their websites mainly to provide routine constituent services. Others attempt to give their website a personal touch by adding something like a family recipe. Texas Representative Dick

Armey updates his Internet site with his proposals for a flat tax and he has a running tally of the national debt (Schmitt 1997).

8.) The Future of Politicians on the Internet

The Internet and World Wide Web have the capabilities to alter our culture, economy and future. Things are quickly changing and eventually there will be unlimited channels of fully digital, interactive virtual reality transmitting data, entertainment and news (Fineman 1997).

The Internet is like other new mass media communication tools. There are paranoid claims made along with dreams of what this new technology will bring to society. The Internet is basically just another way of communicating information. Its future use will be determined by how people choose to use it (Willock 1997). The one constant thing about the Internet is that it is always changing because of the needs of its users (Berman and Weitzner 1997).

Digital democracy will most likely change party conventions and network news, causing them to decline or even disappear. One of the most important things about the digital world is every unchecked fact is all too available and every opinion equal (Fineman 1997).

In Philadelphia, a federal court found the Internet to be the most participatory form of mass speech currently. The Internet is, however, still not fully developed in America and even less so in other countries. The Internet has great potential and more people are becoming involved,

leading hopefully to more political participation (Berman and Weitzner 1997). Currently political Websites, in terms of content and quality, rate in the middle in comparison to other Websites on the Internet. The focus is mainly on multimedia display to the exclusion of interactivity (Berghel 1996).

While the potential for growth on the Internet is still only a guessing game of sorts, some strategists believe it will become a dominate means of communication and there is a fair amount of evidence supporting this theory. In 1996, two-thirds of people polled in an AT&T poll said they were interested in using the Internet to find information on politicians. As the affordability to Internet access increases, there is great reason to believe that this medium will continue to grow (Willock 1997).

Although the Internet didn't live up to the overblown hype that it promised in 1996, the Internet in time will become a major force in American politics, according to political consultants (Browning 1997). Experts believe that cyberpolitics will become crucial by 2000. Every politician should have a developed website by then, because it is expected that the Internet will be more widely used by the population. For the time

being, politicians will have to become more computer sophisticated (Carey 1996).

Evolution of Microdemocracy

According to visionary computer newsletter guru, Esther Dyson, the Web will produce an explosion of microdemocracy. The access to political information is being radically democratized. Voters can instantly research the records of any politician on nearly any issue. Currently, however, there is a lack of easy access to politicians' voting records. Since many politicians don't list voting records on their websites, people would be better off going to congressional websites to get the information. Of course the voting records will do people little good if they are hoping to affect the political process, because by the time they see how their politician voted it is too late to do any thing about it. (Schmitt 1997).

III. METHODOLOGY

This thesis will examine the websites of all 100 United States Senators. Every webpage connected to the senators' websites will also be examined. Only those pages that have been created for the senators' websites will be examined. The way this will be determined is by examining the website address. For Example, Senator Kerrey's homepage address is www.senate.gov/~kerrey/. His connecting webpages are similar to this: www.senate.gov/~kerrey/biography/.

There will be three main areas examined: informational content, interactive content, and audio-visual content. The informational content will examine the actual text information that is presented on the senatorial website. The informational content will include things such as: Biography, Press Releases, Speeches etc.

Interactive content of the senatorial websites contains things which require interaction on the users part. Some of the interactive contents include things like E-mail and Issue Polls. This area will be examined to see how much the websites involve their users.

The third area is audio-visual content of the senatorial websites. This is also important because the website should contain attractive

features to keep or gain the user's attention. The audio-visual area includes things like: audio clips, graphics, animated graphics etc.

After the data about the three areas was collected SPSS, a statistical analysis software program, was used to help examine the differences between the Senators in several different ways: gender and race, party affiliation, length of service in the senate, region of the country they represent, urban and rural states, and age of the Senators.

The three areas of content (informational content, interactive content, and audio-visual content) are the dependent variables. The six areas for comparison (gender and race, party affiliation, length of service in the senate, region of the country they represent, urban and rural states, and age of the Senators) are the independent variables. A one way analysis of variance was used to determine the results of four of the independent variables: gender and race, party affiliation, region of the country they represent, and urban and rural states.

For the two remaining independent variables (length of service in the senate, and age of the Senators) a cross tabulation was done with a 2-tailed significance. From the website content analysis it is hoped that an understanding of what the senatorial websites contain and how they are being used will be gained.

List of variables

I. Independent Variables

A. Gender & Race

White Male Senators

Non White Male Senators - This includes all male minorities and all female Senators.

The range for this variable is 0-1, 0 is representative of the non white male Senators and 1 is representative of the white male Senators.

*note: At first gender and race were listed separately, but the number of females and minorities was very small. There were only 9 female senators and only 4 minority senators: Native American =1, Asian American = 2, and African American =1. (The only African American senator also happens to be a female.) Gender and race were then combined to make the findings more significant.

B. Party Affiliation

Republican

Democrat

The range for this variable is 0-1, 0 is for the Democrat Senators and 1 for the Republican Senators.

C. Length of Service in the United States Senate

The number of years the senator had spent in the United States Senate at the time the websites were viewed in late July and early August of 1998.

The range for this variable is wide since the actual years of service were used. The range went from 1 and a half years to 43 and a half years of service in the senate.

D. Region of the Country

The states were divided into 4 regions based on the divisions made by the United States Census 1990. (See table 1)

The range for Region of the country the Senators represent are 0-3. The northern states were entered as 0, the southern states as 1, the Midwestern states as 2, and the western states as 3.

North: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

South: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

West: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming.

E. Urban and Rural States

Urban and Rural states will be categorized based on a median split of the percentage of the states' population that lives in urban areas. According to the 1990 U.S. Census Bureau, the median split was found to be 68.8%. States with a total urban population over 68.8% were classified as urban states and those with a lower total urban population were classified as rural states.

The urban and rural states had a range of 0-1. 0 was representative of Rural states and 1 was representative of urban states.

Urban:

Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Washington.

Rural:

Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New

Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

F. Age

The individual age of each of the senator as of August 1998.

The range for age was from 40-96 years.

II. Dependent Variables

A. Informational Content

The range for informational content is 0-14. Each individual item listed under informational content was given a 0 if it did not contain the listed item and a 1 if it did contain the listed item.

1. Legislative Information

Information pertaining to senatorial activities that is not a Press Release or an article written by the Senator. The information was probably written for the website. Example: a list of issues that are currently being discussed in the senate or short paragraphs discussing the current status of issues before the senate.

2. Biography

Information about the Senators' history in politics and upbringing.

3. Scheduled Activities

This includes any listing of: upcoming events the Senator plans to attend, schedule of legislative activities, list of television appearances, or schedule of daily senate activities.

4. Office Information

The website provides information about how to contact the Senator. This includes office locations, addresses and phone numbers.

5. Speeches

Complete copies of speeches given by the Senator are on the website. They are not edited versions of speeches given by the Senator. This does not include links to copies of speeches not on the Senator's website. The speeches are sometimes listed under the Press Releases.

6. Press Releases

Articles prepared by the senatorial staff for the press. They include edited copies of speeches and summaries of senate activities.

7. Articles by the Senator

The article is listed as being written by the Senator. They are sometimes found listed under press releases.

8. State Links

The website has links to state websites. They can be links to state government websites, tourism websites, and state business websites.

This does not include state media websites.

9. Federal Links

The website has links to federal government websites. Example: U.S. House of Representatives

10. Media Links

The website has links to a media website. Example: The Washington Post

11. Committee Links

The website has links to senatorial committee websites that the Senator is a member of.

12. Committee Information

Senatorial committee information is contained on the Senator's website.

This does not include press releases, speeches and articles by the Senator about the committees. The information should be displayed in a separate section on the Senator's website.

13. State Highlights

Information about the state represented by the Senator is on the website.

This can include: a photo gallery of photos of the state, information about

the history of the state, economic report about the state, state trivia (facts about the state), and listing of famous statesmen.

14. Internships

Information about the Senators internship program, usually includes an application form.

B. Interactive Content

The range for interactive content is 0-7. Each individual item listed under interactive content was given a 0 if it did not contain the listed item and a 1 if it did contain the listed item.

1. Internet Chat Session

Allows schools to apply for an internet chat session with the Senator.

2. Issue poll

A survey completed by users of the website that consists of a question of the week. The votes of the users who enter there opinion on the topic can find out the results the following week.

3. Opinion Poll

This requires users to answer a questionnaire about a wide variety of topics. The questions can deal with political issues and demographical questions.

4. E-mail

An E-mail address is presented on the senatorial website. It allows the users to send computer based responses to the Senator.

5. Constituent Survey of Users

This is a questionnaire about what kind of people are using the website. It allows the senators to find out who is using their website. It asks what party the user belongs to and what age group as well as many other questions.

6. Guest Book

A form that can be filled out by the website user. The users enter information about who they are, some allow users to register for a Internet newsletter about the Senator.

7. Search Engine

Allows the user to search the website for a specific topic. They can do this by entering keywords of the topic they wish to find information on and, if it is available, the search engine will provide a link to that information.

C. Audio-Visual Content

The range for audio-visual content is 0-5. Each individual item listed under audio-visual content was given a 0 if it did not contain the listed item and a 1 if it did contain the listed item.

1. Background

The background is a type of graphic which is placed as the background color or design of the webpage. The senatorial website contains at least one background which is colored or is a tiled graphic design.

2. Animated Graphics

This is a graphic which is animated. The graphic changes or moves.

3. Graphics

This includes graphic designs and photos.

4. Audio Clip

This is an audio recording of some statement. The recording is usually of the Senator speaking. Typically it is an audio greeting.

5. Video clip

This is a video recording which includes audio and motion picture recordings.

Research Questions

Research Question 1: Is there a difference between the senatorial websites of white male senators and non white male senators?

There shouldn't be a difference between the websites of white male Senators and non white male Senators. Race and Gender should not play a role in the contents of senatorial websites.

Research Question 2: Is there a difference between the senatorial websites of Democrat and Republican Senators?

There shouldn't be any significant differences between Republican and Democratic websites based on the quality of their content. With both parties having almost equal representation there is not reason to anticipate that one party would have an advantage over the other.

Research Question 3: Is there a difference between the senatorial websites based on the number of years the Senators have spent in the senate?

New member are expected to have more content on their websites than old members of the senate. The new members to the senate are more likely to use their website to make a statement. A detailed website shows they are "hip" and current. The older Senators are also more likely to be

resistant to changes and therefore focus their efforts on traditional media instead of the Internet.

Research Question 4: Are there any significant differences between senatorial websites based on the region of the country the senators represent?

No differences are expected between senatorial websites based on the region of the country the senators represent. There shouldn't be any reason for senators from one region of the country to have more content on their senatorial websites.

Research Question 5: Is there a difference between the senatorial websites of senators from urban states and rural states?

Senators from urban states are expected to have more content on their websites than senators from rural states. This might be because Senators from urban states are more likely to have a larger audience on the Internet.

Research Question 6: Are there differences between the senatorial websites based on the age of the senators?

Younger senators should have more content on their senatorial websites than older senators. Younger senators are more likely to be familiar with the internet than older senators. The older Senators are

more likely to be resistant to changes. They might put more effort into using traditional media.

Gender and Race

RQ1a) Compare white male senators to non white male senators in the category of information.

RQ1b) Compare white male senators to non white male senators in the category of interactivity.

RQ1c) Compare white male senators to non white male senators in the category of audio-visual characteristics.

RQ1d) An overall analysis of white males to non white males in all three categories: information, interactivity, and audio-visual characteristics.

Party Affiliation

RQ2a) Compare party affiliation of the senators to the category of information.

RQ2b) Compare party affiliation of the senators to the category of interactivity.

RQ2c) Compare party affiliation of the senators to the category of audio-visual characteristics.

RQ2d) Compare party affiliation of the senators in all three categories: information, interactivity, and audio-visual characteristics.

Length of Service in the Senate

RQ3a) Compare new members of the Senate to old members of the Senate to the category of information.

RQ3b) Compare new members of the Senate to old members of the Senate to the category of interactivity.

RQ3c) Compare new members of the Senate to old members of the Senate to the category of audio-visual characteristics.

RQ3d) Compare new members of the Senate to old members of the Senate in all three categories: information, interactivity, and audio-visual characteristics.

Region of Country

RQ4a) Compare senators based on the region of the country they represent to the category of information.

RQ4b) Compare senators based on the region of the country they represent to the category of interactivity.

RQ4c) Compare senators based on the region of the country they represent to the category of audio-visual characteristics.

RQ4d) Compare senators based on the region of the country they represent in all three categories: information, interactivity, and audio-visual characteristics.

Urban and Rural States

RQ5a) Compare senators from urban and rural states to the category of information.

RQ5b) Compare senators from urban and rural states to the category of interactivity.

RQ5c) Compare senators from urban and rural states to the category of audio-visual characteristics.

RQ5d) Compare senators from urban and rural states in all three categories: information, interactivity, and audio-visual characteristics.

Age of Senator

RQ6a) Compare senators based upon their age to the category of information.

RQ6b) Compare senators based upon their age to the category of interactivity.

RQ6c) Compare senators based upon their age to the category of audio-visual characteristics.

RQ6d) Compare senators based upon their age in all three categories: information, interactivity, and audio-visual characteristics.

IV. FINDINGS

RQ1 The best anticipated finding was between white male senators and non white male senators. In agreement with the expected findings no significant difference was found between white male Senators and non white male Senators in terms of website content. This finding supports the idea that the Internet doesn't show any gender or racial differences.

RQ2 The most surprising finding has to do with the difference between Republican and Democratic websites. Table 2 presents evidence that contrary to the expected findings that there was a difference between the content of the websites based on political party. Democrats seem to have more informational content as compared to Republicans. In looking at the websites that contained the least amount of content the bottom three were Republicans. This could be due to the fact that Republicans senatorial websites might have been more conservative in their disclosure of information.

RQ3 Another anticipated finding was the difference found between the length of service of the Senators. Table 3 shows that newer members of the Senate have more informational content than the longer standing members of the Senate. This probably due to the fact that the new

members felt the need to disclose more information to the public. In order to gain more support with a younger generation, who on the Internet more often to gain information on topics of interest.

RQ4 Another surprising finding has to do with the region of the country the senator represents. In the area of audio-visual content, Table 4, shows there was a difference between the regions that the senators represent . According to the results, senators from states in the North region have better audio-visual content. On the other end of the scale Midwest region senators have the smallest amount of audio-visual content available on their websites. With larger cities in the north region the likelihood of finding a better trained webmasters is more present.

RQ5 No difference was found between senators from urban and rural states. Contrary to the expected findings, senators from urban states do not have better websites than senators from rural states.

RQ6 In agreement with the expected findings, a difference was found between the websites of senators based upon their age. Tables 5 and 6 show that more informational content and interactive content was found on the websites of younger senators. Also table 7 shows a difference in the overall analysis of the websites of older and younger senators.

Younger senators websites do seem to have better overall content than

older senators websites. No significant finding was found in audio-visual content based on the age of the senators. Younger people are more aware of the power of information that the Internet provides to the world. Older Senators may be less likely to utilize this medium of information disclosure and less likely to be aware of its potential.

The best developed websites and the least developed websites

The top three websites with the best overall content belong to Senators J. Robert Kerrey, Christopher J. Dodd, and Spencer Abraham. These websites contained up to 11-12 informational items. They had 2-3 interactive items and 5 audio-visual items. Their overall total was 19 items of content.

The most basic websites belonged to Senators Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Richard Lugar, and Chuck Hagel. Senators Campbell and Lugar have only the websites that were made by the senatorial computing center. Senator Hazel's website was at least made by his staff but it was still very basic. The overall total number of items of content in Campbell and Lugar's websites was 5 and Hazel's was 7. The three websites only had 1 audio-visual item and they had no interactive items.

THE MOST BASIC WEBSITES

Republican Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell of Colorado -

www.senate.gov/~campbell/

Republican Senator Richard Lugar of Indiana - www.senate.gov/~lugar/

Republican Senator Chuck Hagel of Nebraska - www.senate.gov/~hagel/

THE BEST DEVELOPED WEBSITES

Democrat Senator J. Robert Kerrey of Nebraska -

www.senate.gov/~kerrey/

Democrat Senator Christopher J. Dodd of Connecticut -

www.senate.gov/~dodd/

Republican Senator Spencer Abraham of Michigan -

www.senate.gov/~abraham/

V. CONCLUSION

In studying cyberpolitics it was interesting to see that like all other new communications mediums, the internet, is slowly being absorbed into the world of politics. This absorption should grow at an exorbitant rate in the future as evidence of by the past few years. The politicians who learn how to utilize the internet well have the potential to benefit greatly from it.

It was interesting to learn through the literature review how the Internet can bring politicians and constituents closer together. Constituents can now keep a closer check on what their politicians are doing and hold them accountable for their actions. Also politicians have an easy way of reaching their constituents without having their information filtered by the media.

According to the research from the literature review the percentage of people utilizing the political Internet websites is still small but it is consistently growing.

The results of this thesis were interesting. It was a great surprise to learn that the anticipated results for party affiliation and region were wrong. Both areas were not expected to show any difference in content, yet the results showed Democrats to have better informational content

and the northern Senators have better audio-visual content. Also, it was believed this study might show a difference in the area of urban and rural states. Since there was no difference between the senators websites based on urban and rural states, urbanity must not have had a significant role in the content of the senatorial websites.

The anticipated results were however correct in the areas of gender and race, length of service, and age. It is very interesting to find that gender and race doesn't appear to influence the content of senatorial websites. In the areas of length of service and age of the senators it shows that the younger and newer senators are more willing to accept the internet as a communications tool. Although this study was far more consuming than anticipated, it was well worth undertaking. It will be interesting to see how important political websites will become in the future of politics.

An electronic democracy is still heavily questioned by skeptics who debate the future impact of it. Meeks points out that, once politicians are elected, the money that keeps them there is from special interest groups. He predicts that in the future things will change; the general public will become empowered via the Internet (Meeks 1997).

People will soon come to realize that the Internet is just another means of communicating information, with its own problems and promises. The important things to note about the Internet are the ability to think and the capacity to use many different kinds of knowledge (Makulowich 1996).

This new technology embodies the ideals of Thomas Jefferson in the nature of effective government. Jefferson is quoted as saying, "It is not by the consolidation, or concentration of powers, but by their distribution, that good government is effected" (Jefferson 1904).

We are still in the very early stage of cyberpolitics, people are in the midst of struggling to make up the rules for what is legitimate for politicians to do on the Internet (Kantrowitz and Rosenberg 1994).

Nevertheless, anything that enhances a sense of connection is considered good especially with such cynicism surrounding politics (Fineman 1997).

"The precincts in cyberspace may be virtual, but the problems in America remain very real" (Fineman 1995).

References

- Berger, Jerry. "Critics of Traditional Media Are Flocking to the Web,"
Editor and Publisher, 30 December 1995, 40.
- Berghel, Hal. "Digital Politics," *Communications of the ACM*, Oct 1996,
19-25.
- Berman, Jerry, and Daniel J. Weitzner. "Technology and Democracy,"
Social Research, Fall 1997, 1313-19.
- Browning, Graeme. "Updating Electronic Democracy," *Database*, June/July
1997, 47-54.
- Carey, John H. "Virtually Kissing Babies?: Net Politics Is Growing, But
It's Not a Potent Grassroots Tool Yet," *Business Week*, 25 March
1996, 70-71.
- Fineman, Howard. "The Brave New World of Cyberspace," *Newsweek*, 27
February 1995, 30-3.
- _____. "Who needs Washington?," *Newsweek*, 27 Jan 1997, 50-52.
- Gelernter, David. "The Internet & American Culture," *National Review*, 28
July 1997, 31-2.
- Hurwitz, Roger., and John C. Mallery. "Of Public Cyberspace: A Survey of
Users and Distributors of Electronic White House Documents," April
1, 1994 [database on-line] available from

<http://www.ai.mit.edu/projects/iip/doc/surveys/report.html>

;Internet; accessed 1 September 1998.

Jacques, Wayne W., and Scott C. Ratzan. "The Internet's World Wide Web and Political Accountability," *American Behavioral Scientist*, August 1997, 1226-37.

Jefferson, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*. Edited by Paul Leicester Ford. Vol. 1, New York: G.P. Putnam's sons, 1904-5.

Kantrowitz, Barbara, and Debra Rosenberg. "Ready Teddy? You're Online," *Newsweek*, 12 September 1994, 60-1.

Kern, Montague. "Social Capital and Citizen Interpretation of Political Ads, News, and Web Site Information in the 1996 Presidential Election," *American Behavioral Scientist*, August 1997, 1238-49.

Makulowich, John S. "Future Trends on the Net," *Online*, January- February 1996, 37-8.

Matloff, Norman S. "Political Networking," *National Review*, 28 July 1997, 37-8.

Media Studies Center. "Digital Democracy: New Media Coverage of the 1996 Campaign," Oct. 4, 1996 [database on-line] available from http://www.freedomforum.org/freedo...ech_future/1049arltranscript.html ;Internet; accessed November 20, 1998.

Meeks, Brock N. "Better Democracy Through Technology," *Communications of the ACM*, Feb 1997, 75-8.

Mundy, Alicia. "Politicians in Cyberspace," *Mediaweek*, 10 July 1995, 20.

Schmitt, Eric. "Congress Remains In Touch On the Web," *New York Times News Service*, 1997.

Willock, Rita Kirk. "Cyber-Politics," *American Behavioral Scientist*, August 1997, 1208-25.

References Not Cited

Cochran, Wendell. "The Boys on the 'Net," *American Journalism Review*, April 1996, 40-2.

Stedman, Craig. "Surfing Surrogate Saves Time: PoliTech Clients Include Candidates, Lobbyists," *Computer World*, 14 July 1997, 41-2.

Table 1
Census Regional Division Map

Table 2
Informational Content based on Political Party

Informational Content based on Length of Service in the Senate

Table 4
Audio-Visual Content based on the Census Reaions

Table 5
interactive Content based on the Age of the Senators

Informational Content based on the Age of the Senators

Table 7
Total Content based on the Age of the Senators

Table 8
Mean, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation of Variables

	Mean	Median	Mode	Std dev	RANGE
Age	59.46	58	56	9.797	40-96
Length of Service	11.79	9.5	1.5	9.559	1-5-43.5
<u>informational</u>	8.98	9	9	1.917	0-14
articles by the senator	0.48	0	0	0.502	0-1
senators biography	0.98	1	1	0.141	0-1
committee information	0.11	0	0	0.314	0-1
committee links	0.84	1	1	0.368	0-1
federal links	0.98	1	1	0.141	0-1
internship information	0.72	1	1	0.451	0-1
legislation information	0.62	1	1	0.488	0-1
media links	0.48	0	0	0.502	0-1
office information	0.99	1	1	0.1	0-1
press releases	0.95	1	1	0.219	0-1
scheduled activities	0.14	0	0	0.349	0-1
speeches	0.61	1	1	0.49	0-1
state links	0.89	1	1	0.314	0-1
state highlights	0.19	0	0	0.394	0-1
<u>interactive</u>	1.23	1	1	0.649	0-7
Constituent Survey of User	0.01	0	0	0.1	0-1
e-mail	0.94	1	1	0.239	0-1
guest book	0.05	0	0	0.219	0-1
issue poll	0.02	0	0	0.141	0-1
internet chat sessions	0.03	0	0	0.171	0-1
opinion poll	0.03	0	0	0.171	0-1
search engine	0.15	0	0	0.359	0-1
<u>audio-visual</u>	2.74	3	2	1.125	0-5
animated graphics	0.43	0	0	0.498	0-1
audio clip	0.35	0	0	0.479	0-1
background	0.75	1	1	0.435	0-1
graphics	1		1	0	0-1
video clip	0.21	0	0	0.409	0-1

	Informational				Interactive				Audio-Visual				Total			
	D.F. Total	F	Ratio	F Prob	D.F. Total	F	Ratio	F Prob	D.F. Total	F	Ratio	F Prob	D.F. Total	F	Ratio	F Prob.
Political Party	99	4.0466	<u>0.047</u>		99	1.2813	0.2604		99	0.231	0.6318		99	3.2574	0.0742	
Gender & Race	99	0.5812	0.4477		99	1.7247	0.1922		99	2.6307	0.108		99	2.1262	0.148	
Region	99	0.5476	0.651		99	2.4165	0.0711		99	2.8615	<u>0.0408</u>		99	1.48 15	0.2244	
Urban & Rural	99	0.1726	0.6787		99	0.5909	0.4439		99	1.5581	0.2149		99	0.1483	0.701	

*note: One Way Analysis of Variance

	Informational				Interactive				Audio-Visual				Total			
	D.F. Total	F	Ratio	F Prob	D.F. Total	F	Ratio	F Prob	D.F. Total	F	Ratio	F Prob	D.F. Total	F	Ratio	F Prob.
SERVICE	100	-0.2019	<u>0.044</u>		100	-0.1574	0.1 18		100	-0.0098	0.923		100	-0.1759	0.08	
AGE	100	-0.2409	<u>0.016</u>		100	-0.2757	<u>0.005</u>		100	-0.1137	0.26		100	-0.2703	<u>0.007</u>	

*note: (Coefficient / (Cases) /2-tailed Significance)

Table 10
List of Informational, Interactive, and Audio-Visual Content Items

<u>Informational</u>	<u>Interactive</u>	<u>Visual</u>
-Legislative Information	-Internet Chat Session	-Background
-Biography	-Issue poll	-Animated Graphics
-Scheduled Activities	-Opinion Poll	-Graphics
-Office Information	-E-mail	Audio Clip
-Speeches	-Constituent Survey of Users	Video clip
-Press Releases		
-Articles by the Senator	-Guest book	
-State Links	-Search Engine	
-Federal Links		
-Media Links		
-Committee Links		
-Committee Information		
-State Highlights		
-Internships		

Table 11
Complete list of data

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	id	party	gender	service	region	urban
1	Abraham, Spencer	1	1	3.5	2	1
2	Akaka, Daniel K.	0	0	7.5	3	1
3	Allard, Wayne -	1	1	1.5	3	1
4	Ashcroft, John -	1	1	3.5	2	0
5	Baucus, Max - Mo	0	1	19.5	3	0
6	Bennett, Bob - U	1	1	5.5	3	1
7	Biden, Joseph -	0	1	25.5	1	1
8	Bingaman, Jeff -	0	1	15.5	3	1
9	Bond, Christophe	1	1	11.5	2	0
10	Boxer, Barbara -	0	1	5.5	3	1
11	Breaux, John - L	0	0	11.5	1	0
12	Brownback, Sam -	1	1	1.5	2	1
13	Bryan, Richard H	0	1	9.5	3	1
14	Bumpers, Dale -	0	1	23.5	1	0
15	Burns, Conrad R.	1	1	9.5	3	0
16	Byrd, Robert C.	0	1	39.5	1	0
17	Campbell, Ben Ni	1	0	5.5	3	1
18	Chafee, John H.	1	1	21.5	0	1
19	Cleland, Max - G	0	1	1.5	1	0
20	Coats, Dan - Ind	1	1	7.5	2	0
21	Cochran, Thad -	1	1	19.5	1	0
22	Collins, Susan -	1	0	1.5	0	0
23	Conrad, Kent - N	0	1	11.5	2	0
24	Coverdell, Paul	1	1	5.5	1	0
25	Craig, Larry E.	1	1	7.5	3	0
26	D'Amato, Alfonse	1	1	17.5	0	1
27	Daschle, Thomas	0	1	11.5	2	0
28	DeWine, Mike - O	1	1	3.5	2	1
29	Dodd, Christophe	0	1	17.5	0	1
30	Domenici, Pete V	1	1	26.5	3	1
31	Dorgan, Byron L.	0	1	5.5	2	0
32	Durbin, Richard	0	1	1.5	2	1
33	Enzi, Mike - Wyo	1	1	1.5	3	0
34	Faircloth, Lauch	1	1	5.5	1	0
35	Feingold, Russel	0	1	5.5	2	0
36	Feinstein, Diann	0	0	5.5	3	1
37	Ford, Wendell H.	0	1	23.5	1	0
38	Frist, William H	1	1	3.5	1	0
39	Glenn, John - Oh	0	1	23.5	2	1
40	Gorton, Slade -	1	1	17.5	3	1
41	Graham, Bob - Fl	0	1	11.5	1	1
42	Gramm, Phil - Te	1	1	13.5	3	1
43	Grams, Rod - Min	1	1	3.5	2	1
44	Grassley, Charle	1	1	17.5	2	0
45	Gregg, Judd - Ne	1	1	5.5	0	0
46	Hagel, Chuck - N	1	1	1.5	2	0
47	Harkin, Tom - Io	0	1	13.5	2	0
48	Hatch, Orrin G.	1	1	21.5	3	1
49	Helms, Jesse - N	1	1	26.5	1	0
50	Hollings, Ernest	0	1	31.5	1	0
51	Hutchinson, Tim	1	1	1.5	1	0
52	Hutchison, Kay B	1	0	4.5	3	1
53	Inhofe, James M.	1	1	3.5	1	0
54	Inouye, Daniel K	0	0	35.5	3	1
55	Jeffords, James	1	1	9.5	0	0

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	metro	birth	age	bio	leginfo	schedact	office
1	70.5	1952	46	1	1	1	1
2	89.0	1924	74	1	1	0	1
3	82.4	1943	55	1	0	1	1
4	68.7	1942	56	1	1	0	1
5	52.5	1941	57	1	0	0	1
6	87.0	1933	65	1	0	1	1
7	73.0	1942	56	1	0	0	1
8	73.0	1943	55	1	1	0	1
9	68.7	1939	59	1	0	0	1
10	92.6	1940	58	1	1	0	1
11	68.1	1944	54	1	1	0	1
12	69.1	1956	42	1	1	0	1
13	88.3	1937	61	1	0	0	1
14	53.5	1925	73	1	1	0	1
15	52.5	1935	63	1	1	1	1
16	36.1	1917	81	1	1	0	1
17	82.4	1933	65	1	0	0	1
18	86.0	1922	76	1	1	0	1
19	63.2	1942	56	1	1	0	1
20	64.9	1943	55	1	1	0	1
21	47.1	1937	61	1	0	0	1
22	44.6	1952	46	1	0	0	0
23	53.3	1948	50	1	1	0	1
24	63.2	1939	59	1	1	0	1
25	57.4	1945	53	1	1	0	1
26	84.3	1937	61	1	0	0	1
27	50.0	1947	51	1	1	0	1
28	74.1	1947	51	1	0	0	1
29	79.1	1944	54	1	1	1	1
30	73.0	1932	66	1	0	0	1
31	53.3	1942	56	1	0	0	1
32	84.6	1944	54	1	1	0	1
33	65.0	1944	54	1	1	0	1
34	50.4	1928	70	1	1	0	1
35	65.7	1953	45	1	1	1	1
36	92.6	1933	65	1	1	0	1
37	51.8	1924	74	1	0	0	1
38	60.9	1952	46	1	1	1	1
39	74.1	1921	77	1	1	0	1
40	76.4	1928	70	1	0	0	1
41	84.8	1936	62	1	1	0	1
42	80.3	1942	56	1	1	0	1
43	69.9	1948	50	1	1	1	1
44	60.6	1933	65	1	1	0	1
45	51.0	1947	51	1	0	0	1
46	66.1	1946	52	1	0	0	1
47	60.6	1939	59	1	0	0	1
48	87.0	1934	64	1	1	0	1
49	50.4	1921	77	1	0	0	1
50	54.6	1922	76	1	1	0	1
51	53.5	1949	49	1	1	0	1
52	80.3	1943	55	1	0	0	1
53	67.7	1934	64	1	0	0	1
54	89.0	1924	74	1	0	0	1
55	32.2	1934	64	1	1	0	1

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	speeches	pr	articles	statelx	fedlx	medialx	commlx
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
2	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
4	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
6	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
7	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
8	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
9	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
10	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
11	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
13	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
14	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
15	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
18	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
19	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
20	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
21	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
22	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
23	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
24	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
25	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
26	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
27	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
28	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
29	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
30	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
31	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
32	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
33	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
34	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
35	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
36	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
37	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
38	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
39	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
41	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
42	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
43	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
44	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
45	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
46	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
47	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
48	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
49	1	0	0	1	1	1	0
50	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
51	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
52	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
53	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
54	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
55	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	comminfo	sthhigh	constit	guestbk	intern	netchat	oppoll
1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
4	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
14	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
15	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
22	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
25	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
26	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
27	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
28	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
29	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
30	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
31	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
32	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
33	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
36	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
37	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
38	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
41	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
44	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
45	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
49	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
50	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
51	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
52	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
53	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
54	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
55	0	1	0	0	1	0	0

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	ispoll	email	search	backgd	animgif	gifs	audio
1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
3	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
4	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
5	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
6	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
7	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
8	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
9	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
10	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
11	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
12	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
13	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
14	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
15	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
16	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
18	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
19	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
20	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
21	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
22	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
23	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
24	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
25	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
26	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
27	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
28	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
29	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
30	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
31	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
32	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
33	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
34	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
35	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
36	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
37	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
38	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
39	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
40	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
41	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
42	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
43	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
44	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
45	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
46	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
47	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
48	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
49	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
50	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
51	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
52	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
53	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
54	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
55	0	1	0	1	1	1	1

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	video	viewed	inform	audiovis	interact	total
1	1	07/09/98	11	5	3	19
2	0	07/27/98	10	2	0	12
3	0	07/09/98	12	3	2	17
4	0	07/09/98	11	2	3	16
5	0	07/10/98	9	4	1	14
6	0	07/10/98	11	1	1	13
7	0	07/10/98	8	2	1	11
8	0	07/27/98	10	1	2	13
9	0	07/27/98	6	2	1	9
10	0	07/27/98	10	2	1	13
11	1	07/27/98	10	3	1	14
12	0	07/28/98	7	2	1	10
13	0	07/28/98	8	3	1	12
14	0	07/28/98	10	4	1	15
15	1	07/28/98	11	4	2	17
16	0	07/29/98	11	3	1	15
17	0	07/29/98	4	1	0	5
18	0	07/29/98	9	3	1	13
19	0	07/29/98	10	2	1	13
20	0	07/29/98	7	1	0	8
21	0	07/30/98	7	2	1	10
22	0	07/31/98	7	3	1	11
23	0	07/31/98	6	2	1	9
24	0	07/31/98	7	4	1	12
25	0	07/31/98	12	1	2	15
26	0	07/31/98	8	4	1	13
27	0	07/31/98	9	3	2	14
28	0	07/31/98	8	3	1	12
29	1	08/02/98	12	5	2	19
30	0	08/02/98	5	2	1	8
31	1	08/03/98	9	5	3	17
32	0	08/03/98	7	1	1	9
33	0	08/03/98	9	3	1	13
34	0	08/03/98	7	3	1	11
35	0	08/03/98	10	2	1	13
36	0	08/03/98	9	2	1	12
37	0	08/03/98	8	3	1	12
38	1	08/03/98	12	4	2	18
39	0	08/03/98	9	2	1	12
40	0	08/03/98	11	2	1	14
41	0	08/03/98	10	2	1	13
42	0	08/04/98	8	2	0	10
43	0	08/04/98	12	2	1	15
44	0	08/04/98	9	4	2	15
45	0	08/04/98	8	4	4	16
46	0	08/06/98	5	1	1	7
47	0	08/06/98	6	2	1	9
48	0	08/06/98	10	2	1	13
49	0	08/06/98	7	2	1	10
50	0	08/06/98	8	2	1	11
51	0	08/04/98	10	3	2	15
52	0	08/06/98	8	3	1	12
53	0	08/06/98	9	2	1	12
54	0	08/04/98	7	2	2	11
55	1	08/06/98	12	5	1	18

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	id	party	gender	service	region	urban
56	Johnson, Tim - S	0	1	1.5	2	0
57	Kemphorne, Dirk	1	1	5.5	3	0
58	Kennedy, Edward	0	1	35.5	0	1
59	Kerrey, J. Rober	0	1	9.5	2	0
60	Kerry, John F. -	0	1	13.5	0	1
61	Kohl, Herb - Wis	0	1	9.5	2	0
62	Kyl, Jon - Arizo	1	1	3.5	3	1
63	Landrieu, Mary -	0	0	1.5	1	0
64	Lautenberg, Fran	0	1	15.5	0	1
65	Leahy, Patrick J	0	1	23.5	0	0
66	Levin, Carl - Mi	0	1	19.5	2	1
67	Lieberman, Josep	0	1	9.5	0	1
68	Lott, Trent - Mi	1	1	9.5	1	0
69	Lugar, Richard -	1	1	21.5	2	0
70	Mack, Connie - F	1	1	9.5	1	1
71	McCain, John - A	1	1	11.5	3	1
72	McConnell, Mitch	1	1	13.5	1	0
73	Mikulski, Barbar	0	0	11.5	1	1
74	Moseley-Braun, C	0	0	5.5	2	1
75	Movnihan, Daniel	0	1	21.5	0	1
76	Murkowski, Frank	1	1	17.5	3	0
77	Murray, Patty -	0	0	5.5	3	1
78	Nickels, Don - O	1	1	17.5	1	0
79	Reed, Jack - Rho	0	1	1.5	0	1
80	Reid, Harry - Ne	0	1	11.5	3	1
81	Robb, Charles S.	0	1	9.5	1	1
82	Roberts, Pat - K	1	1	1.5	2	1
83	Rockefeller IV,	0	1	13.5	1	0
84	Roth Jr., Willia	1	1	27.5	1	1
85	Santorum, Rick -	1	1	3.5	0	1
86	Sarbanes, Paul S	0	1	21.5	1	1
87	Sessions, Jeff -	1	1	1.5	1	0
88	Shelby, Richard	1	1	11.5	1	0
89	Smith, Bob - New	1	1	7.5	0	0
90	Smith, Gordon -	1	1	1.5	3	1
91	Snowe, Olympia J	1	0	3.5	0	0
92	Specter, Arlen -	1	1	17.5	0	1
93	Stevens, Ted - A	1	1	27.5	3	0
94	Thomas, Craig -	1	1	3.5	3	0
95	Thompson, Fred -	1	1	3.5	1	0
96	Thurmond, Storm	1	1	43.5	1	0
97	Torricelli, Robe	0	1	1.5	0	1
98	Warner, John W.	1	1	19.5	1	1
99	Wellstone, Paul	0	1	7.5	2	1
100	Wyden, Ron - Ore	0	1	1.5	3	1

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	metro	birth	age	bio	leginfo	schedact	office
56	50.0	1946	52	1	0	1	1
57	57.4	1951	47	1	1	0	1
58	84.3	1932	66	1	1	0	1
59	66.1	1943	55	1	1	0	1
60	84.3	1943	55	1	1	0	1
61	65.7	1935	63	1	1	0	1
62	87.5	1942	56	1	1	0	1
63	68.1	1955	43	1	1	1	1
64	89.4	1924	74	1	1	0	1
65	32.2	1940	58	1	1	0	1
66	70.5	1934	64	1	1	0	1
67	79.1	1942	56	1	1	0	1
68	47.1	1941	57	1	1	1	1
69	64.9	1932	66	1	0	0	1
70	84.8	1940	58	1	1	0	1
71	87.5	1936	62	1	1	0	1
72	51.8	1942	56	1	0	1	1
73	81.3	1936	62	1	1	0	1
74	84.6	1947	51	1	1	0	1
75	84.3	1927	71	1	1	0	1
76	67.5	1933	65	0	1	0	1
77	76.4	1950	48	1	1	0	1
78	67.7	1948	50	1	1	1	1
79	86.0	1949	49	1	0	0	1
80	88.3	1939	59	1	1	0	1
81	69.4	1939	59	1	1	0	1
82	69.1	1936	62	1	0	0	1
83	36.1	1937	61	1	1	0	1
84	73.0	1921	77	1	0	0	1
85	68.9	1958	40	1	0	0	1
86	81.3	1933	65	1	0	0	1
87	60.4	1946	52	1	0	0	1
88	60.4	1934	64	1	0	0	1
89	51.0	1941	57	1	0	0	1
90	70.5	1952	46	1	1	0	1
91	44.6	1947	51	1	1	0	1
92	68.9	1930	68	1	0	0	1
93	67.5	1923	75	1	0	0	1
94	65.0	1933	65	1	1	0	1
95	60.9	1942	56	1	1	0	1
96	54.6	1902	96	0	0	0	1
97	89.4	1951	47	1	1	0	1
98	69.4	1927	71	1	0	0	1
99	69.9	1944	54	1	0	0	1
100	70.5	1949	49	1	1	1	1

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	speeches	pr	articles	statelx	fedlx	medialx	comm1x
56	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
57	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
58	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
59	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
60	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
61	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
62	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
63	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
64	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
65	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
66	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
67	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
68	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
69	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
70	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
71	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
72	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
73	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
74	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
75	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
76	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
77	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
78	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
79	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
80	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
81	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
82	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
83	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
84	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
85	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
86	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
87	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
88	1	1	1	0	1	0	1
89	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
90	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
91	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
92	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
93	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
94	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
95	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
96	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
97	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
98	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
99	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
100	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	comminfo	sthhigh	constit	guestbk	intern	netchat	oppoll
56	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
57	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
58	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
59	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
60	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
61	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
63	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
64	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
65	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
66	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
67	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
68	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
70	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
71	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
72	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
74	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
75	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
77	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
78	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
79	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
81	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
82	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
83	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
85	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
86	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
87	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
89	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
90	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
91	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
92	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
93	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
95	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
96	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
98	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
99	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
100	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	ispoll	email	search	backgd	animgif	gifs	audio
56	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
57	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
58	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
59	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
60	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
61	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
62	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
63	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
64	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
65	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
66	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
67	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
68	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
69	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
70	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
71	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
72	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
73	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
74	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
75	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
76	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
77	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
78	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
79	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
80	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
81	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
82	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
83	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
84	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
85	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
86	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
87	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
88	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
89	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
90	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
91	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
92	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
93	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
94	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
95	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
96	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
97	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
98	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
99	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
100	0	1	0	0	0	1	0

SPSS stuff:senate stuff:the Stuff:Defence Data

	video	viewed	inform	audiovis	interact	total
56	0	08/06/98	9	2	1	12
57	1	08/06/98	7	4	1	12
58	1	08/06/98	9	5	2	16
59	1	08/06/98	12	5	2	19
60	0	08/06/98	11	2	1	14
61	0	08/07/98	12	2	1	15
62	0	08/07/98	9	3	1	13
63	0	08/07/98	12	1	2	15
64	0	08/07/98	8	3	2	13
65	1	08/07/98	11	4	2	17
66	0	08/07/98	10	2	1	13
67	1	08/07/98	11	3	2	16
68	1	08/07/98	9	4	1	14
69	0	08/07/98	4	1	0	5
70	0	08/07/98	9	3	1	13
71	1	08/07/98	10	3	1	14
72	1	08/07/98	11	5	1	17
73	0	08/07/98	7	2	1	10
74	0	08/07/98	9	2	1	12
75	0	08/07/98	9	2	1	12
76	0	08/07/98	7	3	1	11
77	1	08/08/98	11	3	1	15
78	0	08/08/98	11	3	1	15
79	1	08/08/98	10	5	2	17
80	1	08/09/98	9	5	1	15
81	1	08/09/98	11	4	2	17
82	0	08/09/98	8	3	1	12
83	1	08/09/98	11	4	1	16
84	0	08/09/98	9	2	1	12
85	0	08/09/98	9	2	1	12
86	0	08/09/98	7	3	1	11
87	0	08/09/98	10	3	1	14
88	0	08/10/98	7	2	1	10
89	0	08/10/98	8	2	1	11
90	0	08/10/98	10	3	1	14
91	0	08/10/98	9	3	1	13
92	0	08/10/98	7	2	1	10
93	0	08/10/98	7	3	1	11
94	1	08/10/98	9	4	2	15
95	0	08/10/98	11	2	1	14
96	0	08/10/98	6	2	0	8
97	0	08/10/98	7	4	2	13
98	0	08/10/98	8	1	1	10
99	0	08/10/98	9	3	1	13
100	0	08/10/98	12	1	1	14