

**Online Action in Campaign 2000:  
An Exploratory Analysis of the U.S. Political Web Sphere**

Kirsten A. Foot  
University of Washington  
School of Communications  
Box 353740  
Seattle, WA 98195-0001  
(206) 543-2660  
[kfoot@u.washington.edu](mailto:kfoot@u.washington.edu)

Steven M. Schneider  
SUNY Institute of Technology  
School of Arts & Sciences  
Utica, NY 13504-3050  
(315) 792-7331  
[steve@sunyit.edu](mailto:steve@sunyit.edu)

**Copyright 2002, Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media.**

Acknowledgements:

This study was supported by the Pew Charitable Trusts and conducted at the Annenberg Public Policy Center, University of Pennsylvania during the authors' tenure as Research Fellows in the Information and Society Program. An earlier version of this paper was presented at "Campaigning on the Net," 2<sup>nd</sup> International Colloquium, Institut d'Etudes Politiques, Strasbourg, France, March 2001.

Author bios:

**Kirsten A. Foot** (Ph.D. University of California, San Diego) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication, University of Washington. **Steven M. Schneider** (Ph.D. Massachusetts Institute of Technology) is an Associate Professor of Political Science at the SUNY Institute of Technology. Together they co-direct WebArchivist.org, a research group that seeks to enhance archiving and indexing of specialized collections of Web materials, facilitate scholarly analyses, and develop sense-making tools for individuals using digital archives.

## **Online Action in Campaign 2000: An Exploratory Analysis of the Political Web**

### **Abstract**

**This study examines the nature of political action on and between election-oriented Web sites during the 2000 election season in the United States, based on Web files and interviews with political Web producers. Our analysis focuses on 3 facets of online action: coproduction, carnival, and mobilization. We suggest these portend an evolution of political communication, and we point to ways in which the 2000 political Web re-shaped the U.S. electoral process. Through this paper we seek to contribute to both the emerging literature on Web studies in general and on the impact of the Internet on electoral politics.**

The current trend in both popular and scholarly discourse is to downplay, if not reject outright, the revolutionary impact of the Internet on democracy. This argument suggests that politics on the Internet resembles closely politics offline— and that what happens online is inconsequential since there is no clear evidence yet of it affecting election outcomes. What has been called the “normalization” hypothesis (Margolis & Resnick 2000) seems to be reinforced by the failure of commercial models of Web-based political information distribution in the United States during the 2000 election campaign.

This view, it seems to us, mistakes the lack – to date – of election outcome evidence for a lack of significant impact. A focus on the apparent lack of impact of the Web on voting behavior may overlook the fundamental changes in the campaign process, and thus the political system manifested in the thousands of political Web sites – and the links between them – that surfaced during the 2000 election season. We suggest that analyzing what political actors actually do on the Web reveals a rapidly evolving political system. In this article, we identify and characterize three facets of online political action – carnival, coproduction, and mobilization – and present examples of from Web materials produced during the 2000 elections. These three dimensions of action by no means comprise an exhaustive list of all types of online action. For instance, the increasing use of the Web for political information and persuasion, already relatively well documented (see for example Davis & Owen, 1998; Davis, 1999; Klinenberg & Perrin, 2000), is not dealt with directly in this analysis. Nor are these categories mutually exclusive. For example, the evidence discussed below suggests that carnival can be coproduced on and across sites, and that mobilization is sometimes embedded in carnival. However, we suggest these three action dimensions illuminate critical developments that are apparent across genres of political sites, allowing us to see more clearly the evolutionary impact of the Internet on the political system.

In this paper, we review the available literature pertaining to the relationship between the Internet and American politics. We then describe the multimethod approach we developed to identify and examine forms of political action on the Web, which we term *Web sphere analysis*. We describe and theorize three action dimensions and provide exemplars of the ways they were apparent on the Web during the 2000 campaign. We conclude by suggesting that a close examination of these action dimensions in the 2000 political Web sphere reveals several developments that may have significant, long-term implications for electoral politics, including novel forms of cooperation between rival actors, enhanced means of large-scale citizen mobilization, shifts in campaign practices, and the establishment of the Web (distinct from other Internet applications) as a robust dimension of the U.S. public sphere.

### **The Internet and U.S. politics**

Where did the “political Web” come from? To properly situate the political Web sphere in the context of the 2000 campaign, we review the relatively brief history of politics on the Internet. As outlined in numerous sources, the history of the Internet begins with the advent of the ARPANET in the United States in the mid 1960s. The first overtly political uses of the Internet are usually traced back to Usenet, which was first introduced in 1979. By 1986, communities with explicit political agendas had adopted e-mail and bulletin board systems and were using these Internet applications intensively. These communities – such as The Well, Cleveland FreeNet, PeaceNet, EcoNet, GreenNet

– facilitated communication and organization among political activists throughout the world, perhaps reaching a peak level of activity with mobilization efforts surrounding the Chinese student uprising in 1989 and the Persian Gulf War in 1991-1992 (see Frederick, 1993). The dominant conclusion of both users and contemporaneous scholars was that computer networking technology had the potential to dramatically alter the nature and shape of political discourse, and of democracy itself, by engaging and energizing new participants in the political process (Abramson, Arterton, & Orren, 1988; Downing, 1989; Dulio, Goff, & Thurber, 1999; Garramone, Harris, & Rizante, 1986; Glass, 1996; Groper, 1996; Hacker, Lowl, Scott, & Steiner, 1996; Margolis & Resnick, 2000; Meadow, 1986; Mickunas & Pilotta, 1998; Myers, 1993; O'Sullivan, 1995; Schneider, 1996).

Margolis and Resnick (2000) identify an optimistic strand in the literature on computer-mediated communication that suggests that the Internet would democratize politics by fostering greater participation, encouraging new parties and interests groups, and leveling the playing field among system participants. While this optimism has been present since some of the earliest discussions of using “information utilities” for political purposes (Leonard, Etzioni, Hornstein, & Abrams, 1971; Sheridan, 1971; Stevens, 1971), it has also been tempered – from the earliest days – by a more pragmatic approach. Parker (1972, p. 93), in one of the earlier papers exploring these topics, warns that “technology advanced in the name of participatory democracy, especially on-line polling and voting, is more likely to concentrate than redistribute political power.” This is certainly the argument advanced Margolis and Resnick (2000), who reject the “cyberspace revolution” hypothesis in favor of a “normalization of politics” perspective. And Bonchek (1995) tempers enthusiasm with realism when he argues that computer mediated communication “facilitates collective action by reducing transaction costs related to group organization.” At the same time, he notes the relatively high transaction costs associated with using computer networks, and he cautions that access to computer networks is not equitably distributed across different social and economic groups. Warnick (1998) pointed out that the parodic uses of the Web during campaigns may actually increase public cynicism about the political process. However, her more recent work, (Warnick, 2001) reflects a shift toward the view that the Web may serve to re-engage many citizens who might otherwise be disinterested in politics—particularly younger people and those attracted to political humor.

By the 1996 and 1998 campaigns, Internet-based politics had moved from the arcane and utopian, (Diamond, McKay, & Silverman, 1993; Hacker, Lowl, Scott, & Steiner, 1996; Myers, 1993), to the mainstream and *Realpolitik*, (Bimber, 1998; Bucy, D'Angelo, & Newhagen, 1999; Bystrom, 1998; D'Alessio, 1997, 2000; Davis, 1999; Dulio, Goff, & Thurber, 1999; Johnson, Braima, & Sothirajah, 1999; Kamarck, 1999, 2000; Klotz, 1998; Margolis, Resnick, & Tu, 1997; Tedesco, Miller, & Spiker, 1999; Whillock, 1998). Early studies of the Web in the 2000 campaigns continue in the same vein (Benoit & Benoit, 2000; Hansen, 2000; Sillaman, 2000). One analysis of the political Web in the 1996 U.S. elections focused on features available to Web users, and found that 75% of the candidate sites examined used interactive features, such as e-mail addresses, on their sites (Davis, 1999). None of the candidates, however, used the Internet to have public discussions with citizens; all chose which e-mail messages to respond to (Klinenberg & Perrin, 2000; Stromer-Galley, 2000). Kamarck (1999) offers a large-scale analysis of campaign site content for the 1998 senatorial and gubernatorial races. She

finds that most sites provided what has been termed “brochure-ware,” more or less pamphlets transformed into on-line form, providing candidate histories and issue positions. Few candidates used their sites in 1998 to attack opponents, or to direct visitors to related sites. And surprisingly, although a majority of sites solicited volunteer help, only a small number solicited on-line donations. Harpham (1999) confirms several of Kamarck's findings, also noting that 49% of sites contained endorsements from outside individuals or groups and that half failed to identify the candidate by party. Similarly, Dulio (1999) found that more than two thirds of Senate and House candidates had sites in 1998, and that nearly one third accepted online contributions.

The “normalization” of politics on the Internet is further evidenced by the increasing dominance of major party Web sites relative to minor party Web sites (Margolis & Resnick, 2000). Citing data presented in Mann (1995), the proportion of political party Web sites identified by the Yahoo! guide as affiliated with one of the major parties jumped from less than half in 1994 to more than 70% in 1998; minor party sites have been outnumbered since 1996 (Margolis & Resnick, 2000). This development is attributed to the resource advantage enjoyed by the major parties. These figures demonstrate that the Web has become a realm in which most campaigns and political parties find it necessary to have some kind of a presence – although what that presence should entail and how it should be enacted is still ambiguous to many of these actors.

The studies cited above, although helpful in many regards, focus almost exclusively on sites produced by campaigns and political parties. Although we expect to see publications examining Web-based activity by other actors in the 2000 campaign in the near future, we have not found any other analysis of political action across sites produced by different types of political actors. Our focus in this article is on three key forms of political action manifested in and across many kinds of Web sites, particularly through hyperlinks. We developed Web sphere analysis to move toward greater understanding of the political Web as a constantly evolving, networked sphere, rather than simply a collection of individual Web sites, (Schneider, Harnett, & Foot, 2001).

### **Studying the 2000 Political Web Sphere**

We conceptualize a Web sphere not simply as a collection of Web sites, but as a hyperlinked set of dynamically defined digital resources spanning multiple Web sites deemed relevant or related to a central theme or “object.” The boundaries of a Web sphere are delimited by a shared object-orientation and a temporal framework. To conduct this exploratory study of cross-site action on the political Web, we developed the notion of Web sphere analysis as an analytic strategy that includes relations between producers and users of Web materials, as potentiated and mediated by the structural and feature elements of Web sites, hypertexts, and the links between them.

The most crucial element in this definition of Web sphere is the dynamic nature of the sites to be included. This dynamism comes from two sources. First, the researchers involved in identifying the boundaries of the sphere are likely to continuously find new sites to be included within it. Second, as will be discussed below, the notion of defining a Web sphere is recursive in that pages that are referenced by other included sites as well as pages that reference included sites are considered as part of the sphere under evaluation. Thus, as a Web sphere is archived and analyzed over time, its boundaries are dynamically

shaped by both the researchers' identification strategies and changes in the sites themselves.

Our goals in this study were to discover emergent dimensions of online action, and to trace the relationships between them as the political Web was developing during the 2000 election season in the United States. Working with several teams of research assistants, we employed three inter-related methods of data collection on the political Web sphere between July and December, 2000: archiving, annotating, and interviewing. To support these data collection methods, we developed a suite of Web tools, which we have elaborated elsewhere (Schneider, Harnett, & Foot, 2001). Our approach draws on methods of multi-site ethnography described by Marcus (1998), and reflects our aim of developing a grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) of the role of the Web in the U.S. electoral process.

Our data collection efforts first began by identifying and archiving Web materials pertinent to the 2000 elections. Our objective was to identify as many Web sites with election-oriented content as possible. We used standard Web indexes to locate sites produced by federal candidates, national and state party organizations, national and state advocacy groups, civic organizations, mainstream, and alternative press outlets. We followed links on these sites to find additional sites, including those produced by individual citizens. This was an ongoing process over 6 months as we continued to identify new Web sites throughout the election season (and, indeed, for several weeks following Election Day as well). We collected periodic (daily, weekly, or monthly) "snapshots" of these sites, preserving relevant links within and among the sites and preserving the sites in time.

Second, we browsed the identified political Web daily for 6 months, noting unusual features, links, and various forms of political action on the election-oriented sites. Our written observations were recorded and stored in our database in the form of notes indexed to the original Web page to which they referred. These Web notes served as ethnographic field notes for us – firsthand accounts of our own experience of the political Web – what sites, features, content, links, and path options we found, how we found them, and what political actions they enabled us as citizen-researchers to pursue or constrained us from pursuing.

Third, we interviewed a wide range of election-oriented Web site producers, both individually and in groups. Our respondents included producers of campaign sites as well as producers of election-oriented sections on press, portal, civic and advocacy group sites. We followed a semi-structured approach in the interviews, employing an agenda of open-ended questions but also adapting to the expertise and interest areas of our respondents. Transcripts of the interviews enabled us to learn about and compare site producers' aims, concerns, and views on the production of the political Web.

To summarize our data corpus, we archived almost 1 million unique Web pages, culled from nearly 5,000 different Web sites. The archived sites included about 750 candidate Web sites, 100 civic and advocacy group sites, 50 press sites, and 15 portal sites, each of which was visited and annotated at least once by one or more members of our research team. In addition, we interviewed nearly 50 political Web site producers, representing a range of site genres. The analysis we present in this essay draws upon archive, annotation, and interview data, but it does not report comprehensively on any of

them. Findings from our interview data, in particular, are reported only minimally in this essay due to space constraints.

In our analysis of the political Web, we distinguished among five elements, each of which is employed as a unit of analysis in this study. These elements are a link, a Web page, a Web site, a Web presence, and a Web phenomenon. Links, pages, and sites are common terms – and so are rarely defined explicitly. In our usage, a link is a traversable connector between two URLs. The components of a link are the linked-from URL, the linked-to URL, the text or image representing the link on a Web page, and the date the link was traversed. A Web page is the set of files required by a Web browser to completely display a URL that points to an html file. We operationalized a Web site as a collection of Web pages sharing a common “base URL” and residing on a server, or servers, controlled by the same entity or organization. This definition of a Web site allows the researcher to designate the base URL or home page; this designation may or may not correspond to the site producer’s definition of the home page. A Web site may contain links to pages on other sites, but by this definition those pages would not be considered part of this unit of analysis. It is important to remember that each Web page, and thus a Web site, is rendered for a particular user using a particular computer and browser at a particular time.

We use the term *Web presence* to signify the collection of sites produced and/or controlled by a single entity or organization, a usage consistent with Klinenberg and Perrin’s (2000). For example, in the 2000 election season, political party committees such as the Democratic National Committee (DNC) produced several Web sites, each with a different purpose or targeting a different audience. Thus, the Web presence of the DNC during the election season included [Democrats.org](http://Democrats.org), [1-800thefacts.com](http://1-800thefacts.com), and [iknowwhatyoudidintexas.com](http://iknowwhatyoudidintexas.com), among others. All three sites were clearly labeled “Paid for by the Democratic National Committee” but had separate base URLs and were not necessarily cross-linked. Thus, they were separate sites but part of the same Web presence.

Our final unit of analysis, a Web phenomenon, signifies an event or type of action on the Web that involves multiple actors and multiple sites over time, perhaps through some form of linking. The cross-site Web action regarding the Louise Woodward court case reported by Hine (2000) is an example of a Web phenomenon. Another example would be two candidates engaging in dueling press releases or debates on their respective Web sites. To illustrate further, a Web phenomenon occurred in the U.S. election Web sphere after the site producer of a Washington U.S. Senate candidate, Maria Cantwell, created a link on her site to a photo of her opponent, Slade Gorton, which was displayed on Gorton's campaign site. On the Cantwell site, the linked photo of Gorton posing with a large, fake fish was framed with text that conveyed a much different message than the text frame on the Gorton site. The link and reframing became the source of much controversy, both online and off. Over the course of several days, a Web phenomenon developed as actors representing both of the campaigns, the press, advocacy groups, and individual citizens posted their views regarding the fish photo controversy on pages across a range of Web sites. Many of these pages were linked to each other and the fish photo as it appeared on the two campaign sites. In this way, the fish photo controversy became a Web phenomenon.<sup>1</sup>

## **Online Action**

We view all five elements described above as inscriptions or instantiations of communicative and potentially political action. As we examined our Web data, we looked for patterns in and across these elements. Our repeated and close “readings” of these elements in the 2000 political Web sphere were guided primarily by the question “Of what form of action is this a case?” In the remainder of the paper, we identify and examine three facets of online action that emerged from our analysis – coproduction, carnival, and mobilization. These dimensions of action are conceptual building blocks toward a grounded theory of Web-based political action during the 2000 election. We describe each of these action dimensions as they emerged in our analysis, exemplifying them from our Web data corpus. We then discuss the implications that each action dimension carries for the electoral process, and conclude by pointing to the systemic changes we believe have been set in motion by the 2000 political Web.

### **Coproduction**

The basic definition of coproduction is to produce jointly. We use this term to denote the joint production of Web-accessible digital materials by disparate actors. Our notion of coproduction on the Web as a form of political action draws upon the insights of Hutchins (1995) on the distributed nature of cognition – and thus production – in many realms, and builds upon current research on collective, distributed work processes (e.g., Middleton & Engestrom, 1996). It is conceptually similar to the notion of distributed construction that Boczkowski (2000) developed in his analysis of the digitalization of news production. In this regard, the duality of Web production and consumption must be emphasized. All political actors – ordinary citizens as well as political professionals – who venture into political Web space are not only users but also potential producers. Conversely, the professional producers of the political Web materials are simultaneously users or consumers of the political Web, as our interviews revealed consistently. We suggest that coproduction of the political Web in 2000 occurred between political actors, including citizens, candidates, journalists, advocacy and civic groups, and for-profit Internet entrepreneurs, in four distinct ways: in the production of features, in the production of sites, across Internet applications, and through links.

First, multiple actors coproduced features on a variety of sites. The “Campaign Watchdog” feature that appeared on ABCNEWS.com a few days before the general election illustrates this kind of coproduction.<sup>2</sup> The new feature on the press site was introduced with the headline “Help ABCNEWS Patrol the Campaign Trail” and the following appeal for citizen reports:

ABCNEWS needs YOU to help us monitor the most extreme efforts to win elections, from the White House right down to your statehouse. The candidates, parties and their supporters are throwing everything they can find at their rivals to win your vote. Are they crossing the line? Right up until the polls close, send us tips about questionable e-mail, phone calls, advertisements, fliers and activities on the streets and at the polling places.

An e-mail form with text boxes requesting the reader's name, e-mail address and phone number was provided on the page for readers to submit their requests to be contacted by ABCNews.com to file a report, and anonymity was assured. Over the next week, a series of campaign “shenanigans” reports were posted under the Campaign Watchdog feature.



These reports appeared to have been initiated by individual citizen Web users in e-mail responses to the Campaign Watchdog invitation, then verified and written up by ABCNews.com reporters. In this way, Campaign Watchdog exemplified feature coproduction on the political Web.

Another example of coproduction of site features included the ability for site visitors to compare their own views to those of selected candidates. For example, AOL.com offered a “presidential selector” feature in which respondents indicated their positions on a large number of issues, and, upon completion, were presented with an analysis identifying their issue proximity to presidential candidates.<sup>3</sup> On the site produced by Jean Elliot Brown, a candidate for the U.S. House from Florida, site visitors were able to indicate their positions on a number of issues. Upon completing the mini survey, the site indicated the similarities and differences between the respondent's issue position and those of both Brown and her opponent in the race.<sup>4</sup>

Multi-actor coproduction was apparent not just in the production of individual features, but also in whole sites as well. A prime example of this second mode of coproduction was the Web White & Blue 2000 site, which featured the first online presidential debate in U.S. history.<sup>5</sup> The production of this “rolling cyber debate” involved six presidential campaigns and a variety of nonprofit civic groups. The coproduced site was updated daily; it also functioned simultaneously as a coproduced feature syndicated to the sites of 17 press organizations and Internet portal companies. The coproduction of Web White & Blue illustrates one of the most novel forms of action online: cooperation between competing actors, both among rival political campaigns and competing commercial news agencies, as well as between nonprofit and for-profit entities.

The third form of coproduction we observed occurred across Internet applications. By this we mean that election-oriented Web pages were linked to e-mail, bulletin board, and chat applications. This kind of coproduction can be illustrated through the cross-application cooperation of a civic group called Minnesota E-Democracy and a commercial e-mail list host portal called Egroups (which has since merged with Yahoo!). The e-mail discussion lists affiliated with Minnesota E-Democracy are among the largest and most active state-level political mailing lists in the US. At the time of this study, subscriptions were solicited through the organization's Web site, and several list options were described with corresponding links entitled “Join <listname>.”<sup>6</sup> Each of the “Join” links resolved to a list subscription form on the Egroups discussion forum site.<sup>7</sup> Egroups employed several different Internet applications in its business of hosting e-mail lists and discussion boards. The use of Egroups mailing list service by Minnesota E-Democracy, and in particular the links from the E-Democracy Web site to the EGroups mailing lists, illustrates one way in which the political Web was coproduced not only between actors but also across applications.

A fourth way in which the political Web was coproduced was through links. For example, the Speakout.com site, a for-profit political portal, demonstrated this form of coproduction by providing links to dozens of issue advocacy group sites.<sup>8</sup> These links enabled visitors to get more information about the particular issues of concern to them from a range of perspectives, and in so doing, contributed to the coproduction of the political Web. This form of coproduction is the most familiar to Web users.

However, it should be noted that conceptualizing links as a form of coproduction privileges the action of the producer of the link, and does not necessarily imply that the producer of the linked-to site was voluntarily involved in the action. In fact, one of the important characteristics differentiating the Web from traditional media is the ease with which other actors can be drawn into coproductive relationships without their permission or even knowledge. We suggest that any site producer that provided links to election-oriented content elsewhere on the Web was involved in coproduction with the producer of the linked-to page. Clearly, then, many actors coproduced Web content with reluctant or even antagonistic “partners.” We refer to this variant of coproduction as *unilateral coproduction*, and illustrate it through the following three cases.

The first example of a reluctant coproducer is the Web phenomenon referenced above involving Web sites from Senate candidates Cantwell and Gorton from Washington. When site producers from the Cantwell site added their own interpretation to a photograph of opponent Gorton, the source of which was a linked-to file on the Gorton Web site, the two campaigns were engaged in coproduction through links, albeit with the Gorton organization as a reluctant (and later antagonistic) partner.<sup>9</sup> In another case of unilateral coproduction, Florida congressional candidate Jean Elliott Brown used her Web site to draw comparisons between her stance on issues and her opponent's positions, and she supported these comparisons through links to her opponent's site.<sup>10</sup> A third example of coproduction through links was found on a site produced by Murray Sabrin, a primary election candidate for U.S. Senate from New Jersey. The Sabrin site featured a link from the front page offering to show visitors “the scary world of John Corzine,” another primary candidate for the same office.<sup>11</sup> Upon clicking the link, a page featuring two frames appeared. The top frame was a banner across the top of the page with a link to the Sabrin site. The bottom frame, filling most of the window, was a fully functional version of the Corzine site. In effect, the Sabrin campaign added a link to its own site on the Corzine Web site. This link, of course, was only visible to visitors who entered the Corzine site via the link from the Sabrin page. Although the examples we've provided so far illustrate unilateral coproduction by official site producers through links, hackers also participated in coproducing Web sites produced by other political actors through links and/or more common hacking techniques. For instance, on election day, early morning visitors to the home page of one of the main sites of the Republican National Committee found a black screen filled with dense white text and the following lowercase headline: “this hack has not been sanctioned by a political party or candidate. welcome to one of the former main web pages of the gop. take a minute to read.”<sup>12</sup> The text that followed filled two screens. Written in the first person by an anonymous author, it was a rant against Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush. At the end of the rant, there was a single, yellow-font link labeled “want more? click here.” We were probably not the only readers to feel a sense of suspense as we waited for the link to resolve – only to discover that we'd been shuttled to the official Al Gore for President site.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, in what seemed likely to be the work of a hacker, the Website controlled by Patricia Walsh, a former primary candidate for a New Jersey House seat, featured adult-only content for several weeks following her withdrawal from the race.<sup>14</sup>

In contrast to the widespread practice of unilateral coproduction through links, some site producers engaged in mutual coproduction through “Web rings.” By carrying a common label and/or link, the producers of these sites identified their sites as being of

interest to each other's visitors, thus creating a series of interlinked sites. One example of a Web ring was the collection of sites carrying the Minnesota E-Democracy (MED) 2000 icon/link. This Web ring "partnership" was "open to all media organizations, Internet companies, and non-partisan civic groups that did not endorse candidates."<sup>15</sup> Site producers from any of these entities could join the ring by downloading the MED 2000 icon and linking it to the MED 2000 home page. They could also send an icon representing their organizations to the producers of the MED 2000 site to be posted in the list of "partners." The icon served to identify the host site as a "partner" in the Web ring, and the linked-to page explaining the MED 2000 campaign was a signifier of support for a set of civic values.<sup>16</sup>

The variants of coproduction on the 2000 political Web that we have presented above underscore the inability of any single Web site producer to control his or her desired message. This poses a significant challenge for producers of candidate sites in particular, since, as one campaign site producer commented, "the number one rule of political communication is to be on message."<sup>17</sup> The ever-present possibility of unilateral coproduction on the Web is perceived as a threat by site producers with a mandate to convey a singular message. The forms of coproduction made possible by hypertext media enable not just multiple meanings to be drawn from any particular site, but for any element of a site or an entire site to be re-appropriated and/or re-framed in a new context, quickly and with relative ease. For this reason we suggest that the coproductive capacities of the Web environment are necessitating change in the practices of campaigns and effecting shifts in the traditional structure of power relations between political actors. In the next section, we analyze a second form of online action that has the potential to further reshape the relations between political actors in a campaign season.

## **Carnival**

Since at least the 1820s, Johann Goethe and others have recognized carnival as a form of political action. Mikhail Bakhtin, in a 1963 Russian-language book that was later translated into English (Bakhtin, 1984) observed that during pre-Lenten carnivals in Medireview times, "what [was] suspended in carnival first of all [was] hierarchical structure and all the forms of terror, reverence, piety, and etiquette connected with it" (pp. 122-123). Film critic Tom Sobshack (1996) elaborates that in carnival, "normal constraints and conventions are thrown off, democracy reigns while commoner and aristocrat rub shoulders, the crude and the vulgar are enshrined, the fool reigns" (p. 179). Building on Goethe's work, Brophy (1997) argues that carnival deserves the most attention as a performance of middle-class political activity and as an element of the political public sphere.

We employ the concept of carnival to denote online action that transgresses and/or inverts established social and political mores, norms, and hierarchies. Our data suggest that carnival is a potent dimension of political action on the Web with the potential for sparking significant offline action as well. The classic elements of carnival include jests and insults directed toward political actors, satire and parody, the transgression of social mores, and the inversion or suspension of hierarchical norms. In this section we present data illustrating some of the many manifestations of election-oriented carnival on the Web during the fall of 2000.

Jests and insults abounded on the political Web. Scores of individual citizens, advocacy groups, and even some campaigns and political parties employed derogatory humor on their Web sites to deprecate or just poke fun at candidates. One of the more creative instances appeared on the campaign site of Steve LeBoeuf, a congressional candidate from North Carolina.<sup>18</sup> In a playful twist of names and images, LeBoeuf's face was displayed morphed onto the body of Star Wars' hero "Obi-Boeuf Kenobi," in laser combat with his opponent Garth "Darth" Burr. Another example of Web jest (and voter mobilization) was a page entitled "Let's Play Election Dress-Up," featuring Gore and Bush as digital paper dolls in briefs, surrounded by clothing costumes that could be mouse-dragged and dropped over either candidate.<sup>19</sup> At the bottom of the page was the reminder "Now you've had some fun, DON'T FORGET TO VOTE!" and a mobilization feature labeled "Click here to send this page to a friend and remind them to vote too!"

More acidic forms of humor were part of the political Web carnival, too, in the form of satire and parody, produced by every kind of political actor. The candidacy of Doonesbury cartoon character "the Duke" was one of the most well developed parodies – of campaign Websites in particular as well as the overall campaign process.<sup>20</sup> The Duke's campaign home page featured a Duke 2000 logo and the slogan "Absolutely nothing to lose." The site included 10 different sections that mirrored the organization of many actual candidate sites, including a media center, photo archive, candidate profile, and campaign store. Throughout the site, "photos" of the Duke interacting with representatives of the press, other presidential candidates, and other well-known figures were displayed. And the "Oppo Report" contained "The complete archive of daily intelligence reports, chronicling the campaign maneuverings of the Ambassador's adversaries," based on news reports of events in other (actual) campaigns.

One example of the use of satire on the Web was [iknowwhatyoudidintexas.com](http://iknowwhatyoudidintexas.com), sponsored by The Democratic National Committee.<sup>21</sup> The home page displayed an ominous photo montage of oil rig smoke stacks, a child with his head buried in his arms on a desk, and stacks of money juxtaposed with the face of George Bush. The site focused on Bush's environmental record, and it featured press reports as well as a video of a well-known American rock musician, Lenny Kravitz, explaining "what's at stake" for the environment in the presidential election. Another example of political satire on the Web was directed against an incumbent senatorial candidate from Washington, Slade Gorton. One of several Gorton anti-candidate sites satirized the candidate in several ways, first by creating a misleading URL: [electsladegorton.com](http://electsladegorton.com). The home page was designed to resemble a regular campaign site, with the headline "Slade Gorton 2000" and a smiling photo of the candidate. The introductory text was a set of tongue-in-cheek "campaign" statements:

"Slade Gorton loves Washington State!

Slade loves dams and gold mines too!

He also likes money a lot!

Vote for Slade! OK! Yessir!"<sup>22</sup>

This site also serves to illustrate the transgression of social mores that was evident across many sites. In U.S. culture, it is socially taboo to touch the face of another adult, except as a sign of intimacy. A link from the front page of the site led to a page featuring a large photo of Gorton and entitled “Fun With Slade's Freaky Face.” Visitors were invited to “Click and drag on Slade's face to help his image.” Mouse-strokes across the photo distorted the image accordingly.

Another manifestation of carnivalesque transgressions against social mores appeared in a series of “slap sites,” anti-candidate sites that displayed an animated face photo of a candidate morphed onto a cartoon body. On one such site, visitors clicking a button labeled “Slap Hillary” heard a slapping sound and saw the candidate’s “face” roll and bob as if it had been slapped, eyes popping open and then shutting.<sup>23</sup> These slap sites violated not only the social taboo of touching an adult’s face but also norms proscribing violence in general and physical attacks against politicians in particular. However, these digital dartboards harken back to a time-honored barroom tradition of tossing darts at images of politicians’ faces. Had the candidates provided the links to these sites (none did according to our data), the phenomenon would have been more closely analogous to carnival action in earlier centuries characterized by politicians volunteering to have cream pies thrown in their faces. Opportunities for “unilateral carnival” on the Web follow from the capacity for unilateral coproduction we demonstrated in the previous section.

Finally, the carnivalesque actions of suspending and/or inverting hierarchies were widely apparent on the political Web. First and foundationally, increasing access to the means of Web-production enabled a broad range of individual citizens to express their political views on Web sites – side by side, in effect, with sites produced by the elite of the political and press corps. However, the technologies of Web production also enabled the inversion of hierarchies in another significant way on the political Web. Speech, whether captured on audio or video tapes or in text, once encoded into digitized files, can conceivably be transmitted and displayed anywhere on the Web. Thus, a public statement by a candidate or campaign representative can be captured, displayed, reframed, and reinterpreted by any Web site producer, including individual citizens. In sharp contrast to traditional print and broadcast media, this capacity of the digital, multimedia, hyperlinked realm affords an increasing number of citizens powerful means for transcending the traditional power structures that control the dissemination and interpretation of campaign information. Furthermore, the Web enables citizens to engage in political speech that is potentially “heard” by anyone else on the Web.

One instance of this kind of inversion took place on the parody site [GWBush.com](#), produced by an individual citizen, Zach Exley.<sup>24</sup> The site producer posted a text quote and video clip of Bush in a press interview being asked to comment on the [GWBush.com](#) parody site. The candidate, whose campaign slogans included “freedom first,” responded that “There ought to be limits to freedom.” On [GWBush.com](#), the quote and video clip were framed in a way that ridiculed Bush – headlined with the phrase “The Internet is more freedom than America can handle.” The [GWBush.com](#) site also illustrated the practice of enshrining the crude and vulgar common to carnival through crass animated “dances” and a video clip of a young George look-a-like picking his nose.

The latent potential of online carnival to translate into potent offline action was demonstrated through [GWBush.com](#) as well as other parody sites. The day after the

election, November 8, the front page of GWBush.com featured a new link, following a farcical post-election “statement” attributed to Bush and labeled “whatever you do, don't click here.”<sup>25</sup> The link resolved to a new site called CounterCoup.com, which served as a “surface” (Taylor & van Every, 2000) for citizens to organize a series of demonstrations in dozens of cities across the U.S. on November 11 and November 18.<sup>26</sup> These protests attracted hundreds of participants in many cities, and some received considerable coverage in the news media. Although e-mail has become a common tool for organizing protests, the November 11 street demonstrations represent one of the first attempts at large-scale organizing via the Web alone. What is particularly poignant is the fact that these organizing efforts grew largely out of parody sites produced by individual citizens rather than sites produced by more traditional advocacy groups. General e-mail list and city-specific message boards were added to the CounterCoup site quickly in the days following the election, but the site was the locus of the organizing activity. CounterCoup.com serves as an example of the transformation of online carnival action into the kind of protest-mobilization that medireview monarchs would have hated – but upon which democracy thrives. Thus, diverging from the forms of pseudo campaign participation engendered by parody sites in 1996 (Warnick, 1998), in 2000 some parody site producers made strategic and potentially powerful use of the Web's capacity for authentic protest mobilization, especially in the aftermath of the election. In the next section, we examine this and other types of mobilization that were apparent on the 2000 political Web in greater detail.

### **Mobilization**

The third form of action observable across site genres that contributed to an evolution of the electoral process was mobilization. For the purposes of this analysis, we define mobilization as two-step persuasive action – that is, an attempt to persuade someone to persuade others to act in a particular way. By this definition, a Web text such as “tell your friends to vote for Mr. Smith” would be mobilization in contrast to the simple persuasive text “vote for Mr. Smith.” We observed five key types of mobilization taking place on the Web during the 2000 election season: civic promotion, issue promotion, candidate promotion, vote swapping, and protest. In this section, we describe manifestations of each of these kinds of mobilization and point to the implications they hold for electoral politics.

We consider efforts to mobilize voting in general as civic promotion in distinction from issue or candidate promotion. There were numerous exhortations on the Web for citizens to vote—and to persuade their friends to vote – that did not include any explicit reference to the candidates, parties, or issues concerns on which they would be voting. A variety of site producers, including some of the sites featuring carnival action described above, encouraged citizens to cast a ballot. Nonprofit civic groups and the producers of press and for-profit portal sites used a range of strategies and features on their sites to facilitate informed voting while presenting themselves as neutral in regard to particular issue stances or candidates.

The SmartVoter.org site, sponsored by the California League of Women Voters, was just one of many civic sites that sought to provide citizens with detailed information about the candidates and propositions on which they would vote.<sup>27</sup> This site was distinctive, however, in that it provided residents of participating areas with the

opportunity to view and print a sample ballot in advance of the election. Visitors were asked to type in their street address and zip code, with the assurance that their information would be kept confidential. They were then provided with a list of all candidates as well as state and local propositions that would be on the ballot in their precinct. Basic information about each candidate on the ballot, as collected by official government sources, was also available, and candidates had an opportunity to add their own content to pages maintained by the site. The availability of sample ballots on sites such as SmartVoter.org may constitute a precursor to full-scale Internet voting. Even if such online sample ballots prove not to be a harbinger of online voting, they provide a way for organizations to help individual citizens become aware of the full range of choices they will face in the ballot booth on Election Day.

A diverse array of issue-oriented advocacy groups used the Web to seek to mobilize site visitors not only to vote themselves on the basis of a particular issue but also to promote that issue to others. One of the more innovative Web tools for issue mobilization was exemplified by NARAL, the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. The NARAL site featured a video of actress Whoopi Goldberg expressing her views on reproductive rights and the presidential election, which could be viewed with a click by anyone who had downloaded the RealPlayer application. A second link underneath the Goldberg video invited site visitors to send an electronic greeting card with the video to their friends by e-mail.<sup>28</sup> The e-card looked like a postcard with the headline “make your choice count” and the message “George W. Bush supports banning almost all abortions. Al Gore supports a woman’s right to choose. Make your choice count on Election Day. And make sure your friends have the facts.” That last sentence is what identifies this feature as a tool for issue-based mobilization, not just issue voting.

In addition to a link to the Goldberg video (and a link to download RealPlayer in case the recipient did not already have the application), the e-card also contained three other features. The first was a button link labeled “Take Action to protect your right to choose,” which resolved to the main NARAL site front page. The second feature was a button link labeled “Take a Quiz on the Candidates' Positions,” which resolved to a candidate-comparison quiz feature on the NARAL site. These link features appear to be an attempt to meet one of the key challenges faced by advocacy groups: how to attract more visitors to their Web sites. These features functioned strategically to draw recipients of the e-card to NARAL's site to “take action” or “take a quiz,” rather than explicitly inviting them to visit the site. Finally, the e-card invited the viewer to “Forward to a Friend” and provided an e-mail forwarding feature comprised of two text boxes labeled “Your E-mail” and “Your Friend's E-mail” and a send button. Thus the e-card functioned as a tool for multiplying mobilization efforts through both explicit text and through the inclusion of an e-mail forwarding feature.

The third type of mobilization we observed on the political Web was candidate promotion. The major presidential candidates’ sites as well as some of the senate and congressional candidates’ sites included several mobilization features and invited site visitors to use these tools to persuade others to vote for the candidate. The most common candidate promotion tools were “downloadables,” and the presidential sites carried the widest range of them. These included campaign flyers and brochures that could be printed and distributed, graphics designed by a campaign that could be downloaded for

signs or buttons, photos of the candidate, campaign logos to post on one's Web site, computer desktop wallpaper and screen savers featuring the candidate or campaign logo, and even camera-ready print advertisements and broadcast-quality radio advertisements that enthusiasts were encouraged to place in traditional media outlets.<sup>29</sup> In addition to downloadables, some candidate sites also featured e-cards and encouraged site visitors to send them to others to show their support of the candidate. Although our data do not reveal the actual use of these candidate e-cards, comments from anecdotal evidence indicated that candidate e-cards were just as likely to be used in jest as in sincere candidate promotion. More research needs to be done on how Web-based candidate promotion tools are actually employed by citizens. However, for the purposes of our analysis, it is sufficient to note that the Web enabled campaigns to equip supporters with textual and graphical tools to promote their favored candidates across applications online and in a range of forums offline.

A fourth and novel type of election-oriented mobilization that appeared on the Web during the 2000 elections was vote swapping. In the last weeks before the general election, the U.S. campaign financing system, the state-based "winner take all" electoral college procedure, and the relative standing in the pre-election polls among the three leading candidates combined to create an opportunity for creative synergy among supporters of the Democratic candidate, Al Gore, and the Green Party candidate, Ralph Nader. The strategy underlying this Web-based vote swapping effort was to persuade Nader supporters to pledge their votes to Gore in those states where Gore had a chance of beating Bush. In exchange, Gore supporters in non-competitive states were asked to pledge their vote to Nader. The appeal to Gore supporters was the prospect that a sufficient number of votes would be cast for Gore in the highly competitive states to win the Electoral College votes. The appeal to Nader supporters was the hope of their candidate receiving the necessary 5% of the national popular vote for the Green Party to receive federal campaign funds in the 2004 election cycle. Each site developed to mobilize vote swapping functioned somewhat differently, but in general the site developers sought to recruit voters from different key states to pledge to trade their votes. On one site, running tallies were kept of vote pledges received for both candidates.<sup>30</sup>

The final type of election-oriented mobilization we observed on the Web was protest. Protest appeared in various ways on the Web throughout Campaign 2000. Any site that explicitly opposed a particular candidate could be considered a statement of protest. A number of these anti-candidate sites appeared on the Web during the summer and fall of 2000 – for instance, the NoGore.com site.<sup>31</sup> NoGore.com and other anti-candidate sites attempted both to persuade visitors to vote against a specific candidate as well as to mobilize others to oppose the candidate.

After November 7, anti-candidate sites opposing Bush and Gore became rallying points for voters disgruntled with the prolonged ambiguity and political maneuvering in the Florida recount. Once Election Day had passed, these anti-candidate sites were joined by a host of others in a cross-site Web phenomenon of protest directed against several targets – the Bush and Gore campaigns and their legal teams, the Florida Supreme Court and state officials, and the Electoral College system in general. For example, NoGore.com added a feature that enabled site visitors to register their complaints with the Florida Supreme Court.<sup>32</sup> Another site, DemandAREvote.com, featured an e-mail message requesting a re-vote in Palm Beach County that could be "signed" by a site



visitor and sent with one click to Florida Governor Jeb Bush, Secretary of State Katherine Harris, and Attorney General Bob Butterworth.<sup>33</sup> The text on the home page urged visitors to “Let others know about this site, we need to send thousands of e-mails,” and the home page provided a feature labeled “Tell a friend about this site” which facilitated easy forwarding of the URL by e-mail. Another post-election site for e-mail protest, which also urged visitors to mobilize their friends, was RevotePalmBeach.com. This site featured an AP photo of the Palm Beach ballot and an e-mail form into which a site visitor could type his or her own e-mail address, the e-mail address of a friend, and a text message before sending.<sup>34</sup>

In summary, each of the types of mobilization we have identified in this section involved the coproduction of features, multiple Internet applications, and strategic linking. We suggest that these Web-based efforts were designed to engender both online mobilization of personal networks and offline political actions of voting and protest. We now turn to consider potential effects of all three forms of online action analyzed in this paper

### **Implications**

In this article we have presented findings from our preliminary analysis of online action in political Web space during the 2000 election campaign in the United States. We suggest that coproduction, carnival, and mobilization represent three dimensions of election-oriented action on the Web. We view these forms of online action as foundational building blocks toward our argument that the use of the Web changes political practice in subtle but important ways.

These forms of action on the U.S. 2000 political Web carry implications for future electoral processes. We suggest that they portend an evolution of political communication, manifested in the following ways. Dichotomies between producers and consumers of campaign communication—largely reified by traditional broadcast and print media – are transcended by the manifold forms of coproduction made possible through the Web. The Web’s capacity for unilateral coproduction diminishes the degree of control any message producer can maintain. Furthermore, coproductive options increase the range of ways that individual citizens may participate in campaign activities.

The variety of carnival actions observed online signify a releasing of both more creative energies and a broader range of dissident voices than are usually expressed through traditional media and in the mainstream press. Multimedia carnival humor on the Web may appeal to potential voters who would otherwise be disengaged in the electoral process, and just as print-based political cartoons can be sources of serious political commentary, carnival action on the Web may shape political opinions. The post-election use of Websites in 2000 as surfaces for organizing both online and offline protest is particularly significant. These post-election protests, along with the vote-swapping mobilization efforts, were among the first large-scale attempts by citizens to use the Web (in distinction from e-mail or other discussion forums) to influence the electoral process, and thereby the political system.

The number and range of civic promotion efforts observed online suggest increased, expanded, and intensified attempts to mobilize citizens for informed voting. The other mobilization attempts we observed – for candidate and issue promotion, vote swapping, and protest – imply a multiplication of ways that political actors can become involved in the electoral process. Furthermore, participating in online mobilization carries

relatively lower costs of time, energy, and financial resources than participation in parallel offline action would.

More generally, our interviews with site producers suggested that the Web transformed the way many political actors went about their daily activities during the campaign season. These actors – including journalists, campaign professionals, candidates, activists, and citizens – were just beginning to integrate the Web into their political lives, or, more accurately perhaps, to establish a robust presence on the Web. The site producers we interviewed were concerned about how enter and use the Web strategically. However, this new multimedia tool and environment has already effected many changes in the ways they think about their election-oriented activities.

In many respects, the 2000 election provided a platform for political actors to experiment with the new modes of communication. The Web also provided novel ways for citizens and other actors to engage in the electoral process with particular emphasis on information gathering, production, and distribution. Further, the Web facilitated new organizational possibilities. In this way, the Web seems poised to contribute to a shift in the “structure of political opportunities” (Eisinger, 1973) that may allow significant social or political change to flourish. Finally, we suggest that the Web engenders the creation of media with an easily accessible history – which may have the effect of deepening and “lengthening” the information pool drawn on by citizens, journalists, and campaign professionals over time.

In conclusion, we argue that the ways in which campaigns are conducted and that candidates and citizens interact are being re-shaped by the multimedia, hyperlinked Web. We suggest that the Web enabled not only these actors but also the press, portal companies, and civic and advocacy groups to engage in political action more broadly, deeply, and interactively than does traditional print or broadcast media. As researchers examining the nature and impact of political Web space, we need to ensure that our methods allow us to capture these kinds of subtle effects. We believe this study demonstrates the need for ongoing archiving and analysis of political Web spheres, and, in fact, of other Web spheres as well. In addition, our work draws attention to the importance of developing standards of practice for the systematic archiving of Web collections. We recommend that further research on the role of the Web in electoral politics should include systematic analyses of cross-site phenomena, closer examination of Web-related shifts in campaign practices, and studies of usage patterns on the political Web beyond simply number and duration of site visits.

## References

Abramson, J. F., Arterton, F. C., & Orren, G. R. (1988). *The electronic commonwealth: The impact of new media technologies on democratic politics*. New York: Basic Books.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. Caryl Emerson, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Benoit, W. J. & Benoit, P. J. (2000). The virtual campaign: Presidential primary Websites in Campaign 2000. *American Communication Journal*, 3(3), retrieved from <http://acjournal.org/holdings/vol3/Iss3/curtain.html#4>.

Bimber, B. (1998). The Internet and political mobilization: Research note on the 1996 election season. *Social Science Computer Review*, 16(4), 391-401.

Boczkowski, P. (2000, June). *Distributed construction: Changing regimes of information creation in online newspapers*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.

Bonchek, M. S. (1995, April). *Grassroots in cyberspace: Using computer networks to facilitate political participation*. Paper presented at 53rd Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.

Brophy, J. (1997). Carnival and citizenship: Politics of carnival culture in the Prussian Rhineland 1823-1848. *Journal of Social History*, 30(4), 873-904.

Bucy, E. K., D'Angelo, P., & Newhagen, J. E. (1999). The engaged electorate: New media use as political participation. In L. L. Kaid & D. G. Bystrom (Eds.), *The electronic election: Perspectives on the 1996 campaign communication* (pp.55-67). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Burbules, N. C., & Callister, T. A. (2000). *Watch IT: The risks and promises of information technologies for education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bystrom, L. L., & Bystrom, D. (1998). *The electronic election: Perspectives on the 1996 campaign communication*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

D'Alessio, D. (1997). Use of the World Wide Web in the 1996 U.S. election. *Electoral Studies*, 16(4), 489-500.

D'Alessio, D. (2000). Adoption of the World Wide Web by American political candidates, 1996-1998. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44(4), 556-568.

Davis, R. (1999). *The Web of politics: The Internet's impact on the American political system*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Davis, R., & Owen, D. (1998). *New media and American politics*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Diamond, E., McKay, M., & Silverman, R. (1993). Pop goes politics: New media, interactive formats, and the 1992 campaign. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 37(2), 257-261.

Downing, J. (1989). Computers for political change: Peacenet and public data access. *Journal of Communication*, 39(3), 154-162.

Dulio, D. A., Goff, D. L., & Thurber, J. A. (1999). Untangled Web: Internet use during the 1998 election. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 32(1): 53-58.

Eisinger, P. K. (1973). The conditions of protest behavior in American cities. *American Political Science Review*, 67(1), 11-28.

Frederick, H. H. (1993). Computer networks and the emergence of global civil society: The case of the Association for Progressive Communications (APC). In L. Harasim (Ed.), *Global networks: Computers and international communication* (pp. 283-295). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Garramone, G. M., Harris, A.C., & Anderson, R. (1986). Uses of political computer bulletin boards. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 30(3), 325-339.

Garramone, G. M., Harris, A. C., & Rizante, G. (1986). Predictors of motivation to use computer-mediated political communication systems. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 30(3), 445-457.

Glass, A. J. (1996). On-line elections: The Internet's impact on the political process. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 1(4), 140-146.

Groper, R. (1996). Electronic mail and the reinvigoration of American democracy. *Social Science Computer Review*, 14(2), 157-168.

Hacker, K. L., Lowl, L., Scott, M., & Steiner, R. (1996). Uses of computer-mediated political communication in the 1992 presidential campaign: A content analysis of the Bush, Clinton and Perot computer lists. *Communication Research Reports*, 13(2), 138-146.

Hansen, G. (2000, November). *Internet presidential campaigning: The influences of candidate Internet sites on the 2000 elections*. Paper presented at the National Communication Association, Seattle, WA.

Harpham, E. J. (1999, September). Going on-line: The 1998 congressional campaign. *Proceedings from the American Political Science Association* (pp. 1-26). Atlanta, GA.

Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the wild*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Johnson, T. J., Braima, M. A. M., & Sothirajah, J. (1999). Doing the traditional media sidestep: Comparing the effects of the Internet and other nontraditional media with traditional media in the 1996 presidential campaign. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76(1), 99-123.

Kamarck, E. C. (1999). Campaigning on the Internet in the elections of 1998. In E. C. Kamarck & J. J. S. Nye (Eds.), *democracy.com?: Governance in the network world* (pp.99-123). Hollis, NH: Hollis Publishing.

Klinenberg, E. & Perrin, A. (2000). Symbolic politics in the information age: The 1996 Republican presidential campaigns in cyberspace. *Information, Communication & Society*, 3(1), 17-38.

Klotz, R. (1998). Virtual criticism: Negative advertising on the Internet in the 1996 Senate races. *Political Communication*, 15(3), 347-365.

Leonard, E., Etzioni, A., Hornstein, H., Abrams, P., Stephens, T., & Tichy, N. (1971). MINERVA: A participatory technology system. *Science and Public Affairs, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 27(9), 4-12.

Mann, M. (1995). *Politics on the Net*. Indianapolis, IN: Que Corporation.

Marcus, G. E. (1998). *Ethnography through thick and thin*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Margolis, M. & Resnick, D. (2000). *Politics as usual: The cyberspace revolution*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Margolis, M., Resnick, D., & Tu, C. (1997). Campaigning on the Internet: Parties and candidates on the Work Wide Web in the 1996 primary season. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 2(1), 59-78.

Meadow, R. G. (1986). The electronic machine: New technologies in political campaigns. *Election politics*, 3(3), 26-31.

Mickunas, G. & Pilotta, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Technocracy vs. democracy: Issues in the politics of communication*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Middleton, D. & Engestrom, Y. (Eds.). (1996). *Cognition and communication at work*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Myers, D. D. (1993). New technology and the 1992 Clinton presidential campaign. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 37(2), 181-187.

O'Sullivan, P. B. (1995). Computer networks and political participation: Santa Monica's teledemocracy project. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 23(2), 93-107.

Parker, E. B. (1972). On-line polling and voting. In H. Sackman & B. Boehm (Eds.), *Planning community information utilities* (pp. 93-109). Montvale, NJ: AFIPS Press.

Schneider, S. M. (1996). Creating a democratic public sphere through political discussion: A case study of abortion conversation on the Internet. *Social Science Computer Review* 14(4), 373-393.

Schneider, S. M., Foot, K. A. & Harnett, B. H. (2001, May). *Catch and code: A method for mapping and analyzing complex Web spheres*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Sheridan, T. (1971). Citizen feedback: New technology for social choice. *Technology Review*, 73(3), 46-51

Sillaman, L. (2000). *The digital campaign trail: Candidate images on campaign Websites*. Unpublished master's thesis, Annenberg School of Communication, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

Sobshack, T. (1996). Bakhtin's carnivalesque in 1950s British comedy. *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 23(4), 179-185.

Stevens, C. (1971). Citizen feedback: The need and the response. *Technology Review*, 73(3), 38-45.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stromer-Galley, J. (2000). On-line interaction and why candidates avoid it. *Journal of Communication*, 50(4), 111-132.

Taylor, J. R., & van Every, E. J. (2000). *The emergent organization: Communication as its site and surface*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum

Tedesco, J. C., Miller, J. L., & Spiker, J. A. (1999). Presidential campaigning on the information superhighway: An exploration of content and form. In L. L. Kaid & D. Bystrom (Eds.), *The electronic election: Perspectives on the 1996 campaign communication*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Warnick, B. (1998). Appearance or reality? Political parody on the Web in Campaign '96. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 15(3), 306-324.

Warnick, B. (2001). *Critical literacy in a digital era: Technology, rhetoric, and the public sphere*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Whillock, R. K. (1998). Digital democracy: The '96 presidential campaign on-line. In R.E. Denton (Ed.), *The 1996 presidential campaign: A communication perspective (pp.179-197)*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

<sup>1</sup> See endnote # 9, below, for citations to specific pages that were part of this Web phenomenon.

<sup>2</sup> [http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/DailyNews/WATCHDOG\\_FORM.html](http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/DailyNews/WATCHDOG_FORM.html), archived 10 November 00, ID=0\_973862044\_\_3\_974028482.

<sup>3</sup> “Take our quiz”, link from <http://Webcenter.election2000.aol.com/home/election/>, [archived as /homeelection/] ID=0\_973575602\_\_2\_973626541, archived 07 November 00, to <http://www.presidentialmatch.com/>, accessed 07 November 00.

<sup>4</sup> <http://jeanelliottbrown.com/compare/questions.php3>, ID=5\_971732865\_158\_0\_971845298, and <http://jeanelliottbrown.com/compare/logcompare.php3>, ID=160\_971733085\_220\_0\_971847500, archived 16 October 00.

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.Webwhiteblue.org>, ID= 0\_971327442\_\_3\_971347680, archived 12 October 00.

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.e-democracy.org/mn-politics>, ID=16\_969667995\_45\_0\_969818216, archived 22 September 00.

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.egroups.com>, accessed 22 September 00.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. “National Rifle Association” link from <http://www.speakout.com/Activism/guncontrol>, ID= 0\_970330801\_\_1\_970417225, archived 30 September 00, to <http://www.nra.org>, ID= 0\_969552522\_\_1\_969667532, archived 28 September 00, and “Million Mom March” link to <http://www.millionmommarch.com/home/>, ID= 559\_971127286\_708\_2\_971183517, archived 09 October 00.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.cantwell2000.com/content/buster.html>, ID= 4\_961333660\_79\_2\_961987420, archived 18 June 00; [http://www.slade2000.com/contents/tourdiary/pic\\_wbuster2.jpg](http://www.slade2000.com/contents/tourdiary/pic_wbuster2.jpg) , ID=80\_961333663\_86\_1\_961987833, archived 18 June 00; <http://www.kathleenlisson.com/deeplink.html>, ID=0\_973387373\_\_3\_973444784, archived 04 Nov 00; <http://seattlep-i.nwsourc.com/local/cant14.shtml> and <http://www.king5.com/biztech/storydetail.html?StoryID=2213> both accessed 26 June 01.

<sup>10</sup> <http://jeanelliottbrown.com/compare/logcompare.php3>, ID=160\_971733085\_220\_0\_971847500, archived 16 October 00.

<sup>11</sup> < <http://www.murraysabrin.com/gif/corzine.gif>>, link from <http://www.murraysabrin.com>, ID=96070915252, to <http://www.murraysabrin.com/corzine.html>, ID=9607103631140, both archived 31 May 00.

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.gop.org>, accessed 7 November 00.

<sup>13</sup> “want more? click here”, link from [www.gop.org](http://www.gop.org) to [www.algore2000.com](http://www.algore2000.com), accessed 7 November 00.

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.walshforcongress.com>, ID=96083326738, archived 30 May 00 and ID=0\_962136575\_\_1\_962255256, archived 27 June 00.

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.e-democracy.org/2000/partners.html> ID=69\_969668034\_71\_2\_969816497, archived 22 September 00.

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.e-democracy.org/2000> ID=62\_969668035\_71\_2\_969816257, archived 22 September 00

<sup>17</sup> Interview with Lynn Reed, Internet coordinator for Bradley for President Campaign. April, 2000.

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.voteleboeuf.com>, ID= 0\_963087147\_115\_2\_964260127, archived 04 August 00.

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.wotch.com/funstuff/election2000/default2.asp\#>, accessed 5 November 00.

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.duke2000.com>, ID= 0\_963524829\_\_3\_963640866, archived 13 July 00.

<sup>21</sup> <http://iknowwhatyoudidintexas.com>, ID= 0\_969809241\_\_3\_969916115, archived 24 September 00.

<sup>22</sup> <http://electsladegorton.com>, ID= 0\_973863457\_\_0\_973990523, archived 10 Nov 00.

<sup>23</sup> <http://frontpagemag.com/slaphillary/>, ID= 19\_973479803\_47\_0\_973570251, archived 05 November 00.

<sup>24</sup> <http://gwbush.com>, ID= 0\_973261858\_\_0\_973455575, archived 03 November 00.

<sup>25</sup> “whatever you do, don’t click here,” link from <http://www.gwbush.com>, ID= 0\_973866156\_\_2\_973913110 archived 10 November 00, to <http://countercoup.org>, ID= 19\_974580939\_44\_2\_974676498 archived 18 November 00.

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.countercoup.com>, ID= 19\_974580939\_44\_2\_974676498, archived 18 November 00.

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.smartvoter.org>, ID= 0\_963415781\_\_4\_963506751 archived 12 July 00.

<sup>28</sup> <http://naral.com/whoopi>, ID= 0\_973815307\_\_1\_973860523, archived 09 November 00.



<sup>29</sup> For example, see <http://georgewbush.com/Downloads.asp>, ID=5\_967141648\_32\_0\_967148412, archived August 00; <http://www.votenader.org/publicmedia.html>, ID= 28\_973018158\_380\_1\_973119406, archived 31 October 00 and [www.algore2000.com/getinvolved/index.html](http://www.algore2000.com/getinvolved/index.html), ID=43\_965062314\_283\_4\_966372714, archived 31 July 00.

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.winwincampaign.org>, ID= 0\_973105332\_\_3\_973180515, archived 01 November 00.

<sup>31</sup> <http://nogore.com>, ID= 0\_973523898\_\_3\_973546934, archived 06 November 00.

<sup>32</sup> <http://nogore.com>, accessed 12 November 00.

<sup>33</sup> <http://demandarevote.com>, ID= 0\_973961996\_\_3\_974080265, archived 11 November 00.

<sup>34</sup> <http://revotepalmbeach.com>, accessed 12 November 00.