

# Routledge Handbook of Internet Politics

*Edited by*  
Andrew Chadwick and  
Philip N. Howard

t&f proofs

---

# Bureaucratic reform and e-government in the United States

## An institutional perspective

Jane E. Fountain

*Technology enactment, an analytical framework that focuses on the processes by which new information and communication technologies come to be used by organizational actors, is distinctly institutional in orientation. An institutional perspective provides a challenge to researchers to integrate attention to structure, politics, and policy into studies of e-government. It also invites attention to the roles and relationships of formal and informal institutions. Formal institutions—laws, regulations, budget processes, and other governmental procedures—are central to legitimation and shaping incentives for the use of ICT as an integral and inseparable set of elements in the administrative state. Informal institutions—networks, norms, and trust—are equally influential. Challenges in the development of e-government stem from core issues of liberty, freedom, participation, and other central elements of democracy. Structurally, however, such challenges may be viewed through an institutional lens in terms of the adequacy of formal and informal institutions to support e-government. An institutional perspective, drawing primarily from economic sociology as well as from the institutional turn in economics, provides a path to deepening studies of information and communication technologies in government in ways that can illuminate state development and capacity. In addition, this chapter describes key institutional developments in e-government during two presidential administrations in the United States as well as key developments in state and local U.S. government.*

---

The study of institutions is central to politics and governance, hence to internet politics and e-government. E-government research has focused predominantly on government information provision online, on public service delivery online, and on the attitudes and use patterns of citizens. An essential complement to these streams of research is one that examines the internal structures and processes of what theorists of the state term “state capacity” and “state structure,” and what others have called the administrative or bureaucratic state. I argue in this chapter that an

institutional perspective on e-government can provide important insights into bureaucratic reform, political development, the policy-making process, and the role of civil servants in information societies.

This chapter summarizes key elements of an institutional perspective and then briefly describes institutional developments associated with bureaucratic reform using e-government across two presidential administrations in the United States. Throughout, I sketch developments in budgeting, governance, management, oversight, and legislation that

have been central to e-government. Similarly, I highlight several informal institutional arrangements such as management processes, culture, the structure of working groups, and informal norms. In addition, the chapter briefly summarizes key developments in state and local e-government in the United States. It concludes with a challenge to researchers to probe more deeply the emergent institutional correlates of increased internet and web use in government.

### **Institutions: formal, informal, and middleware**

The term “institution” refers to regularized patterns and processes that simplify and order cognition and behavior at the individual, group, organizational, and societal levels of analysis. I focus here on institutional perspectives on organizations (for key conceptual formulations and critical overviews see Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1991; Scott, 1987). By definition, institutions are widely shared and socially agreed upon, regularized, and, in many cases, taken for granted. Institutionalists (including neo-institutionalists) have sought to account for strategic behavior and entrepreneurship in institutionalized contexts (see, for example, DiMaggio, 1988; Beckert, 1999; Garud *et al.*, 2002; Maguire *et al.*, 2004); institutionalization in interorganizational networks and fields (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Baum and Oliver, 1992; Brint and Karabel, 1991; Leblebici *et al.*, 1991; Starr, 1982); and institutional change (Greenwood *et al.*, 2002; Dacin *et al.*, 2002; Hargadon and Douglas, 2001; Hoffman, 1999; Greenwood and Hinings, 1996).

Formal governmental institutions include legislation, regulation, budgetary processes, and the structures and regularized practices of the U.S. executive, legislative, and judiciary branches of government.

Informal, micro-level institutions include those social processes that have been studied as “social capital”: trust, norms, and networks of individuals (Putnam, 1994; Fountain, 1998; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998; Burt, 2005). Mediating between formal and informal institutional elements are organizational and interorganizational level structures and processes including management practices, task structures, and operating routines. The connection to e-government, in which ICTs are used to regularize and rationalize a host of information and communication flows, should be obvious.

Government information flows can be conceptualized across these three levels of institutionalized processes. First, micro-level interactions at the individual and small-group level structure and continually restructure ongoing social relations and comprise the locus of shared information and sense-making. For example, civil servants regularly contact trusted colleagues to interpret new information, to compare notes on accepted and promising practices, and to ask or give advice, support, and referrals. In the process of these interactions, individuals reflexively monitor and update their assessments of those they can trust, those with whom to communicate, and to share knowledge.

At a middle level, functioning like “middleware,” organizations and interorganizational arrangements, including networks, also codify and routinize information through systems, routines, and processes. Routinized information is, in part, what is meant by organization. Innovation often comprises a rethinking and restructuring of organizational and interorganizational processes (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). At a highly formalized and macro-level, the rules of the state—institutions such as legislation and regulation—constrain the behavior of government department and agencies, as well as economic and societal actors.

Formal institutions also include broad societal agreements on such matters as property rights and appropriate accountability, oversight, and resource allocation structures and practices. Thus, a multi-level integrated information system (MIIS) influences behavior directly and indirectly in government (Fountain, 2007; Nee and Ingram, 1998). Organizational change occasioned by information and communication technologies often perturbs—and is influenced by—all three layers producing unanticipated effects. I have called this combination of institutional, organizational, and new technological elements “technology enactment” (Fountain, 2001).

In sum, an institutional perspective on e-government focuses attention on the internal workings—the structure and capacity—of the state. It draws out the role of the widely shared, regularized patterns of professional behavior of civil servants and other government officials working within institutionalized roles and settings. The study of e-government, using an institutional perspective, provides an opportunity to observe the collision of stable practices and traditions with technological innovations.

### **Weberian bureaucracy and the American state**

The modern American bureaucratic state is a child of the industrial revolution. Although the term “bureaucracy” has been used by neo-liberals to connote inefficiency and ineffectiveness relative to market-based mechanisms, bureaucracy as an organizational form in government largely replaced patrimonial systems (including widespread use of patronage appointments) with a professional civil service. Through a protracted series of political negotiations over decades, bureaucratic government came to substitute

merit for political loyalty as the key measure of fitness for employment in the professional public service. The American bureaucratic state was built from a young nation of parties and courts. Although temporal delimiters oversimplify complex political development patterns, the American administrative (or bureaucratic) state was born during the final decades of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth century. Innovations in state structure and processes, although deeply contested, were meant to align the government more closely with the results of enormous changes in the structure of the economy, rapid shifts in transportation and communication, and ensuing crises in banking, finance, and, not least, conditions and prospects for labor (Skowronek, 1982).

By analogy, one would expect to see changes in the structure and capacity of the state over a 50-year period as actors seek to re-align government with key dimensions of the information economy and network society. The institutional context in which long-term change efforts are embedded, however, is structured for stability. Thus, an institutional perspective draws attention to structure and process as well as the play of bureaucratic inertia, habits of mind, and the relative stability and durability of institutionalized forms and arrangements in the context of new capabilities occasioned by technology.

The development of information and communications technology (ICT) use by governments in the United States has by no means followed a predictable technologically determinist path. Nor could rational actor accounts predict the shape of bureaucratic reform through e-government. The technology enactment framework has been used to explain the successes and failures of ICT-based bureaucratic reform in the federal government during

the Clinton administration (Fountain, 2001). Yet many other frameworks and models used in e-government research draw from institutional perspectives as well (Gasco, 2003; Danziger, 2004; Wiklund, 2005; Heeks and Bailur, 2007).

## Where are we now?

Since 1993, two presidential administrations in the United States have focused bureaucratic reform initiatives in part on e-government. This section draws from empirical and archival research conducted by the author and summarizes those initiatives and the institutional developments associated with them (Fountain, 2001, 2006). More briefly, the section that follows sketches some of the major bureaucratic reform developments at the state and local government levels. Throughout, I highlight key institutional developments.

The emergence of the internet and the World Wide Web (the web) during the early 1990s led U.S. governments to begin to develop web-based government information and public services in order to align governments with societal and economic systems and expectations. Government agencies increasingly have made information available online including laws, rules, and regulations as well as policy and practical information for citizens concerning retirement, disability, health, education, housing, agriculture, transportation, and the environment. In addition, interactive public services increasingly are available including tax filing for individuals and businesses, licensing, registration, and permitting. Beyond the provision of information and services, bureaucratic reform also entails agency and inter-agency reorganization meant to leverage new capabilities made possible by ICTs.

## ***“Reinventing government” during the Clinton administration***

The Clinton administration (1993–2001) coincided technologically with early societal and economic euphoria that attended the beginning of open access to the internet through the web. Politically, President Clinton’s was the first Democratic administration since the Franklin Roosevelt administration during the 1930s to win a second term. Economically, national unemployment rates and inflation were low, and the federal budget was briefly in surplus. Although Democratic, neo-liberalism was a hallmark of the administration. Clinton (1996) declared in an address to Congress that “the era of big government is over.”

The beginnings of e-commerce and societal uses of the internet and web in the U.S. focused on development of web portals to simplify citizen and business search for information by integrating access to several websites. Before the internet was publicly accessible, bureaucratic reforms had been undertaken that focused on simplification of forms and procedures and service integration, notably, “one-stop shopping,” to make government information and organizations easier to navigate. These efforts mirrored standard business practice in the service sector. In one sense, digital tools merely enhanced the power of a set of reforms already underway and accepted as legitimate and appropriate by civil servants. Yet the extraordinary power of the internet to allow citizens to access government “anytime, anywhere,” greatly increased accessibility and made abstruse government documents and procedures, now online, more glaringly unresponsive to citizens.

In the mid 1990s, some large government agencies began to develop what the administration called “virtual agencies,”

or cross-agency web portals, in an effort to re-organize information and services by client type rather than agency jurisdiction. The U.S. federal government first organized students.gov, seniors.gov, and business.gov portals oriented toward three key voter groups, to provide these citizen subpopulations with a “single point of contact” with government. The term “virtual state” has been used by the author as a metaphor meant to capture the organization of government information increasingly in terms of virtual organizations such as these.

Launched on March 3, 1993, during the first phase of the National Performance Review (NPR), the bureaucratic reform effort begun during the Clinton administration was led energetically and visibly by Vice President Al Gore. The *Gore Report on Reinventing Government* was presented to the president on September 7, 1993, followed by a national tour to promote the reform effort (National Performance Review, 1993; Office of the Vice President, 1993). Information technology use was only one element of the larger bureaucratic reform initiative. The strategy for its use was underpinned by radical re-engineering methods and heroic assumptions regarding the potential disintermediation effects of the internet (Hammer and Champy, 1993). Initial steps of the NPR included cutting the federal workforce, primarily middle management positions, by 252,000 employees; passage of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), which requires agencies to develop strategic and performance plans; dramatic reduction of internal regulations (or red tape); and a requirement for agencies to develop “customer service” standards and strategies.

The NPR staff published a report, “Reengineering through Information Technology,” in September 1993 that included 13 recommendations combining general directions with specific projects:

strengthen leadership in IT; implement nationwide, electronic benefits transfer; develop integrated digital access to government information and services; provide government wide e-mail; improve government’s information infrastructure; ensure privacy and safety; improve IT acquisition; provide incentives for innovation; provide training and technical assistance in IT to federal employees; create a national environmental data index; establish an international trade data system; provide an intergovernmental tax system; establish a national law enforcement and public safety network (National Performance Review, 1993). In 1998, the reform initiative was renamed the National Partnership for Reinventing Government.

Approximately 30 virtual agencies were developed throughout the U.S. federal government during the Clinton administration. Moreover, a single government-wide portal, FirstGov.gov, was designed to connect to all federal agency web pages. At this writing, it remains one of the largest repositories of web pages in existence.

The strategic direction of this early bureaucratic reform effort was encapsulated in the subtitle of the Gore report: “building a government that works better and costs less.” The phrase echoes American public administration themes and objectives dating from the late nineteenth century. Early efforts, during a period in the 1990s when the federal budget actually was in surplus, focused publicly on government service enhancement, then referred to baldly as “customer service,” rather than cost cutting. Yet during the same period, the federal government, following the example of U.S. businesses, cut the federal workforce by 250,000 jobs, primarily in middle management positions. This dramatic reduction indelibly connected use of ICTs with downsizing in the psyche of the federal workforce.

Early federal government websites in the United States allowed taxpayers to interact with government in ways similar to interactions using e-commerce following a historical pattern of alignment of state and economy that characterizes the marketized culture of the American state. By 1999, for example, 20,000 citizens used credit cards to pay their federal taxes online. The Environmental Protection Agency provided environmental and regulatory data to the public over the web and estimated that it saved approximately \$5 million annually by digital provision of information. Public health agencies at the community, state, and federal levels began to provide access to previously centrally held information through centralized sites such as the Information Network for Public Health Officials (INPHO) housed within the Centers for Disease Control and Protection in the U.S. Public Health Service.

Proliferation of government websites and interactive information systems during this time period mirrors the highly fragmented and relatively autonomous nature of central departments and agencies in the U.S. federal government and the highly federated structure of the American state. Beyond the White House team of political appointees, staff, and consultants leading the National Performance Review and the Reinventing Government programs, there was no adequate oversight body for the reform effort because institutional arrangements and formal institutions simply did not exist at that time. The strategy explicitly called for a decentralized approach to innovation, to allow federal employees to use and develop their ideas without overarching coordination and control. The e-government program of the Clinton administration followed closely the zeitgeist in the U.S. of the early days of the internet and web.

On the negative side, the highly political nature of the Vice President's reform efforts linked development timetables to

political timing so that events could become showcases for new technological innovations. These temporal pressures were both catalytic in terms of speeding up new developments and problematic in terms of contorting the actual time required to manage such complexity. Structurally, the formal institutions required to govern digital projects lay in the future. The White House-based bureaucratic reform team had strong support at the highest levels of the administration. But they lacked funding, management and oversight methods, and procedures adequate for governance and operations of fundamental technological innovation and change throughout the government. The naïve beliefs that the internet is self-organizing, self-correcting, and infinitely flexible reflected the euphoria of the time and substituted for hard analysis and planning. Severe cuts in the federal workforce shifted resources to the private sector, with increasing use of contracting and IT assistance from outside the government.

On the positive side, the experiments and flexibility allowed to public servants broke through old, well-worn routines and mental frameworks for how governance should work. Civil servants were told to be "grass-roots activists," and gained important experience with IT management, with envisioning the possibilities for governance and operations using web-based operations, and, not least, with inter-agency working groups and projects. At the same time, other formal institutions required for legitimation developed, including legislation, oversight bodies and procedures, regulation, and emergent changes in congressional committees and oversight.

### ***The "Presidential Management Agenda" of the Bush administration***

Beginning in January 2001, the Bush administration continued to use e-government

as a tool of bureaucratic reform following many, but not all, of the broad outlines developed during the Clinton administration. The strong role of professional civil servants in the detailed design and implementation of reforms has much to do with this continuity of effort. Yet major discontinuities between the two administrations reflected, first, the need to reduce ICT costs during a much more constrained budgetary environment; second, a desire to evaluate and consolidate a plethora of disconnected, grass-roots reinvention efforts, which had produced a fragmented e-government landscape; third, heightened awareness of security and privacy challenges, post-9/11; and, finally, the Republican administration's desire to *manage* by strengthening business methods, and specifically by instituting strong control, accountability, and performance objectives.

The central strategy for bureaucratic reform through e-government was articulated in the "The President's Management Agenda" (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2002/mgmt.pdf>). The reform blueprint consists of five "government-wide initiatives" including e-government. This enterprise, or government-wide, approach to bureaucratic reform is isomorphic with enterprise strategies in business.

The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 became law during the Clinton administration and mandated agency strategic planning including annual performance plans and reports. The Clinger-Cohen Act (the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996) requires agencies to treat IT acquisition, planning, and management as a "capital investment" in order to focus IT investments strategically. These and other legislative mandates began to institutionalize e-government systems management. The Bush administration continues the trend toward rationalization and control of ICT management.

The President's Management Agenda is premised upon the economics of ICT and

its potential to improve productivity. It notes that:

The federal government is the world's largest single consumer of information technology (IT). IT has contributed 40 percent of the increase in private-sector productivity growth, but the \$45 billion the U.S. government will spend on IT in 2002 has not produced measurable gains in public-sector worker productivity.

(U.S. Executive Office of the President, 2001: 22)

Bush administration staff attributed lack of productivity gains to lack of strategic IT development; that is, to a failure to align IT systems development with agency performance goals. They cited a tendency toward automation of "pre-existing processes" rather than strategic use of IT for innovation, a central finding of institutional perspectives on e-government. Moreover, they noted lack of consolidation across IT systems developed for generic functional areas such as finance, procurement, and human resources. To remedy these problems, the administration focused on performance strategies and performance gains at the enterprise level, "across agency boundaries" using the budget process as a key tool for project management. Put simply: those projects that do not produce results do not receive funding, have management replaced, and are noted in high-visibility reports. In spite of consolidation efforts, both the Clinton and Bush administrations have remained dedicated to providing government information and services through multiple channels: face-to-face, telephone, and web based. Managing across multiple channels, however responsive to the public, increases the cost and complexity of e-government bureaucratic reform.



The President's budget for 2002 proposed \$20 million for e-government in 2002 and \$100 million for the period between 2002 and 2004 to develop "collaborative E-government activities across agency lines" (U.S. Executive Office of the President, 2001: 23). Yet congressional appropriations during this period were markedly less generous. Thus, most e-government projects have been funded largely through existing agency program budgets. Among the projects specifically singled out in the "President's Management Agenda" were further development of Firstgov.gov; development and implementation of digital signatures, which are needed for online transactions; a single e-procurement portal, with the ungainly name [www.FedBizOpps.gov](http://www.FedBizOpps.gov) to allow businesses to access notices of solicitations over \$25,000; government-wide federal grants application and management ([grants.gov](http://grants.gov)); and greater transparency and access to administrative rule-making in regulatory agencies ([regulations.gov](http://regulations.gov)).

### ***Cross-agency initiatives and shared services***

The Bush administration's e-government plan, initially called "Quicksilver" and based upon a set of projects developed during the Clinton administration, evolved to focus on the infrastructure and management of 25 cross-agency initiatives. The e-government plan also includes a Line of Business strategy, discussed below, and calls for a Federal Enterprise Architecture, an effort to align information architecture within agencies with respect to strategic planning and to align architectural components for similar functional areas across agencies.

The 25 projects are grouped into four categories: government to business, government to government, government to citizen, internal efficiency and effectiveness, and a project that affects all others, e-authentication. Government-to-business

projects include: electronic rule-making, tax products for businesses, streamlining international trade processes, a business gateway, and consolidated health informatics. Government-to-government projects include: interoperability and standardization of geospatial information, interoperability for disaster management, wireless communication standards between emergency managers, standardized and shared vital records information, and consolidated access to federal grants. Government-to-citizen projects consist of: standardized access to information concerning government benefits, standardized and shared public recreation information, electronic tax filing, standardized access and processes for administration of federal loans, and citizen customer service. Projects focused on internal efficiency and effectiveness within the central government include: training, recruitment, human resources integration, security clearance, payroll, travel, acquisitions and records management. (For further information concerning each project see [www.e-gov.gov](http://www.e-gov.gov).)

The 25 projects were selected from more than three hundred initial possibilities by a task force working with IT specialists from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The plethora of possibilities was developed during the Clinton administration and they continue as e-government projects although they lie outside the rubric of the "President's Management Agenda". In all cases, such projects focus attention on the development of horizontal relationships across government agencies. In this sense, they advance beyond what some have called the first stage of e-government typically entailing information provision online to citizens. They also progress further than so-called stage-two e-government, or putting transactions online such as payments to government. In a sense, the evolutionary stage three of e-government might be cross-agency initiatives built on shared systems.

Ironically, such efforts reinvigorate management developments from the 1970s by using proprietary intranets to develop shared databases and information systems using electronic data interchange. The public accessibility of the internet, flexibility of open standards, and web-based programming mean that the technological and systems development challenges differ significantly from the previous efforts, but many of the organizational and institutional challenges are similar. These institutional developments mirror supply-chain integration in vertically integrated firms and industry networks. They are not being invented whole cloth by governments; they exemplify structural isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). As processes and systems are incorporated into government from business, however, they become embedded in a distinctly different environment from their original setting in business.

The point of the Quicksilver effort was to find “quick wins,” functional management areas in which an IT system had been developed that could be used as the basis for a government-wide system and for which the benefits would be significant. But the opportunities to develop government-wide IT systems to consolidate management functions obscured the challenges of institutional change. The effort was—and continues to be—led largely by IT professionals. It has suffered in many cases from lack of program management and the involvement of seasoned civil servants with program management experience. Experienced program managers, for example, understand subtle differences in seemingly generic management functions based on program and policy characteristics, history, and legislation.

### ***Governance and oversight***

The current e-government projects are overseen and supported by the OMB

Office of E-government and Information Technology, a statutory office established as part of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347). The Administrator for E-government and IT, at the apex of the organization, is an associate director of OMB reporting to the Deputy Director for Management, who reports to the OMB Director. The position initially was held by Mark Forman, a political appointee, and is currently held by Karen Evans, a former career civil servant and now a political appointee. The Associate Administrator for E-government and Information Technology, who reports to the Administrator, is responsible for the 25 cross-agency projects. Five portfolio managers have specific responsibility to oversee the cross-agency initiatives. A management consulting group (private contractors) has been responsible for most of the day-to-day communications and reporting for the programs. In effect, they serve as staff and liaisons between OMB and the cross-agency projects that are based in government agencies.

The new organization within OMB signals a major institutional development in the U.S. federal government. Before passage of the E-Government Act of 2002, which established the federal CIO and OMB structure, there was no formal capacity within OMB to oversee and guide cross-agency initiatives. This structural gap formed a major impediment to the development of networked governance during the Clinton administration. In terms of political development and fundamental changes in the nature of the bureaucratic state, we see here the emergent institutionalization of a structure for the direction and oversight of cross-agency, or networked, governance.

The projects themselves are not part of the OMB hierarchy. Oversight and guidance of the projects is exercised by portfolio managers, but the lead agency—or managing partner—for each project is

a federal agency. Each managing partner agency appointed a program manager to lead its project. Program managers are typically senior career federal civil servants. They have been responsible for developing a consultative process among agencies involved in each project and, in consultation with OMB, they are responsible for developing project goals and objectives. In most cases, program managers were also required to devise staffing and funding plans to support their project. Neither funds nor staff was allocated as part of the president's agenda.

The E-Government Act provided for federal funding for the projects of approximately \$345 million over four years. But an average of only \$4 million to \$5 million per annum actually has been appropriated by Congress. Strategies developed by each project for funding, staffing, and internal governance vary widely and have been largely contingent on the skills and experience of the program manager. So far, the legislature has not adapted organizationally to networked government. This lag in institutional development makes it difficult to build networked systems because appropriations of funds continue to flow to individual agencies and programs within them. As John Spotila, former director of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs in OMB, remarked: "Even without homeland security absorbing most of the IT dollars, cross-agency projects have never been a favorite of Congress, where appropriations are awarded through a 'stovepipe system' of committees that makes a multi-agency approach difficult" (quotation in Frank, 2002). Appropriations for the cross-agency initiatives were \$5 million in financial years (FY) 2002 and 2003 and only \$3 million in FY 2004. John Scofield, a spokesman for the House Appropriations Committee was quoted during the 2004 budget negotiations as saying: "We have never been convinced

that the fund [requested to support cross-agency initiatives] doesn't duplicate what already exists in other agencies or performs unique functions ... It has never been well-justified, and we don't have a lot of spare cash lying around" (Scofield quoted in Miller, 2004).

### ***Lines of business: building a shared services environment***

In 2004, the Bush administration launched the Lines of Business initiative to further consolidate and streamline functional management across the federal government. The original five lines of business, identified by virtue of shared enterprise architecture, include human resource management, financial management, grants management, federal health architecture, case management and information systems security. In 2005 the Information Technology Security task force was added as a sixth line of business. The initiative also now includes a seventh, the budget formulation and execution line of business.

Consolidated systems, or "centers of excellence," in President's Management Agenda parlance, may be operated either by agencies or private vendors. Competition is to be fostered by maintaining approximately four IT systems for each line of business. Agencies then choose the system that best meets their needs and budget. For example, the grants management centers of excellence, selected by competition, include the Department of Health and Human Services, the National Science Foundation (primarily for research grants), and the Department of Education, which has yet to build its system. The centers are to compete for agency business and to develop competitive pricing for shared services.

Yet funding shared services is difficult at times to align with congressional appropriations and oversight, which remain

agency based. Congressional committees increasingly have demanded that approval for budget transfers across agencies be approved by Congress. The authority of “lead agencies” over agencies within lines of business networks is collaborative and negotiated, and, even when negotiated through Memoranda of Understanding, remains highly contingent and informal relative to statutory authorities. The coordination costs of such arrangements remain “off the books” in the sense that they fail to show up on budgets and in performance documents.

### **Developments in state and local e-government**

A substantial gap in U.S. e-government collaboration exists between levels of government in the highly federated American system. For example, local and federal initiatives seldom collaborate with each other. This does not mean, however, that government leaders are unaware of initiatives outside their immediate level of government. In fact, “[due] to their variation in geography, demographics, and infrastructure, [the 50] states serve as laboratories of experimentation for e-government. Federal policy-makers may find aspects of state e-government planning and implementation useful examples for future decisions regarding the integration of federal information and services” (Seifert and McLoughlin, 2007, p. 1).

Currently all 50 states in the U.S. have e-government or IT departments or divisions. However, the degree and types of activity in each department and the level of support for each initiative vary widely from state to state. West ranks the websites of states of Delaware, Michigan, Maine, Kentucky, and Tennessee as the top five with respect to access, privacy, and the availability of services and other resources. He notes that the Delaware

website is designed for efficiency and ease of use, and, because most pages can be translated into multiple languages, the information is also widely accessible (West, 2007). By contrast, state websites for Arkansas, Mississippi, New Mexico, West Virginia, and Wyoming were ranked as the bottom five.

In addition to the number of services available, West (2006, 2007) examines the types of services available online. For example, in 2006, Iowa and Massachusetts allowed citizens to pay traffic tickets online; Alaska installed webcams at the field offices of the Department of Motor Vehicle to allow citizens to gauge wait times at offices. In 2007, Virginia and Vermont allowed online donations to military troops and charities; Georgia provided a searchable list of gas prices; and South Carolina provided closed captioned legislative broadcasts. Common problems among state websites include outdated information; inconsistent web page structures or URLs; and inconsistent color schemes and layouts that make it difficult for users to know whether they have left the “official” state web page when they click into a page that contrasts visually with others (West, 2006).

While the importance of an online presence is critical, e-government is much more than the existence of a website. E-government programs must have strong management and leadership and clear strategies in place in order to be effective. The majority of state government chief information officers (CIOs) surveyed by the National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO) have adopted an enterprise architecture as a way to structure e-government initiatives across an entire state government. Most states have designated a chief enterprise architect to lead their programming, although the official title varies from state to state (NASCIO, 2005). All 50 states have CIOs, but the management of

e-government initiatives extends beyond the CIO to include finance and accounting offices, IT departments, and information resources departments (Seifert and McLoughlin, 2007).

As with federal e-government programs, state-level e-government strategies seek to exploit the value of cross-agency collaboration for integration of existing services. Similarly, all such projects affect organizational structures and agency cultures. The challenge of building sustainable collaboration was ranked a high priority for state CIOs in a 2005 survey by NASCIO (NASCIO, 2006b). State CIOs sought to consolidate and share models in several arenas—from procurement to security and disaster recovery. Communication services and online payment engines are reported to be the most commonly completed initiatives; standardized log-ins and identity authentication were the most commonly proposed new initiatives (NASCIO, 2006b). Those CIOs who responded to the survey cited cost savings and increased information sharing as the most common reasons to begin a consolidation program. Seventy-seven percent of CIOs also cited a pervasive stovepiped, agency-based culture as the greatest human resources barrier to implementing any consolidation effort. Moreover, 80 percent view resistance to change in their workforces to be the major obstacle to successful implementation of consolidation projects (NASCIO, 2006b).

Some of the “best practices” in bureaucratic reform through e-government at the state level reported by NASCIO are not necessarily transferable to other states due to geographic, political, social, and fiscal disparities. Yet they signify innovation and change, act as benchmarks, and point to institutional developments. For instance, in 2006, NASCIO recognized the California Statewide Information System (SIS) for Prenatal and Newborn Screening Program as one of two best

practices in cross-boundary collaboration. Led by the California Department of Health Services (CDHS), the system allows physicians statewide to test newborns for 36 more genetic diseases than without the SIS. The program brings together labs, case coordinators, counselors, physicians, and staff of the CDHS for better control of testing, reporting, and follow-ups so that diagnosis and treatment is better administered and more successful. A second example is Washington D.C.’s Safe Passages information system. Safe Passages allows caseworkers to look through the district’s information systems to see if their clients have case histories with other caseworkers or agencies. The program saves time and produces higher quality client services because caseworkers do not have to duplicate client histories and may quickly access previous case decisions.

Bureaucratic reform using e-government at the local level in the United States is highly varied, somewhat slower to have developed, and less often studied than at the state and federal levels. At the county level, a survey of 3099 county governments in the U.S. indicated that 56.3 percent of counties have adopted e-government portals. Portal development is positively correlated with population size, population growth, racial diversity, income, employment opportunities, and education levels (Huang, 2006). A 2004 analysis of 1873 city government websites in the 70 largest metropolitan areas found 60 percent of the cities did not offer *any* online services (West, 2004a). This shows little change from a previous study in which researchers observed that a “striking” number of cities studied did not offer e-government services (Kaylor *et al.*, 2001) and from Edmiston’s (2003) finding that although most local governments have developed websites, there has been little change in local government operations or practice. However, using surveys from

2002, Norris and Moon (2005) reported “enthusiasm” for e-government at the local level and claim that plans for e-government developments were being made. They also noted the increasing rate of growth in the number of local government websites.

Bureaucratic reform through e-government at the local level has lagged for several reasons. Local governments find it difficult or impossible to finance new IT systems given fiscal constraints and local budget processes. Small local governments tend to lack IT expertise and leadership of staff. Vendors already have packaged several e-government service delivery vehicles for local governments, including vital records processes (Edmiston, 2003; Kaylor *et al.*, 2001; Norris and Moon, 2005).

Forward-looking state and local governments typically innovate before larger central governments whose systems are more difficult to change. However, local and state governments vary dramatically in the extent of electronic information and services available primarily because such governments range from small, poor, rural communities with little access to the internet to large metropolitan areas with extensive infrastructure and a range of conditions in between. The American federated system and the size and scale of the United States make e-government in the U.S. more heterogeneous, fragmented, and variable than perhaps in any other country. Local governments tend to be less highly institutionalized in the sense that staff are not always professionalized, routines and procedures are less closely codified, turnover may be greater in employees and officials, and smaller scale allows for greater informality.

## Conclusion

The future of e-government research can be greatly strengthened and enhanced by

importation of several streams of institutional inquiry and methods. Institutional studies, building on a rich base of theoretical and empirical research, should be able to go further than stating that “culture matters,” or that the organizational and political issues in e-government are more difficult than the technical issues. Such research is not meant to supplant studies of information and service provision or studies of citizen attitudes and uses of e-government, but to complement them by examining institutional and organizational structures and processes and their role in structuring the context within which bureaucratic reform is envisioned, designed, and implemented.

The list of institutional research dimensions is rife with possibilities for e-government research. Among the key topics is the role of formal institutions. What type of legislation seems to be most important for bureaucratic reform to move forward, assuming that the goals of the bureaucratic reform are agreed upon by major stakeholders? Is there a discernible sequence, roughly speaking, to the legislation enacted to support e-government across countries? Might there be some predictive or practical value in answers to such questions? What institutional arrangements provide the necessary oversight and overall guidance for e-government reforms?

At the root of this work are normative questions. The number of services available online or the cultural shifts in civil service attitudes toward cross-agency arrangements are important and interesting. Yet, our principal motivation in the study of government typically is to ask whether the government being created is more democratic, along some dimension, than the government being left behind. Hence, normative inquiry, informed by strong scholarly foundations in political philosophy and theory and in the canonical writing of political science and

political sociology, is greatly needed in the subfield of e-government.

Of great importance also are changes in relationships among government agencies across local, state, federal, and national jurisdictions and between public, private, and non-profit organizations. Currently, institutional arrangements such as the budget process, oversight functions, and the committee structure within legislatures reinforce agency autonomy and operations at the level of a single agency or an agency working in partnership with private sector or non-profit sector organizations. Such institutional arrangements are likely to be modified as policy-makers respond to communities of interest, strengthened by the internet, that cross agency boundaries.

Potential near-term technological changes include greater use of wireless communication, personal digital devices, instant messaging, ubiquitous computing, and increased reliance on visual communications media. As these next-generation technologies become more dominant compared with personal computers, bulletin boards and chat rooms, and computer-mediated text communication, they are likely to exert as yet unknown effects on e-government. Similarly, Web 2.0 tools are likely to have an effect on bureaucratic policy-making processes.

Finally, among the important and as yet unanswered research questions for the future are the following puzzles. What are the effects, if any, of e-government on the quality of policy-making and policy implementation? What are the effects of increased transparency and power to manipulate and analyze information on the ability of governments to serve society and economy? What are the unanticipated consequences of governmental cyber-infrastructure? Government officials and policy-makers may use information and communication technologies for government reform, in part by

restructuring government agencies, operations, and relationships across agencies and with non-governmental organizations. But do they? And what are the principal goals of such reforms? Perhaps the most elusive, and certainly the area of highest speculation, is the degree to which the internet is likely to prove “transformative” for governance in the twenty-first century.

## Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the research assistance of Michelle Sagan Goncalves. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Numbers 0131923 and 0630239. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

## Guide to further reading

The author developed the technology enactment framework and presents detailed case studies of bureaucratic reform using e-government in the United States during the Clinton administration (Fountain, 2001a). A research agenda for the study of ICT and governance was generated through dialog at a workshop of approximately 30 researchers resulting in a monograph (Fountain, 2002). Darrell West (2005) has compared information and services available on government websites in state and local U.S. governments as well as in and among federal agencies. Patrick Dunleavy, Helen Margetts, Simon Bastow, and Jane Tinkler (Dunleavy *et al.*, 2007) compare e-government developments in the United States, with specific attention to

the role of the IT industry and the costs of projects, to those in several other countries including Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia. An assessment of cost savings in e-government is to be found in Fountain and Osorio-Urzu

(2001). Finally, David Lazer's and Viktor Mayer-Schönberger's (2007) edited volume features several chapters on the role and importance of information in e-government.

t&f proofs



---

# Bibliography

---

- 6 P., Leat, D., Seltzer, K. & Stoker, G. (2002). *Towards Holistic Government: the new reform agenda*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- (2004). Joined up government in the western world in comparative perspective: a preliminary literature review and explanation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 14(1), 103–38.
- Abramson, J. B., Arterton, F. C. & Orren, G. R. (1988). *The Electronic Commonwealth: the impact of new media technologies on democratic politics*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Accenture (2001). *Egovernment Leadership: rhetoric vs. reality – closing the gap*. London: Accenture.
- (2002). *Egovernment Leadership: realizing the vision, the government executive series*. London: Accenture.
- (2003). *Egovernment Leadership: engaging the customer, the government executive series*. London: Accenture.
- (2004). *Egovernment Leadership: high performance, maximum value, the value, the government executive series*. London: Accenture.
- (2005). *Leadership in Customer Service: new expectations, new experiences, the government executive series*. London: Accenture.
- Acedo, M. & Krueger, J. I. (2004). Two ego-centric sources of the decision to vote: the voter's illusion and the belief in personal relevance. *Political Psychology*, 25(1), 115–34.
- Adam, A. (2002). Cyberstalking and internet pornography: gender and the gaze. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 4(2), 133–42.
- Adamic, L. & Glance, N. (2005). *The political blogosphere and the 2004 US election: divided they blog*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.blogpulse.com/papers/2005/AdamicGlanceBlogWWW.pdf](http://www.blogpulse.com/papers/2005/AdamicGlanceBlogWWW.pdf)
- Adams, J. (2001). Virtual defense. *Foreign Affairs*, 80(3), 98–112.
- Adams, P. C. & Rina, G. (2003). India.Com: the construction of a space between. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(4), 414–37.
- Adkins, R. E. & Dowdle, A. J. (2002). The money primary: what influences the outcome of pre-primary presidential nomination fundraising? *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 32(2), 256–75.
- Agre, P. E. (2002). Real-time politics: The internet and the political process. *Information Society*, 18(5), 311–31.
- Aguirre, B. E. & Saenz, R. (2002). Testing the effects of collectively expected durations of migration: the naturalization of Mexicans and Cubans. *International Migration Review*, 36(1), 103–24.
- Ahlers, D. (2006). News consumption and the new electronic media. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 11(1), 29–52.
- Ahrens, F. (2006a, September 24). New-media richcraft invites priceless comparisons. *Washington Post*.
- (2006b, October 31). With tribune on block, LA times circulation down 8% drop is steepest among major US newspapers. *Washington Post*.
- Akdeniz, Y. (2002). Anonymity, democracy, and cyberspace. *Social Research*, 69(1), 223–37.
- Akrich, M. (1995). User representations: practices, methods and sociology. In: A. Rip, T. J. Misa & J. Schot (eds.), *Managing Technology in Society: the approach of constructive technology assessment*. London: Pinter Publishers.

- Alba, R. D. & Logan, J. R. (1991). Variations on two themes: racial and ethnic patterns in the attainment of suburban residence. *Demography*, 28(3), 431–53.
- Albrecht, S. (2006). Whose voice is heard in online deliberation? A study of online participation and representation in political debates on the internet. *Information, Communication and Society*, 9(1), 62–82.
- Aldrich, J. H. (1995). *Why parties?: the origin and transformation of political parties in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Alexa Web Service (2007). *Top 100 sites: US*. Retrieved November 22, from [www.alexa.com/site/ds/top\\_sites?cc=US&ts\\_mode=country&lang=none](http://www.alexa.com/site/ds/top_sites?cc=US&ts_mode=country&lang=none)
- Allan, S. (2006). *Online News: journalism and the internet*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Allen, A. (2001). Pornography and power. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 32(4), 512–31.
- Allen, K. (2007, March 28). Online advertising share overtakes newspapers. *The Guardian*.
- al-Saggaf, Y. (2004). The effect of online community on offline community in Saudi Arabia. *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 16(2), 1–16.
- Alterman, J. (1998). *New Media, New Politics: from satellite television to the internet in the Arab world*. Washington, DC: Washington Institute for Near East Policy.
- Alterman, J. (2000). Middle East's information revolution. *Current History*, January, 21–26.
- Althaus, S. L. (1999). Toward a theory of information effects in collective preferences, *Annual Conference of the International Communication Association*. San Francisco: International Communication Association.
- Althaus, S. L. & Tewksbury, D. (2000). Patterns of internet and traditional media use in a networked community. *Political Communication*, 17(1), 21–45.
- (2002). Agenda setting and the “new” news: patterns of issue importance among readers of the paper and online versions of the New York Times. *Communication Research*, 29(2), 180–207.
- Altintas, K. (2002). Censoring the internet: the situation in Turkey. *First Monday*, 7(6).
- Alvarez, R. M. & Hall, T. E. (2004). *Point, Click and Vote: the future of internet voting*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Alvarez, R. M. & Nagler, J. (2002). The likely consequences of internet voting for political representation. *Loyola of Los Angeles Review*, 34(3), 1115–53.
- American Library Association (1989). *Presidential Committee on Information Literacy*. Retrieved May 23, 2002, from [www.infolit.org/documents/89Report/htm](http://www.infolit.org/documents/89Report/htm)
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso.
- Anderson, C. (2006). *The Long Tail: how endless choice is creating unlimited demand*. London: Random House.
- Anderson, J. (1995). Cybarites, knowledge workers and new creoles on the information superhighway. *Anthropology Today*, 11(4), 13–15.
- (1998). *Arabizing the Internet*. Abu Dhabi: Emirates Center for Strategic Studies.
- Anderson, K. (2006). *The Long Tail: why the future of business is selling less of more*. New York: Hyperion.
- Anderson, P. J. & Ward, G. (2007). *The Future of Journalism in the Advanced Democracies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Anderson, R. & Murdoch, S. (2007). Tools and technology of internet filtering. In: R. J. Deibert, J. G. Palfrey, R. Rohozinski & J. Zittrain (eds.), *Access Denied: the practice and policy of global internet filtering*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Anderson, T. & Hill, P. (1975). The evolution of property rights: a study of the American west. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 18(1), 163–79.
- Andrejevic, M. (2002). The work of being watched: Interactive media and the exploitation of self-disclosure. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 19(2), 230–48.
- Ang, I. (2004). *Jordan and Singapore sign a free-trade pact*. Retrieved May 17, 2004, from [www.bilaterals.org/article.php3?id\\_article=142](http://www.bilaterals.org/article.php3?id_article=142)
- Anon. (1988, September 8). Bush trips in speech. *New York Times*.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: cultural dimension of globalization*. Twin City: University of Minnesota Press.
- Archdeacon, T. S. (2007, 14 February). Baltic schools behind in computer use. *The Baltic Times*.
- ARD/ZDF-Arbeitsgruppe Multimedia (1999). Nichtnutzer von online: Einstellungen und zugangsbarrieren. Ergebnisse der ARD/ZDF-offline-studie 1999 [Online non-users: attitudes and access barriers. Results of the ARD/

- ZDF offline study 1999]. *Media Perspektiven*, 1415–22.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (1968). *Between Past and Future: eight exercises in political thought*. New York: Viking.
- (1970). *Man in Dark Times*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Arieanna (2005). *Text messaging lets Iraqis tip authorities to attacks from a safe distance*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [http://blog.ipipi.com/blog/\\_archives/2005/1/21/270942.html](http://blog.ipipi.com/blog/_archives/2005/1/21/270942.html)
- Arquilla, J. (1995). Welcome to the revolution in military affairs. *Comparative Strategy*, 14(2), 331–41.
- (1996). *The Advent of Netwar*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Arquilla, J. & Ronfeldt, D. F. (2001). *Networks and Netwars: the future of terror, crime, militancy*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Ashby, W. (1956). *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. London: Chapman Hall.
- Associated Press (2007a). *Blogs transform Middle East social dialogue*. Retrieved February 10, 2007, from [www.msnbc.msn.com/id/17070982](http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/17070982)
- (2007b, March 13). Egypt: 4-year sentence for blogger upheld. *New York Times*.
- Atkins, D. E., Droegemeier, K. K., Feldman, S. I. et al. (2003). *Revolutionizing Science and Engineering through Cyberinfrastructure: report of the blue-ribbon advisory panel on cyberinfrastructure*. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.
- Atkins, W. (2002). *The Politics of South East Asia's New Media*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Attwood, F. (2002). Reading porn: the paradigm shift in pornography research. *Sexualities: Studies in Culture and Society*, 5(1), 91–105.
- Aune, M., Berker, T. & Sorensen, K. H. (2002). *Needs, Roles, and Participation: a review of social science studies of users in technological design*. Trondheim: NTNU, Department of Interdisciplinary Studies of Culture.
- Axelrod, R. (1985). *The Evolution of Co-operation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ayres, R. U. & Williams, E. (2003). The digital economy: where do we stand? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 71(4), 315–39.
- Balganesh, S. (2006). Common law property metaphors on the internet: the real problem with the doctrine of cybertrespass. *Michigan Telecommunications and Technology Law Review*, 12(2), 265–333.
- Balkin, J. (1991). Ideology as constraint. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(5), 1133–69.
- (2003). The proliferation of legal truth. *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 26 (Winter), 5–16.
- Ball-Rokeach, S. J., Kim, Y. C. & Matei, S. (2001). Storytelling neighborhood: paths to belonging in diverse urban environments. *Communication Research*, 28(4), 392–428.
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong Democracy: participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (2004). Which technology and which democracy. In: H. Jenkins & D. Thorburn (eds.), *Democracy and the New Media*. London: MIT Press.
- Barber, B., Mattson, K. & Peterson, J. (1997). *The State of "Electronically Enhanced Democracy": a survey of the internet*. New Brunswick, NJ: Walt Whitman Center.
- Barcan, R. (2002). In the raw: "home-made" porn and reality genres. *Journal of Mundane Behavior*, 3(1).
- Barlow, J. P. (1996). *A declaration of independence of cyberspace*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://homes.eff.org/~barlow/Declaration-Final.html>
- Barnhurst, K. G. (2002). News geography and monopoly: the form of reports on US newspaper and internet sites. *Journalism Studies*, 3(4), 477–89.
- Barry, B. & Dauphin, J. (2003). Unesco activities in the field of free and open source software (Foss). Paper presented at the ACT 2003 The Fifth Annual African Computing and Telecommunication Summit.
- Barsoum, G. F. (1999). *Jobs for "wilad al-nas" the Jobs Dilemma of Female Graduates in Egypt*. American University, Cairo.
- Bartels, L. (1996). Uninformed voters: information effects in presidential elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40, 194–230.
- Barzelay, M. (2000). *The New Public Management: improving research and policy dialogue*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Baum, J. & Oliver, P. (1992). Institutional embeddedness and the dynamics of organizational populations. *American Sociological Review*, 57(4), 540–59.

- Bauman, Z. (2002). *Society Under Siege*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2005). *Liquid Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Baumgartner, F. R. & Jones, B. D. (1993). *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Baumgartner, F. R. & Leech, B. L. (1998/2001). *Basic Interests: the importance of groups in politics and in political science*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Baumgartner, J. C. (2000). *Modern Presidential Electioneering: an organizational and comparative approach*. Westport, Conn.; London: Praeger.
- Baym, N. K. (2000). *Tune In, Log On: soaps, fandom, and online community*. New York: Sage.
- BBC News Online (2005). *Dutch say "no" to EU constitution*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4601439.stm>
- (2007). *Open source gets European boost*. Retrieved January 17, 2007, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/technology/6270657.stm>
- Beck, U. (1999). *World Risk Society*. London: Blackwell.
- (2000). *What is Globalization?* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Beck, U., Giddens, A. & Lash, S. (1994). *Reflexive Modernization*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Becker, L. B. & Dunwoody, S. (1982). Media use, public affairs knowledge and voting in a local election. *Journalism Quarterly*, 59, 212–18.
- Becker, L. B. & Whitney, D. C. (1980). Effects of media dependencies: audience assessments of government. *Communication Research*, 7, 95–120.
- Beckerman, G. (2007). The new Arab conversation. *Columbia Journalism Review*, January/February.
- Beckert, J. (1999). Agency, entrepreneurs, and institutional change. The role of strategic choice and institutionalized practices in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 20(5), 777–99.
- Bekkers, V. (2004). Virtual policy communities and responsive governance: redesigning online debates. *Information Polity*, 9, 193–203.
- Bell, D. (1981). The social framework of the information society. In: T. Forester (ed.), *The Microelectronics Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (2001). *An Introduction to Cybercultures*. New York: Routledge.
- Bellamy, C. & Taylor, J. A. (1998). *Governing in the Information Age*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bellin, E. (2005). Coercive institutions and coercive leaders. In: M. P. Posusney & M. P. Angrist (eds.), *Authoritarianism in the Middle East: regimes and resistance*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Benford, R. D. & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: an overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 611–39.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The Wealth of Networks: how social production transforms markets and freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bennett, C. J. & Crow, L. (2005). *Location based services and the surveillance of mobility: an analysis of privacy risks in Canada*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://web.uvic.ca/polisci/bennett/pdf/lbsfinal.pdf>
- Bennett, L. (2001). *News: the politics of illusion*, 4th edn. New York: Harlow: Longman.
- Bennett, L., Pickard, V., Iozzi, D., Schroeder, C., Lagos, T. & Caswell, C. (2004). Managing the public sphere: journalistic construction of the great globalization debate. *Journal of Communication*, 54(3), 437–55.
- Bennett, L. & Serrin, W. (2005). The watchdog role. In: G. Overholser & K. H. Jamieson (eds.) *Institutions of American Democracy: the press*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, W. L. (1998). The uncivic culture: communication, identity, and the rise of lifestyle politics. *Political Science and Politics*, 31(4), 41–61.
- (2003). Communicating global activism: strengths and vulnerabilities of networked politics. *Information, Communication and Society*, 6(2), 143–68.
- Bennett, W. L., Breunig, C. & Givens, T. (2008). Crossing political divides: Communication, political identification, and protest organization. In: S. Walgrave & D. Rucht (eds.), *Protest Politics: anti-war mobilization in Western democracies*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bennett, W. L., Foot, K., Werbel, L. & Xenos, M. (2007). *Strategic conflicts in advocacy networks: how narrative frames shape relations among US and UK fair trade organizations*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.

- Bennett, W. L. & Lagos, T. (2007). Logo logic: the ups and downs of branded political communication. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 611, 193–206.
- Bennett, W. L. & Manheim, J. B. (2001). The big spin: strategic communication and the transformation of pluralist democracy. In: W. L. Bennett & R. M. Entman (eds.), *Mediated Politics: communication in the future of democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Benoliel, J. (2005). Law, geography and cyberspace: the case of territorial privacy. *Cardozo Arts and Entertainment Law Journal*, 23(1), 125–96.
- Berelson, B. (1952). Democratic theory and public opinion. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 16(3), 313–30.
- Berger, B. L. (2002). Trial by metaphor: rhetoric, innovation, and the juridical text. *Court Review*, (Fall), 30–38.
- Berkowitz, B. D. (2003). *The New Face of War: how the war will be fought in the 21st century*. New York: Free Press.
- Berry, J. M. (1984). *The Interest Group Society*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Best, S. J., Chmielewski, B. & Krueger, B. S. (2005). Selective exposure to online foreign news during the conflict with Iraq. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 10(4), 52–70.
- Bimber, B. (1998). The internet and political transformation: populism, community, and accelerated pluralism. *Polity*, 31(1), 133–60.
- (1999). The internet and citizen communication with government: does the medium matter? *Political Communication*, 16(4), 409–28.
- (2000). The study of information technology and civic engagement. *Political Communication*, 17(4), 329–33.
- (2001). Information and political engagement in America: the search for effects of information technology at the individual level. *Political Research Quarterly*, 54(1), 53–67.
- (2003). *Information and American Democracy: technology in the evolution of political power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bimber, B. & Davis, R. (2003). *Campaigning Online: the internet in US elections*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bimber, B., Flanagin, A. J. & Stohl, C. (2005). Reconceptualizing collective action in the contemporary media environment. *Communication Theory*, 15(4), 365–88.
- Blavin, J. H. & Cohen, I. G. (2002). Gore, Gibson, and Goldsmith: the evolution of internet metaphors in law and commentary. *Harvard Journal of Law and Technology*, 16(1), 265–85.
- Blears, H. (2007). *Speech to the Fabian Society*. Retrieved May 10, 2007, from <http://fabians.org.uk/events/blears-party-07/speech>
- Blumler, J. G. & Gurevitch, M. (2000). Rethinking the study of political communication. In: J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (eds.), *Mass Media and Society*, 3rd edn. London: Arnold.
- (2001). The new media and our political communication discontents: democratizing cyberspace. *Information, Communication and Society*, 4(1), 1–13.
- Boase, J., Horrigan, J. B., Wellman, B. & Rainie, L. (2006). *The Strength of Ties*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Boczkowski, P. (2002). The development and use of online newspapers: what research tells us and what we might want to know. In: L. A. Lievrouw & S. Livingstone (eds.), *The Handbook of New Media*. London: Sage.
- (2004a). *Digitizing the News: innovation in online newspapers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (2004b). The processes of adopting multimedia and interactivity in three online newsrooms. *Journal of Communication*, 54(2), 197–213.
- Boddy, W. (2003). Redefining the home screen: Technological convergence as trauma and business plan. In: D. Thorburn & H. Jenkins (eds.), *Rethinking Media Change: the aesthetics of transition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bogdanor, V. (1984). Introduction. In: V. Bogdanor (ed.), *Parties and Democracy in Britain and America*. New York: Praeger.
- Bolter, J. D. & Grusin, R. (1999). *Remediation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bonfadelli, H. (2002). The internet and knowledge gaps: a theoretical and empirical investigation. *European Journal of Communication*, 17(1), 65–84.
- Boogers, M. & Voerman, G. (2003). Surfing citizens and floating voters: results of an online survey of visitors to political websites during the Dutch 2002 general elections. *Information Polity*, 8(1–2), 17–27.
- Bosmajian, H. A. (1992). *Metaphor and Reason in Judicial Opinions*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Boubakar, B. & Dauphin, J. (2003). *UNESCO activities in the field of free and open source software*.

- Paper presented at the The Fifth Annual African Computing and Telecommunication Summit, Abuja, Nigeria.
- Bowers-Brown, J. (2003). A marriage made in cyberspace? Political marketing and British party websites. In: R. K. Gibson, P. Nixon & S. Ward (eds.), *Political Parties and the Internet: Net Gain?* London: Routledge.
- Bowler, S. & Donovan, T. (1998). *Demanding Choices: opinion, voting, and direct democracy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- (2002). Do voters have a cue? Television advertisement as a source of information in citizen-initiated referendum campaigns. *European Journal of Political Research*, 41(6), 777–93.
- Bowler, S., Donovan, T. & Tolbert, C. (1998). *Citizens as Legislators: direct democracy in the United States*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Bradley, C. D. (1993). Access to US government information on the internet. *Interpersonal Computing and Technology: An Electronic Journal for the 21st Century*, 1(4).
- Braman, S. (2006). Tactical memory: the politics of openness in the construction of memory. *First Monday*, 11(7).
- Branton, R. P. (2003). Examining individual-level voting behavior on state ballot propositions. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(3), 367–77.
- Brasher, B. E. (2004). *Give Me That Online Religion*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bretschneider, S. (2003). Information technology, e-government, and institutional change. *Public Administration Review*, 63(6), 738–41.
- Bridges.org (2004). *Straight from the Source: perspectives from the African free and open source software movement*. Cape Town: Bridges.org.
- Brint, S. & Karabel, J. (1991). Institutional origins and transformations: the case of American community colleges. In: W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Broder, D. (2000). *Democracy Derailed: initiative campaigns and the power of money*. Orlando: Harcourt.
- Broder, J. (2007, February 9). Edwards learns blogs can cut 2 ways. *New York Times*.
- Brody, R. (1978). The puzzle of political participation in America. In: A. King (ed.), *The New American Political System*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.
- Brosnan, M. J. (1998). The impact of computer anxiety and self-efficacy upon performance. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 14(3), 223–34.
- Brouwer, L. (2006). Dutch Moroccan websites: a transnational imagery? *Ethnic & Migration Studies*, 32(7), 1153–68.
- Browning, G. (2001). *Electronic Democracy: using the internet to transform American politics*, 2nd edn. Medford, NJ: CyberAge Books.
- Brundidge, J. S. (2006). *The contribution of the internet to the heterogeneity of political discussion networks: does the medium matter?* Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Conference, Dresden.
- Bruns, A. (2005). *Gatewatching: collaborative online news production*. New York: Peter Lang.
- (2007). Methodologies for mapping the political blogosphere: an exploration using the issue crawler research tool. *First Monday*, 12(5).
- Bucy, E. P., 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*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Budge, I. (1996). *The New Challenge of Direct Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Buechler, S. (1995). New social movement theories. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 36(3), 441–64.
- Bunz, U., Curry, C. & Voon, W. (2006). Perceived versus actual computer-email-web fluency. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(5), 2321–44.
- Burke, A., Sowerbutts, S., Blundell, B. & Sherry, M. (2002). Child pornography and the internet: policing and treatment issues. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 9(1), 79–84.
- Burkhalter, S., Gastil, J. & Kelshaw, T. (2002). A conceptual definition and theoretical model of public deliberation in small face-to-face groups. *Communication Theory*, 12(4), 398–422.
- Burnett, R. & Marshall, P. D. (2003). *Web Theory: an introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Burnham, D. (1983). *The Rise of the Computer State*. New York: Random House.
- Burt, E. & Taylor, J. (2001). When virtual meets value: insights from the voluntary sector. *Information Communication and Society*, 4(1), 54–73.
- Burt, R. S. (2005). *Brokerage and Closure: an introduction to social capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Burton, C. (2003, November 1). Singapore tightens control over internet cyber-threat. *Financial Times*.
- Burton, J. & Williams, F. (2005, March 10). Singapore overtakes US to lead world in new IT. *Financial Times*.
- Bush, J. (2005, February 27). Worried you don't understand the rules of the Euro game? You'd be more worried if you did. *Independent on Sunday*.
- Bushnell-Embling, D. (2007). *Australian prisoners chipped as part of a new RFID trial, plans to integrate tags with CCTV*. Retrieved June 26, 2007, from www.computerworld.com.au/index.php?id=774240213
- Butler, D. & Ranney, A. (1994). *Referendums Around the World: the growing use of direct democracy*. Washington, DC: AEI Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge.
- Button, M. & Ryfe, D. (2005). What can we learn from the practice of deliberative democracy? In: J. Gastil & P. Levine (eds.), *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Buxton, N. (2002). Dial-up networking for debt collection and development. In: S. Hick & J. McNutt (eds.), *Advocacy, Activism and the Internet: community organization and social policy*. Chicago: Lyceum Books.
- Cammaerts, B. & Carpentier, N. (2005). The unbearable lightness of full participation in a global context: WSIS and civil society participation. In: J. Servaes & N. Carpentier (eds.), *Towards a Sustainable Information Society: deconstructing WSIS*. Bristol: Intellect.
- Campaign for Freedom of Information (1995, October 16). Press release.
- Campbell, A. A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E. & Stokes, D. E. (1960). *The American Voter*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, J. (2000). *The American Campaign, U.S. Presidential Campaigns and the National Vote*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Campbell, J. E. (2004). *Getting it on Online: cyberspace, gay male sexuality, and embodied identity*. Binghampton: Harrington Park Press.
- Can, F. (1999). Feminist rhetoric in cyberspace: the ethos of feminist usenet newsgroups. *Information Society*, 15(3), 187–97.
- Cappella, J. & Jamieson, K. H. (1996). News frames, political cynicism, and media cynicism. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 546, 71–85.
- (1997). *Spiral of Cynicism: the press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cappella, J., Price, V. & Nir, L. (2002). Argument repertoire as a reliable and valid measure of opinion quality: electronic dialogue during Campaign 2000. *Political Communication*, 19(1), 73–93.
- Cappella, J. N. & Jamieson, K. H. (1997). *Spiral of Cynicism: the press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cardoso, F. H. (2004). *We the Peoples: civil society, the United Nations and global governance*. New York: United Nations.
- Carey, J. (1995). The press, public opinion, and public discourse. In: T. Glasser & C. Salmon (eds.), *Public Opinion and the Communication of Consent*. New York: Guilford.
- Carlaw, K., Oxley, L., Walker, P., Thorns, D. & Nuth, M. (2006). Beyond the hype: intellectual property and the knowledge society/knowledge economy. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 20(4), 633–90.
- Cass, R. A. (1995). Judging: norms and incentives of retrospective decision-making. *Boston University Law Review*, 75, 941–96.
- Cassidy, W. P. (2005). Variations on a theme: the professional role conceptions of print and online newspaper journalists. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(2), 264–81.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- (2000). *The Rise of the Network Society*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. & Himanen, P. (2002). *The Information Society and the Welfare State: the Finnish model*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Castles, S. & Davison, A. (2000). *Citizenship and Migration: globalization and the politics of belonging*. New York: Routledge.
- Cave, J., Marsden, C., Klautzer, L., Levitt, R., van Oranje-Nassau, C., Rabinovich, L. et al. (2007). *Responsibility in the Global Information Society: towards multi-stakeholder governance*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Ceasar, J. W. & Busch, A. E. (2005). *Red over Blue: the 2004 elections and American politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

- Center for Communication and Civic Engagement (2004). *The digital election: 2004*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://depts.washington.edu/ccce/civicingagement/digitalelections.html>
- Centre for Policy Research on Science and Technology (nd). *Prepaid in the news*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.sfu.ca/cprost/prepaid/news.htm](http://www.sfu.ca/cprost/prepaid/news.htm)
- Ceruzzi, P. (1997). An unforeseen revolution: computers and expectations 1935–85. In: A. H. Teich (ed.), *Technology and the Future*, 7th edn. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Chadwick, A. (2001). The electronic face of government in the internet age: borrowing from Murray Edelman. *Information Communication and Society*, 4(3), 435–57.
- (2006). *Internet Politics: states, citizens, and new communication technologies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (2007). Digital network repertoires and organizational hybridity. *Political Communication*, 24(3), 283–301.
- Chadwick, A. & May, C. (2003). Interaction between states and citizens in the age of the internet: “E-government” in the United States, Britain, and the European Union. *Governance*, 16(2), 271–300.
- Chaffee, S. H. (2001). Studying the new communication of politics. *Political Communication*, 18(2), 237–44.
- Chaffee, S. H. & Frank, S. (1996). How Americans get political information: print versus broadcast news. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 546(1), 48–58.
- Chaffee, S. H. & Kanihan, S. F. (1997). Learning about politics from the mass media. *Political Communication*, 14(4), 421–30.
- Chaffee, S. H. & Metzger, M. J. (2001). The end of mass communication? *Mass Communication and Society*, 4(4), 365–79.
- Chaffee, S. H., Nichols, M., Graf, J., Sandvig, C. & Hahn, K. (2001). Attention to counter-attitudinal messages in a state election campaign. *Political Communication*, 18(3), 247–72.
- Chaffee, S. H. & Schleuder, J. (1986). Measurement and effects of attention to media news. *Human Communication Research*, 13(1), 76–107.
- Chaffee, S. H., Zhou, X. & Leshner, G. (1992). Political knowledge and the campaign media of 1992. *Communication Research*, 21, 305–24.
- Chalaby, J. K. (2005). *Transnational Television Worldwide*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Chan, B. (2005). Imagining the homeland: the internet and diasporic discourse of nationalism. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 29(4), 336–68.
- Chan, J. K. C. & Leung, L. (2005). Lifestyles, reliance on traditional news media and online news adoption. *New Media and Society*, 7(3), 357–82.
- Chang, J. (2007, January 14). Order to ban YouTube ignites Brazil firestorm. *Seattle Times*.
- Chen, P. (2002). Virtual representation: Australian elected representatives and the impact of the internet. *Journal of Information Law and Technology*, 3.
- Cho, J., de Zúñiga, H., Rojas, H. & Shah, D. (2003). Beyond access: the digital divide and internet uses and gratifications. *IT and Society*, 1(4), 46–72.
- Choi, J. H., Watt, J. H. & Lynch, M. (2006). Perceptions of news credibility about the war in Iraq: why war opponents perceived the internet as the most credible medium. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(1).
- ChoicePoint (2007). *2006 Annual Report*. Alpharetta, GA: ChoicePoint.
- Chua, S. L., Chen, D. T. & Wong, A. F. L. (1999). Computer anxiety and its correlates: a meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 15(5), 609–23.
- Chung, D. S. (2007). Profits and perils: online news producers' perceptions of interactivity and uses of interactive features. *Convergence*, 13(1), 43–61.
- Clark, J. (2003). Introduction: civil society and transnational action. In: J. Clark (ed.), *Globalizing Civic Engagement: civil society and transnational action*. London: Earthscan Publications Limited.
- Clarke, J. & Themudo, N. (2003). The age of protest: internet based dot-causes and the anti-globalization movement. In: J. Clarke (ed.), *Globalizing Civic Action*. London: Earthscan.
- Clayton, R., Murdoch, S. J. & Watson, R. N. M. (2006). *Ignoring the great firewall of China*. Paper presented at the 6th Workshop on Privacy Enhancing Technologies Robinson College, Cambridge, UK.
- Clinton, W. J. (1996). *Address before a joint session of the Congress on the state of the union*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?>



- dbname=1996\_public\_papers\_vol1\_text&docid=pap\_text-54
- CNN (2006). *American votes 2006: US Senate – Virginia*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2006/pages/results/states/VA/S/01/index.html>
- Cobb, R. W. & Elder, C. D. (1983). *Participation in American Politics: the dynamics of agenda-building*, 2nd edn. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Cockburn, C. (1992). The circuit of technology: Gender, identity and power. In: R. Silverstone & E. Hirsch (eds.), *Consuming Technology: media and information in domestic spaces*. London: Routledge.
- Cockburn, C. & Fürst-Dilić, R. (1994). *Bringing Technology Home: gender and technology in a changing Europe*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Cockburn, C. & Ormrod, S. (1993). *Gender and Technology in the Making*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cogburn, D. L. (2004a). Diversity matters, even at a distance: evaluating the impact of computer-mediated communication on civil society participation in the World Summit on the Information Society. *Information Technology and International Development*, 1(3–4), 15–40.
- (2004b). Elite decision-making and epistemic communities: implications for global information policy. In: S. Braman (ed.), *The Emergent Global Information Policy Regime*. New York: Palgrave.
- (2005). Partners or pawns? Developing countries and regime change in global information policy governance. *Knowledge, Technology, and Policy*, 18(2), 52–82.
- Cogburn, D., Johnsen, J. F. & Bhattacharyya, S. (2008). Distributed deliberative citizens: exploring the impact of cyberinfrastructure on transnational civil society participation in global ICT policy processes. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 4(1), 27–49.
- Cogburn, D. L., Mueller, M., McKnight, L., Klein, H. & Mathiason, J. (2005). The US role in global internet governance. *IEEE Communications Magazine* (December), 12–14.
- Cohen, E. A. (1996). A revolution in warfare. *Foreign Affairs*, 75(2), 37–54.
- Cohen, E. L. (2002). Online journalism as market-driven journalism. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 46(4), 532–48.
- Cohen, J. (1997). Deliberation and democratic legitimacy. In: J. F. Bohman & W. Rehg (eds.), *Deliberative Democracy: essays on reason and politics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cohen, J. E. (2007). Cyberspace as/and space. *Columbia Law Review*, 107, 210–56.
- Cohen, R. & Rai, S. (eds.). (2000). *Global Social Movements*. London: Athlone Press.
- Coleman, S. (2004). Connecting Parliament to the public via the internet: two case studies of online consultations. *Information, Communication and Society*, 7(1), 1–22.
- (2005a). Just how risky is online voting? *Information Polity*, 10(1–2), 95–104.
- (2005b). New mediation and direct representation: reconceptualizing representation in the digital age. *New Media and Society*, 7(2), 177–98.
- (2005c). The lonely citizen: indirect representation in a age of networks. *Political Communication*, 22(2), 197–214.
- (2006). Parliamentary communication in an age of digital interactivity. *Aslib Proceedings*, 58(5), 371–88.
- Coleman, S. & Blumler, J. (2001). *Realizing Democracy Online: towards a civic commons in cyberspace*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Coleman, S. & Hall, N. (2001). E-campaigning and beyond. In: S. Coleman (ed.), *Cyberspace Odyssey*. London: Hansard Society.
- Coleman, S. & Ross, K. (2008). *Them and Us: how the media see the public*. London: Blackwell.
- Coleman, S., Taylor, J. & Van Donk, W. (1999). Parliament in the age of the internet. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 52(3).
- Collins, P. M. (2006). *Interest group influence on the supreme court: theoretical and methodological considerations*. Paper presented at the Southern Political Science Association Annual Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Commission of the European Communities (1996). *Communication of the Commission about universal service for telecommunication* (No. COM (1996) 96–73). Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.
- (2002). *Europe 2005: An information society for all* (No. COM 263 final). Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.
- (2003). *European electronic communications regulation and markets 2003: report on implementation of the EU electronic communications*

- regulatory package (No. COM (2003) 715 final). Brussels: Commission of the European Union.
- (2005). *I2010-a European information society for growth and employment* (No. COM (2005) 229 final). Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.
- (2007). *RFID technologies: emerging issues, challenges, and policy options*. Luxembourg: Institute for Prospective Technological Studies.
- Compaine, B. M. (2001). *The Digital Divide: facing a crisis or creating a myth?* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- ComScore (2007). *Mobile web audience already one-fifth the size of PC-based internet audience in the UK*. Retrieved May 14, 2007, from www.comscore.com
- Conboy, M. (2004). *Journalism: a critical history*. London: Sage.
- Consalvo, M. (2002). Selling the internet to women: the early years. In: M. Consalvo & S. Paasonen (eds.), *Women and Everyday Uses of the Internet: agency and identity*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Consalvo, M. & Paasonen, S. (eds.) (2002). *Women and Everyday Uses of the Internet: agency and identity*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Converse, P. E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In: D. A. Apter (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent*. New York: Free Press.
- (1990). Popular representation and the distribution of information. In: J. A. Ferejohn & J. H. Kuklinski (eds.), *Information and Democratic Processes*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Cooke, L. (2005). A visual convergence of print, television, and the internet: charting 40 years of design change in news presentation. *New Media and Society*, 7(1), 22–46.
- Copsey, N. (2003). Extremism on the internet: the far right and the value of the internet. In: R. K. Gibson, P. Nixon & S. Ward (eds.), *Political Parties and the Internet: net gain?* London: Routledge.
- Cornfield, M. (2004a). *Pew Internet Project data memo*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- (2004b). *Politics Moves Online: campaigning and the internet*. New York: Century Foundation Press.
- (2004c). *Presidential Campaign Advertising on the Internet*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- (2006). YouTube and you. *Campaigns and Elections*, 27(8), 43.
- Cornfield, M. & Rainie, L. (2006). *The Impact of the Internet on Politics*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Cornfield, M., Rainie, L. & Horrigan, J. (2003). *Untuned Keyboards: online campaigners, citizens, and portals in the 2002 elections*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Corrado, A. (1996). Elections in cyberspace: prospects and problems. In: A. Corrado & C. M. Firestone (eds.), *Elections in Cyberspace: toward a new era in American politics*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- Cowhey, P. F. (1990). The international telecommunications regime: the political roots of regimes for high technology. *International Organisation*, 45(2), 169–99.
- Cronin, B. & Davenport, E. (2001). E-rogenous zones: positioning pornography in the digital economy. *The Information Society*, 17(1), 33–48.
- Crowley, J. E. & Skocpol, T. (2001). The rush to organize: explaining associational formation in the United States, 1860s–1920s. *American Journal of Political Science*, 45(4), 813–29.
- Crowston, K. & Williams, M. (2000). Reproduced and emergent genres of communication on the World Wide Web. *The Information Society*, 16(3), 201–15.
- D'Haenens, L., Jankowski, N. & Heuvelman, A. (2004). News in online and print newspapers: differences in reader consumption and recall. *New Media and Society*, 6(3), 363–82.
- D'Haenens, L., Koeman, J. & Saeys, F. (2007). Digital citizenship among ethnic minority youths in the Netherlands and Flanders. *New Media & Society*, 9(2), 279–99.
- Dacin, T., Goodstein, J. & Scott, R. (2002). Institutional theory and institutional change: introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 45–56.
- Dahl, R. A. (1967). *Pluralist Democracy in the U.S.: conflict and consent*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- (1989). *Democracy and its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dahlberg, L. (2001). The internet and democratic discourse: exploring the prospects of online deliberative forums extending the public sphere. *Information Communication and Society*, 4(1), 615–33.
- Dahlgren, P. (2005). The internet, public spheres, and political communication: dispersion

- and deliberation. *Political Communication*, 22 (2), 147–62.
- Dahlgren, P. & Gurevitch, M. (2005). Political communication in a changing world. In: J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (eds.), *Mass Media and Society*, 4th edn. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Dalton, R. J. (1994). *The Green Rainbow: environmental groups in Western Europe*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- (2004). *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices: the erosion of political support in advanced industrial democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton, R. J. & Wattenberg, M. P. (2000). *Parties without Partisans: political change in advanced industrial democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Danet, B. (1996). *Text as mask: gender and identity on the internet*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://Atar.msc.huji.ac.il/~msdanet/mask.html>
- Danziger, J. (2004). Innovation in innovation? The technology enactment framework. *Social Science Computer Review*, 22(1), 100–110.
- Davidow, W. H. & Malone, M. S. (1992). *The Virtual Corporation: structuring and revitalizing the corporation for the 21st century*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Davis, G. F. (2005). *Social Movements and Organization Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, G. F., McAdam, D., Scott, W. R. & Zald, M. N. (eds.) (2005). *Social Movements and Organizational Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, R. (1999). *The Web of Politics: the internet's impact on the American political system*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (2005). *Politics Online: blogs, chatrooms, and discussion groups in American democracy*. New York: Routledge.
- Davis, R., Owen, D., Taras, D. & Ward, S. J. (2008). *Making a Difference? The internet and elections in comparative perspective*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Davis, S., Elin, L. & Reeher, G. (2002). *Click on Democracy: the internet's power to change political apathy into civic action*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Davison, R. M., Martinsons, M. G. & Kock, N. (2004). Principles of canonical action research. *Information Systems Journal*, 14(1), 65–86.
- de Vreese, C. H. (ed.). (Forthcoming). *The Dynamics of Referendum Campaigns: an international perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- de Vreese, C. H. & Semetko, H. A. (2004a). News matters: influences on the vote in the Danish 2000 Euro referendum campaign. *European Journal of Political Research*, 43, 699–722.
- (2004b). *Political Campaigning in Referendums: framing the referendum issue*. London: Routledge.
- Deibert, R. J. (2003). Black code: censorship, surveillance, and the militarization of cyberspace. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 32(3), 501–30.
- Deibert, R. J., Palfrey, J. G., Rohozinski, R. & Zittrain, J. (eds.). (2008). *Access Denied: the practice and policy of global internet filtering*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Deibert, R. J. & Rohozinski, R. (2007). Good for liberty, bad for security? The internet and global civil society. In: R. J. Deibert, J. G. Palfrey, R. Rohozinski & J. Zittrain (eds.), *Access Denied: the practice and policy of global internet filtering*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Deibert, R. J. & Villeneuve, N. (2004). Firewalls and power: An overview of global state censorship of the internet. In: M. Klang & A. Murray (eds.), *Human Rights in the Digital Age*. London: Cavendish Publishing.
- della Porta, D. (2005). Multiple belongings, flexible identities and the construction of “another politics”: between the European social forum and the local social fora. In: D. della Porta & S. Tarrow (eds.), *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.
- della Porta, D. & Tarrow, S. (eds.). (2005). *Transnational Protest AND Global Activism*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Delli Carpini, M. X., Cook, F. L. & Jacobs, L. R. (2004). Public deliberation, discursive participation, and citizen engagement: a review of the empirical literature. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 315–44.
- Delli Carpini, M. X. & Keeter, S. (2003). The internet and an informed citizenry. In: D. M. Anderson & M. Cornfield (eds.), *The Civic Web: online politics and democratic value*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- (1996). *What Americans Know About Politics and Why it Matters*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.

- Delli Carpini, M. X. & Williams, B. A. (2001). Let us infotain you: Politics in the new media environment. In: W. L. Bennett & R. M. Entman (eds.), *Mediated Politics: communication in the future of democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Denning, D. (1999). *Information Warfare and Security*. New York: ACM Press.
- Der Derian, J. (2000). Virtuous war/virtual theory. *International Affairs*, 76(4), 771–88.
- Derrida, J. (1997). *The Politics of Friendship*. London: Verso.
- Dessauer, C. (2004). New media, internet news, and the news habit. In: P. N. Howard & S. Jones (eds.), *Society Online: the internet in context*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deuze, M. (1999). Journalism and the web: an analysis of skills and standards in an online environment. *Gazette*, 61(5), 373–90.
- (2003). The web and its journalism: considering the consequences of different types of news media online. *New Media and Society*, 5(2), 203–30.
- d’Haenens, L. (2003). ICT in multicultural society: the Netherlands – a context for sound multiform media policy? *Gazette*, 65(4–5), 401–21.
- d’Haenens, L., Koeman, J. & Saeyns, F. (2007). Digital citizenship among ethnic minority youths in the Netherlands and Flanders. *New Media and Society*, 9(2), 278–99.
- Dia, X. & Norton, P. (2007). The Internet and Parliamentary democracy in Europe. *Journal of Legislative Studies*, 13(3), 342–453.
- Diani, M. (2001). Social movement networks. In: F. Webster (ed.), *Culture and Politics in the Information Age: a new politics?* London: Routledge.
- (2003). Networks and social movements: A research programme. In: M. Diani & D. McAdam (eds.), *Social Movements and Networks: relational approaches to collective action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diani, M. & Donati, P. (2001). Organization change in western European environmental groups: a framework for analysis. *Environmental politics*, 8(1), 13–34.
- DiMaggio, P. & Celeste, C. (2004). *Technological careers: adoption, deepening, and dropping out in a panel of internet users (Russell Sage Working Paper)*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.russellsage.org/publications/workingpapers](http://www.russellsage.org/publications/workingpapers)
- DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organization fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–60.
- (1991). Introduction. In: W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In: L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional Patterns and Organizations*. MA: Ballinger.
- Dimmick, J., Chen, Y. & Li, Z. (2004). Competition between the internet and traditional news media: the gratification-opportunities niche dimension. *The Journal of Media Economics*, 17(1), 19–33.
- Doerschler, P. (2006). Push-pull factors and immigrant political integration in Germany. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87(5), 1100–16.
- Doherty, B. (2002). *Ideas and Actions in the Green Movement*. London: Routledge.
- Donohue, G., Tichenor, P. & Olien, C. (1975). Mass media and the knowledge gap: a hypothesis reconsidered. *Journalism Quarterly*, 50(4), 652–9.
- Doppelt, J. & Shearer, E. (1999). *Nonvoters: America’s no-shows*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Doppely, J. (1996). *Nonvoters: America’s no-shows*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dougherty, M. & Foot, K. (2007). The internet and elections project research design. In: R. Kluver, N. W. Jankowski, K. Foot & S. M. Schneider (eds.), *The Internet and National Elections: a comparative study of web campaigning*. New York: Routledge.
- Dourish, P. (2004). What we talk about when we talk about context. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 8(1), 19–30.
- Dowell, W. T. (2006). The internet, censorship, and China. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, 7(2), 111–19.
- Downing, J. D. H. (1989). Computers for political change: peace net and public data access. *Journal of Communication*, 39(3), 154–62.
- (2001). *Radical Media: rebellious communication and social movements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Downs, A. (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Drake, W. J. (2005). *Reforming Internet Governance: perspectives from the working group on internet*

- governance*. New York: United Nations ICT Task Force.
- Drew, D. & Weaver, D. (2006). Voter learning in the 2004 presidential election: did the media matter? *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83(1), 25–42.
- Drezner, D. (2004). The global governance of the internet: bringing the state back in. *Political Science Quarterly*, 119(3), 477–98.
- Driscoll, C. (1999). Girl culture, revenge and global capitalism: cybergirls, riot grls, spice girls. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 14(29), 173–93.
- Drucker, P. F. (1988). The coming of the new organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 66(1), 45–53.
- Dunleavy, P. & Margetts, H. (1999). *Government on the Web*. London: HMSO.
- (2002). *Government on the Web II*. London: HMSO.
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S. & Tinkler, J. (2006a). *Digital Era Governance: IT corporations, the state and e-government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2006b). New public management is dead – long live digital-era governance. *Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), 467–94.
- Dutta-Bergman, M. J. (2004). Complementarity in consumption of news types across traditional and new media. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 48(1), 41–60.
- Dutton, W., di Gennaro, C. & Millwood-Hargrave, A. (2005). *The Internet in Britain 2005*. Oxford: Oxford Internet Institute.
- Dutton, W. H. (2004). *Social Transformation in the Information Society*. Paris: UNESCO.
- (2005, 1–2 April). *Hired gun or partner in media reform: high noon for the social scientist*. Paper presented at the Synthesizing Necessary Knowledge for a Democratic Public Sphere Workshop, New York.
- Dutton, W. H., Carusi, A. & Peltu, M. (2006). Fostering multidisciplinary engagement: Communication challenges for social research on emerging digital technologies. *Prometheus*, 24(2), 129–49.
- Dutton, W. H. & Helsper, E. J. (2007). *The Internet in Britain 2007*. Oxford: Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford.
- Dutton, W. H., Palfrey, J. & Peltu, M. (2007). *Deciphering the Codes of Internet Governance: understanding the hard issues at stake*. Oxford: Oxford Internet Institute.
- Dutton, W. H. & Peltu, M. (2005). *The Emerging Internet Governance Mosaic: connecting the pieces*. Oxford: Oxford Internet Institute.
- Dutton, W. H., Shepherd, A. & di Gennaro, C. (2006). Digital divides and choices reconfiguring access: National and cross-national patterns of internet diffusion and use. In: B. Anderson, M. Brynin & Y. Raban (eds.), *Information and Communications Technologies in Society*. London: Routledge.
- Duverger, M. (1954). *Political Parties: their organization and activity in the modern state*. London: Methuen.
- Dwyer, P., Hof, R. D. & Kerstetter, J. (2004). *The amazing money machine*. Retrieved August 2, 2004, from [www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/04\\_31/b3894011\\_mz001.htm](http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/04_31/b3894011_mz001.htm)
- Ebbinghaus, B. & Visser, J. (1999). When institutions matter: union growth and decline in Europe 1950–95. *European Sociological Review*, 15(2), 1–24.
- Economist (2007). *Special report: constitutional conundrum*. Retrieved March 15, 2007 from [www.economist.com/research/articlesBySubject/displaystory.cfm?subjectid=3833071&story\\_id=8808026](http://www.economist.com/research/articlesBySubject/displaystory.cfm?subjectid=3833071&story_id=8808026)
- Edmiston, K. D. (2003). State and local e-government: prospects and challenges. *American Review of Public Administration*, 33(1), 20–45.
- Edwards, A. (2002). The moderator as an emerging democratic intermediary: the role of the moderator in internet discussions about public issues. *Information Polity*, 7(1), 3–20.
- Edwards, J. (2007). *John Edwards for President – social networking*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://johnedwards.com/action/networking/>
- Edwards, L. (2005). Switching off the surveillance society? Legal regulation of CCTV in the United Kingdom. In: S. Nouwt, B. R. d. Vries & C. Prins (Eds.), *Reasonable Expectations of Privacy? Eleven country reports on camera surveillance and workplace privacy*. The Hague: Asser.
- eGovernment News (2005, April 5). UK government launches new digital strategy. *eGovernment News*.
- Ehrlich, E. (2003, December 14). What will happen when a national political machine can fit on a laptop. *Washington Post*.
- Eickelman, D. F. & Anderson, J. W. (1999). Redefining muslim publics. In: D. F. Eickelman & J. W. Anderson (eds.), *New Media in the*

- Muslim World*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Eid, G. (2004). *The internet in the Arab world: a new space for repression?* Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.hriinfo.net/en/reports/net2004](http://www.hriinfo.net/en/reports/net2004)
- El Diwany, S. (2007). *Arab world competitiveness report 2007 press release*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.weforum.org/en/media/Latest%20Press%20Releases/AWCReportPR](http://www.weforum.org/en/media/Latest%20Press%20Releases/AWCReportPR)
- El Sayed, H. & Westrup, C. (2003). Egypt and ICTs: how ICTs bring national initiatives, global organizations and companies together. *Information Technology and People*, 16(1), 76–92.
- Eldersveld, S. J. (1982). *Political parties in American society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Elmer, G. (2002). The case of web cookies. In: G. Elmer (ed.), *Critical perspectives on the internet*. Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield.
- (2004). *Profiling Machines: mapping the personal information economy*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- Engel, M. (1996). *Tickle the Public*. London: Gollancz.
- Entman, R. (1991). Framing US coverage of international news. *Journal of Communication*, 41(4), 6–28.
- (1993). Framing: toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- Epstein, L. D. (1980). *Political Parties and Western Democracies*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- ESCWA (2002). Youth unemployment in the ESCWA. *The Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia for the Youth Employment Summit*. Alexandria, Egypt: The Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia.
- Etzioni, A. (1988). *The Moral Dimension: toward a new economics*. New York: The Free Press.
- (1997). The end of cross-cultural relativism. *Socialism and Democracy*, 11, 177–89.
- Eurobarometer (2004). *62.1: The constitutional treaty, economic challenges, vocational training, information technology at work, environmental issues, and services of general interest*. Brussels: Eurobarometer.
- European Commission Staff (2007). *Commission staff working document* (No. COM (2007) 116 final). Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.
- European Union (1995). *Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data*. Brussels: European Union.
- (2005). *WP 105: Working document on data protection issues related to RFID technology. Working party on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data*. Brussels: European Union.
- (2007). *WP 135: Opinion 4/2007 on the concept of personal data. Working party on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data*. Brussels: European Union.
- Eurostat (2005). *Statistics in focus issue 38: The digital divide in Europe*. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from [http://epp.eurostat.cec.eu.int/portal/page?\\_pageid=1073,46587259&\\_dad=portal&\\_schema=PORTAL&p\\_product\\_code=KS-NP-05-038](http://epp.eurostat.cec.eu.int/portal/page?_pageid=1073,46587259&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL&p_product_code=KS-NP-05-038)
- (2006). *Community survey on ICT usage in households and by individuals 2005*. Retrieved August 11, 2007, from [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/europe/i2010/docs/annual\\_report/2006/sec\\_2006\\_604\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/europe/i2010/docs/annual_report/2006/sec_2006_604_en.pdf)
- Eveland Jr, W. P. (2001). The cognitive mediation model of learning from the news: evidence from non-election, off-year election, and presidential election contexts. *Communication Research*, 28(5), 571–601.
- (2002). News information processing as mediator of the relationship between motivations and political knowledge. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(1), 26–40.
- (2003). A “mix of attributes” approach to the study of media effects and new communication technologies. *Journal of Communication*, 53(3), 395–410.
- Eveland Jr, W. P., Cortese, J., Park, H. & Dunwoody, S. (2004). How web site organization influences free recall, factual knowledge, and knowledge structure. *Human Communication Research*, 30(2), 208–33.
- Eveland Jr, W. P. & Dunwoody, S. (1998). Users and navigation patterns of a science world wide web site for the public. *Public Understanding of Science*, 7(4), 285–311.
- (2001a). Applying research on the uses and cognitive effects of hypermedia to the study of the world wide web. *Communication Yearbook*, 25, 79–113.
- (2001b). User control and structural isomorphism or disorientation and cognitive load? Learning from the web versus print. *Communication Research*, 28(1), 48–78.

- (2002). An investigation of elaboration and selective scanning as mediators of learning from the web versus print. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 46(1), 34–53.
- Eveland Jr, W. P., Marton, K. & Seo, M. (2004). Moving beyond “just the facts”: the influence of online news on the content and structure of public affairs knowledge. *Communication Research*, 31(1), 82–108.
- Eveland Jr, W. P., Seo, M. & Marton, K. (2002). Learning from the news in campaign 2000: an experimental comparison of TV news, newspapers and online news. *Media Psychology*, 4(4), 352–78
- Eveland Jr, W. P., Shah, D. V. & Kwak, N. (2003). Assessing causality in the cognitive mediation model: a panel study of motivations, information processing and learning during Campaign 2000. *Communication Research*, 30(4), 359–86.
- Eyerman, R. & Jamison, A. (1991). *Social Movements: a cognitive approach*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Fairlie, R. (2004). Race and the digital divide. *Contributions of Economic Analysis and Policy*, 3(1), 1–35.
- Fallows, D. (2005). *How Women and Men use the Internet*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Fallows, J. (1996a). *Breaking the News: how the media undermine American democracy*. New York: Pantheon books.
- (1996b). Why Americans hate the media. *Atlantic Monthly*, 277(2), 45–64.
- Faris, R. & Villeneuve, N. (2008). Measuring global internet filtering. In: R. J. Deibert, J. G. Palfrey, R. Rohozinski & J. Zittrain (eds.), *Access Denied: the practice and policy of global internet filtering*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Farrell, D., Kolodny, R. & Medvic, S. (2001). Parties and campaign professionals in a digital age: political consultants in the United States and their counterparts overseas. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 6(4), 11–30.
- Farrell, D. & Webb, P. (2000). Political parties as campaign organisations. In: R. J. Dalton & M. P. Wattenberg (eds.), *Parties without Partisans: political change in advanced industrial democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fauconnier, G. & Turner, M. (2003). *The Way We Think: conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fearon, J. D. (1998). Deliberation as discussion. In: J. Elster (ed.), *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Federal Communication Commission (2005). *FCC 05–116: first report and order and notice of proposed rulemaking adopted*. Washington, DC: Federal Communication Commission.
- Ferber, B., Foltz, F. & Pugliese, R. (2005). The internet and public participation: state legislature web sites and the many definitions of interactivity. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 25(1), 85–93.
- Ferdinand, P. (ed.). (2000). *The Internet, Democracy and Democratization*. London: Frank Cass.
- Ferguson, R. (2007). *Bermuda to put RFID in all vehicles on island*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.eweek.com/article2/0,1895,2126991,00.asp](http://www.eweek.com/article2/0,1895,2126991,00.asp)
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Fielding, S. (2001). Activists against “Affluence”: Labour party culture during the “Golden age” circa 1950–70. *Journal of British Studies*, 40(2), 241–67.
- Filzmaier, P. (2004). Information management of MPs: experiences from Austria, Denmark and the Netherlands. *Information Polity*, 9(2), 17–28.
- Finn, P. (2007, May 19). Cyber assaults on Estonia typify a new battle tactic. *Washington Post*.
- Finnegan, M. (2007, January 29). 2008 candidates, foes rush to roll web video. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Fisher, D., Stanley, K., Berman, D. & Neff, G. (2005). How do organizations matter? Mobilization and support for participants at five globalization protests. *Social Problems*, 52(1), 102–21.
- Fisher, W. & Ponniah, T. (eds.). (2003). *Another World is Possible: popular alternatives to globalization at the World Social Forum*. Black Point, NS: Zed Books.
- Flanagin, A., Stohl, C. & Bimber, B. (2006). Modeling the structure of collective action. *Communication Monographs*, 73(1), 29–54.
- Flavian, C. & Gurrea, R. (2006). The choice of digital newspapers: influence of reader goals and user experience. *Internet Research*, 16(3), 231–47.
- Foot, K. M. & Schneider, S. M. (2006). *Web Campaigning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Foot, K. M., Schneider, S. M., Kluver, R., Xenos, M. & Jankowski, N. (2007). Comparing web production practices across electoral web

- spheres. In: R. Kluver, N. Jankowski, K. M. Foot & S. M. Schneider (eds.), *The Internet and National Elections*. New York: Routledge.
- Fountain, J. E. (1998). Social capital: a key enabler of innovation in science and technology. *Science and Public Policy*, 25(2).
- (2001a). *Building the Virtual State: information technology and institutional change*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- (2001b). Toward a theory of federal bureaucracy in the 21st century. In: E. C. Kamarck & J. S. Nye (eds.), *Governance.Com: democracy in the information age*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- (2002). *Information, Institutions and Government: advancing a basic social science research program for digital government*. Cambridge, MA: National Centre for Digital Government, John F. Kennedy School of Government.
- (2006). Central issues in the political development of the virtual state. In: M. Castells & G. Cardoso (eds.), *The Network Society: from knowledge to policy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- (2007). Challenges to organizational change: Multi-level integrated information structures. In: D. Lazer & V. Mayer-Schoenberger (eds.), *Governance and Information Technology: from electronic government to information government*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Fountain, J. E. & Osorio-Urzuá, C. (2001). Public sector: Early stage of a deep transformation. In: R. Litan & A. Rivlin (eds.), *The Economic Payoff of the Internet Revolution*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Fox, S. (2005). *Digital Divisions*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Fox, S. & Livingston, G. (2007). *Hispanics with Lower Levels of Education and English Proficiency Remain Largely Disconnected from the Internet*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project/Pew Hispanic Center.
- Francia, P. L. & Herrnson, P. S. (2002). The e-campaign: coming to an election near you. In: R. D. Faucheux & P. S. Herrnson (eds.), *Campaign Battle Lines*. Washington DC: Campaigns and Elections.
- Franda, M. (2001). *Launching into Cyberspace: internet development and politics in five world regions*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Frank, D. (2002). *IT budget takes on e.gov*. Retrieved February 18, 2002, from [www.few.com/few/articles/2002/0218/cov-budget1-02-18-02.asp](http://www.few.com/few/articles/2002/0218/cov-budget1-02-18-02.asp)
- Franklin, B. (2004). *Packaging Politics: political communications in Britain's media democracy*, 2nd edn. London: Hodder.
- Franklin, M. I. (2007). NGOs and the "Information society": grassroots advocacy at the UN – a cautionary tale. *Review of Policy Research*, 24(4), 309–30.
- Franzen, A. (2000). Does the internet make us lonely? *European Sociological Review*, 16(4), 427–38.
- Fraser, N. (1992). Rethinking the public sphere: a contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In: C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Freedman, D. (2006). Internet transformations: old media resilience in the new media revolution. In: J. Curran & D. Morley (eds.), *Media and Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Freedom House. (2006). *Freedom in the World*. Washington, DC: Freedom House.
- (2007). *Democracy's Century*. Washington, DC: Freedom House.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder & Herder.
- Frey, D. (1986). Recent research on selective exposure to information. In: L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. San Diego, CA: Academic.
- Friedlos, D. (2007). *Heathrow joins trial of RFID scheme*. Retrieved July 5, 2007, from [www.computing.co.uk/computing/news/2193486/heathrow-joins-trial-rfid](http://www.computing.co.uk/computing/news/2193486/heathrow-joins-trial-rfid)
- Frissen, P. (2002). Representative democracy and information society: a postmodern perspective. *Information Polity*, 7(4), 175–83.
- Froehling, O. (1999). Internauts and guerilleros: the Zapatista rebellion in Chiapas, Mexico and its extension into cyberspace. In: M. Crang, P. Crang & J. May (eds.), *Virtual Geographies: bodies, space and relations*. New York: Routledge.
- From Cairo With Love (2005). *The blogging effect*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://fromcairo.blogspot.com/2005/02/blogging-effect.html>
- Froomkin, A. M. (1995). The metaphor is the key: cryptography, the clipper chip, and the constitution. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 143, 709–897.



- Fulk, J. (2001). Global network organizations: emergence and future prospects. *Human Relations*, 54(1), 91–99.
- Fulk, J., Flanagin, A. J., Kalman, M., Monge, P. R. & Ryan, T. (1996). Connective and communal public goods in interactive communication systems. *Communication Theory*, 6(1), 60–87.
- Fulk, J., Heino, R., Flanagin, A. J., Monge, P. R. & Bar, F. (2004). A test of the individual action model for organizational information commons. *Organization Science*, 15(5), 569–85.
- Fuller, J. E. (2004). Equality in cyberdemocracy? Gauging gender gaps in online civic participation. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(4), 938–57.
- Fuller, M. (2003). *Behind the Blip: essays on the culture of software*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Galaskiewicz, J. & Wasserman, S. (1993). Social network analysis: concepts, methodology, and directions for the 1990s. *Sociological methods and research*, 22(1), 3–22.
- Galbraith, J. R. & Kazanjian, R. K. (1988). Strategy, technology, and emerging organizational forms. In: J. Hage (ed.), *Futures of Organizations: innovating to adapt strategy and human resources to rapid technological change*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Gallagher, M. & Uleri, P. V. (eds.). (1996). *The Referendum Experience in Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Galloway, A. (2004). *Protocol: or how control exists after decentralization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Galston, W. A. (2003). If political fragmentation is the problem, is the internet the solution? In: D. M. Anderson & M. Cornfield (eds.), *The Civic Web: online politics and democratic values*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Galusky, W. (2003). Identifying with information: Citizen empowerment, the internet and the environmental anti-toxins movement. In: M. McCaughey & M. Ayers (eds.), *Cyberactivism: online activism in theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Gans, H. J. (2003). *Democracy and the News*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garnham, N. (1990). *Capitalism and Communication: global culture and the economics of information*. London: Sage.
- Garrett, K. R. (2005). Exposure to controversy in an information society (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Michigan: University of Michigan.
- Garrido, M. & Halavais, A. (2003). Mapping networks of support for the Zapatista movement: applying social networks analysis to study contemporary social movements. In: M. McCaughey & M. Ayers (eds.), *Cyberactivism: online activism in theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Garrie, D. B. (2005). The legal status of software. *John Marshall Journal of Computer and Information Law*, 23(Summer), 711–69.
- Garrison, B. (2005). Online newspapers. In: M. B. Salwen, B. Garrison & P. D. Driscoll (eds.), *Online News and the Public*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Garud, R., Jain, S. & Kumaraswamy, A. (2002). Institutional entrepreneurship in the sponsorship of common technological standards in the case of Sun Microsystems and Java. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 196–214.
- Gasco, M. (2003). New technology and institutional change in public administration. *Social Science Computer Review*, 21(1), 6–14.
- Gastil, J. (2000). *By Popular Demand: revitalizing representative democracy through deliberative elections*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gastil, J., Black, L. & Moscovitz, K. (Forthcoming). Group and individual differences in deliberative experience: a study of ideology, attitude change, and deliberation in small face-to-face groups. *Political Communication*.
- Gastil, J. & Crosby, N. (2003). *Voters need more reliable information*. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from [http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/opinion/147013\\_uninformed06.html](http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/opinion/147013_uninformed06.html)
- Gastil, J., Wells, C. & Reedy, J. (Forthcoming). When good voters make bad policies: Assessing and improving the deliberative quality of initiative elections. *Colorado Law Review*.
- Gates Foundation (2005). US public libraries providing unprecedented access to computers, the internet, and technology training. Seattle: Gates Foundation.
- Geens, S. (2007). *Google Earth ban in Sudan is due to US export restrictions*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.sudantribune.com/spip.php?article21501](http://www.sudantribune.com/spip.php?article21501).
- Gelman, A. & King, G. (1993). Why are American election polls so variable when votes are so predictable? *British Journal of Political Science*, 23(4), 409–51.
- Gerber, E. R. (1999). *The Populist Paradox: interest group influence and the promise of direct legislation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Gershon, P. (2004). *Releasing Resources to the Front-Line: independent review of public sector efficiency*. London: HM Treasury.
- GESIS (German Social Science Infrastructure Services) (2007). *Summary of Eurobarometer data*. Retrieved August 14, 2007, from [www.gesis.org/en/data\\_service/eurobarometer/](http://www.gesis.org/en/data_service/eurobarometer/)
- Ghareeb, E. (2000). New media and the information revolution in the Arab world: an assessment. *Middle East Journal*, 54(3), 395–418.
- Ghoshal, S. & Bartlett, C. (1990). The multinational corporation as an interorganizational network. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 603–25.
- Gibbs, J., Ball-Rokeach, S., Jung, J.-Y., Kim, Y.-C. & Qiu, J. (2006). The globalization of every day life: visions and reality. In: M. Sturken, D. Thomas & S. Ball-Rokeach (eds.), *Reinventing Technology: cultural narratives of technological change*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Gibson, O. (2006). *Have you got news for US?* Retrieved November 6, 2007, from [www.guardian.co.uk/media/2006/nov/06/mondaymediasection](http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2006/nov/06/mondaymediasection)
- Gibson, R. K., Howard, P. N. & Ward, S. J. (2000). *Social capital, internet connectedness and political participation: a four-country study*. Paper presented at the International Political Science Association Annual Conference, Quebec, Canada.
- Gibson, R. K., Lusoli, W. & Ward, S. J. (2003a). The internet and political campaigning: the new medium comes of age? *Representation*, 39(3), 166–80.
- (2005). Online participation in the UK: testing a contextualised model of internet effects. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 7(4), 561–83.
- (Forthcoming). Italian elections online: 10 years on. In: J. Newell (ed.), *The Italian General Election of 2006: Romano Prodi's victory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Gibson, R. K., Margolis, M., Resnick, D. & Ward, S. J. (2003b). Election campaigning on the www in the USA and the UK: a comparative analysis. *Party Politics*, 9(1), 47–75.
- Gibson, R. K., Nixon, P. & Ward, S. J. (eds.). (2003c). *Political Parties and the Internet: net gain?* London: Routledge.
- Gibson, R. K. & Rommele, A. (2003). *Regional web campaigning in the 2002 German federal election*. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia.
- (2005). Truth and consequence in web campaigning: is there an academic digital divide? *European Political Science*, 4(3), 273–87.
- Gibson, R. K., Rommele, A. & Ward, S. J. (eds.). (2004). *Electronic Democracy: mobilisation, organisation and participation via new ICTs*. London: Routledge.
- Gibson, R. K. & Ward, S. J. (1999). Party democracy online: UK parties and new ICTs. *Information Communication and Society*, 2(3), 340–67.
- (2002). Virtual campaigning: Australian parties and the impact of the internet. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 37(1), 99–129.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (1991). *Modernity and Self-identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- (1999). *Runaway World: how globalisation is reshaping our lives*. London: Profile Books.
- Giddings, P. J. (2005). *The Future of Parliament: issues for a new century*. New York; Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gil-Garcia, J. R. & Martinez-Moyano. (Forthcoming). Understanding the evolution of e-government: the influence of systems of rules on public sector dynamics. *Government Information Quarterly*.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World is Watching: mass media and the unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- (1983). *Inside Prime Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goldfarb, J. C. (2006). *Politics of Small Things: the powers of the powerless in dark times*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldfarb, Z. A. (2007). *Mobilized online, thousands gather to hear Obama*. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from [www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2007/02/02/AR2007020201233.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2007/02/02/AR2007020201233.html)
- Goldsmith, J. (1998). Against cyberanarchy. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 65(4), 1199–1250.
- Goldsmith, J. & Wu, T. (2006). *Who Controls the Internet? Illusions of a borderless world*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Goldstein, B. (1999). *The Internet in the Mid East and North Africa: free expression and censorship*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Goldstein, K. M. (1999). *Interest Groups, Lobbying, and Participation in America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Google. (2007). *Google Maps terms and conditions*. Retrieved August 15, 2007, from [http://maps.google.ca/help/terms\\_maps.html](http://maps.google.ca/help/terms_maps.html)
- Gore, A. (1994). Remarks prepared for delivery by Vice President Al Gore. Paper presented at the International Telecommunications Union Conference, 1994. Retrieved June 20, 2007, from [www.goelzer.net/telecom/al-gore.html](http://www.goelzer.net/telecom/al-gore.html)
- Graber, D. A. (1984). *Processing the News: how people tame the information tide*. New York: Longman.
- (1988). *Processing the News: how people tame the information tide*, 2nd edn. New York: Longman.
- (2006). *Media power in Politics*, 5th edn. Washington, DC: CQ.
- Graf, J. & Darr, C. (2004). *Political Influentials Online in the 2004 Presidential Election*. Washington, DC: Institute for Politics, Democracy and the Internet, George Washington University.
- Graf, J., Reeber, G., Malbin, J. & Panagopoulos, C. (2006). *Small Donors and Online Giving: a study of donors to the 2004 presidential campaigns*. Washington, DC: Institute for Politics, Democracy and the Internet, George Washington University.
- Granick, J. (2005). Middle East. Nixing the news: Iranian internet censorship. *Harvard International Review*, 27(2), 11–12.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360–80.
- Grant, A. (2005). The reform of party funding in Britain. *Political Quarterly*, 76(3), 381–92.
- Gray, M. & Caul, M. (2000). Declining voter turnout in advanced industrial democracies. *Comparative Political Studies*, 33(9), 1091–1122.
- Gray, V. & Lowery, D. (1996). *The Population Ecology of Interest Representation: lobbying communities in the American states*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Green, D. P. & Shapiro, I. (1994). *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: a critique of applications in political science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Green, N. & Smith, S. (2004). “A spy in your pocket”? The regulation of mobile data in the UK. *Surveillance and Society*, 1(4), 573–87.
- Greene, A. M., Hogan, J. & Grieco, M. (2003). E-collectivism and distributed discourse: new opportunities for trade union democracy. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 34(4), 282–89.
- Greenwood, R. & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: bringing together the old and new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21(4), 1022–54.
- Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R. & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change the role of professional associations in the transformation of institutional fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 58–80.
- Greer, J. & LaPointe, M. (2004). Cyber-campaigning grows up: a comparative content analysis of websites for US Senate and gubernatorial races, 1998–2000. In: R. K. Gibson, A. Roemmele & S. J. Ward (eds.), *E-democracy: mobilisation, organisation and participation online*. London: Routledge.
- Greer, J. D. & Mensing, D. (2006). The evolution of online newspapers: a longitudinal content analysis, 1997–2003. In: X. Li (ed.), *Internet Newspapers: the making of a mainstream medium*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Grignou, B. & Patou, C. (2004). Attac(k)ing expertise: does the internet democratize knowledge. In: W. van de Donk, B. Loader, P. Nixon & D. Rucht (eds.), *Cyberprotest: new media, citizens and social movements*. London: Routledge.
- Grossman, L. K. (1995). *The Electronic Republic*. New York: Viking.
- Guamizo, L. E., Portes, A. & Haller, W. (2003). Assimilation and transnationalism: determinants of transnational political action among contemporary migrants. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(6), 1211–48.
- Guillen, M. & Suarez, S. (2005). Explaining the global digital divide: economic, political and sociological drivers of cross-national internet use. *Social Forces*, 84(2), 681–708.
- Gunkel, D. (2003). Second thoughts: toward a critique of the digital divide. *New Media and Society*, 5(4), 499–522.
- Gunkel, D. J. & Gunkel, A. H. (1997). Virtual geographies: the new worlds of cyberspace. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 14, 123–37.

- Gunter, B. (2003). *News and the Net*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gurak, L. J. (1996). The case of Lotus MarketPlace: organization and ethos in a net-based protest. In: S. Herring (ed.), *Computer-Mediated Communication: linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (1997). *Persuasion and Privacy in Cyberspace: the online protests over Lotus Market Place and the clipper chip*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gustafson, K. E. (2002). Join now, membership is free: women's websites and the coding of community. In: M. Consalvo & S. Paasonen (eds.), *Women and Everyday Uses of the Internet: agency and identity*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Habermas, J. (1962/1981). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. B. W. F. Lawrence, trans.). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- (1973). *Theory and Practice* (J. Viertel, Trans.). London: Heinemann.
- (1974). The public sphere: an encyclopedia article. *New German Critique*, 3, 49–55.
- (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (2004). *The Divided West*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Hachigian, N. (2001). China's cyber-strategy. *Foreign Affairs*, 80(2), 118–33.
- Hacker, J. S., Mettler, S. & Pinderhughes, D. (2005). Inequality and public policy. In: L. R. Jacobs & T. Skocpol (eds.), *Inequality and American Democracy: what we know and what we need to learn*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hacker, K. L. & van Dijk, J. (2000). *Digital Democracy: issues of theory and practice*. Sage: London.
- Haddon, L. (2006). The contribution of domestication research to in-home computing and media consumption. *The Information Society*, 22(4), 195–203.
- Hafkin, N. & Taggart, N. (2001). *Gender, Information Technology and Developing Countries: an analytic study*. Washington, DC: USAID.
- Hafner, K. & Lyon, M. (1996). *Where Wizards Stay Up Late: the origins of the internet*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Haggerty, K. D. & Ericson, R. V. (eds.). (2006). *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Hajnal, P. I. (ed.). (2002). *Civil Society in the Information Age*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Halbert, D. (1999). *Intellectual Property in the Information Age: the politics of expanding ownership rights*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- (2005). *Resisting Intellectual Property*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1994). Cultural identity and diaspora. In: P. William & L. Chrisman (eds.), *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hammer, M. & Champy, J. (1993). *Reengineering the Corporation*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Hampton, K. N. & Wellman, B. (2000). Examining community in the digital neighborhood: early results from Canada's wired suburb. In: T. Ishida & K. Isbister (eds.), *Digital Cities: technologies, experiences and future perspectives*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- (2001). Long distance community in the network society: contact and support beyond Netville. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(3), 476–95.
- Hanafi, S. (2005). Reshaping geography: Palestinian community networks in Europe and the new media. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*, 31(3), 581–98.
- Hands, J. (2006). Civil society, cosmopolitics and the net: the legacy of 15 February 2003. *Information, Communication and Society*, 9(2), 225–43.
- Harding, S. G. (1986). *The Science Question in Feminism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hardy, B. W. & Scheufele, D. A. (2005). Examining differential gains from internet use: comparing the moderating role of talk and online interactions. *Journal of Communication*, 55(1), 71–84.
- Hargadon, A. & Douglas, Y. (2001). When innovations meet institutions: Edison and the design of the electric light bulb. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(3), 476–501.
- Hargittai, E. (2002). Beyond logs and surveys: in-depth measures of people's web use skills. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 53(14), 1239–44.
- (2002). The second-level digital divide: differences in people's online skills. *First Monday*, 7(4).

- (2003). The digital divide and what to do about it. In: D. C. Jones (ed.), *The New Economy Handbook*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- (2004). *How wide a web? Social inequality in the digital age* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Hargittai, E. & Shafer, S. (2006). Differences in actual and perceived online skills: the role of gender. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87(2), 432–48.
- Hargreaves, I. & Thomas, J. (2002). *New News, Old News*. London: BSC/ITC.
- Harmel, R. & Janda, K. (1982). *Parties and their Environments: limits to reform?* New York: Longman.
- Harper, C. (1996). Online newspapers: going somewhere or going nowhere? *Newspaper Research Journal*, 17(3–4), 2–13.
- Harris Interactive (2007). *Survey shows privacy concerns a major roadblock for the adoption of location-based services and presence technology*. Retrieved August 15, 2007, from www.harrisinteractive.com/news/allnewsbydate.asp?NewsID=1184
- Harrison, T. & Falvey, L. (2001). Democracy and new communication technologies. *Communication Yearbook*, 25(1), 1–43.
- Hart, R. P. (1994). Easy citizenship: television's curious legacy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 546, 109–20.
- Hartley, J. (1996). *Popular Reality*. London: Arnold.
- Hauffer, V. (2001). *Public Role for the Private Sector: industry self-regulation in a global economy*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Havick, J. (2000). The impact of the internet on a television-based society. *Technology in Society*, 22(2), 273–87.
- Hawk, B., Rieder, D. M. & Oviedo, O. (eds.). (2008). *Small Tech: the culture of digital tools*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hayden, C. & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2007). Maintaining the digital hub: locating the community technology center in a communication infrastructure. *New Media Society*, 9(2), 235–57.
- Healy, A. & McNamara, D. (1996). Verbal learning and memory: does the modal model still work? In: J. Spense, J. Darley & D. Foss (eds.), *Annual Review of Psychology*. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Hechter, M. & Okamoto, D. (2001). Political consequences of minority group formation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 189–215.
- Heckscher, C. C. & Donnellon, A. (eds.). (1994). *The Post-Bureaucratic Organization: new perspectives on organizational change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heeks, R. & Bailur, S. (2007). Analyzing e-government research: perspectives, philosophies, theories, methods and practice. *Government Information Quarterly*, 24(2), 243–65.
- Heileman, R. (2007, April 15). Money chooses sides. *New York Magazine*.
- Heinz, J. P. (1993). *The Hollow Core: private interests in national policy making*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Heller, M. (1998). The tragedy of the anticommons: property in the transition from marx to markets. *Harvard Law Review*, 111, 621–88.
- Herbsleb, J. D., Mockus, A., Finholt, T. & Grinter, R. E. (2000). Distance, dependencies, and delay in a global collaboration. In: W. A. Kellogg & S. Whittaker (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2000 ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: United States.
- Herbst, S. (1993). *Numbered Voices: how opinion polling has shaped American politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Herman, B. & Gandy, O. (2006). Catch 1201: a legislative history and content analysis of the DMCA exemption proceedings. *Cardozo Arts and Entertainment Law Journal*, 24(1), 121–90.
- Herring, S. C. (1993). Gender and democracy in computer-mediated communication. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 3(2).
- (1995). *Men's Language on the Internet*. Nordlyd: Tromsø University.
- Herring, S. C. (ed.). (1996a). *Posting a Different Voice: gender and ethics in computer mediated communication*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Herring, S. C. (1996b). Two variants of an electronic message schema. In: S. C. Herring (ed.), *Computer Mediated Communication: linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (1999). The rhetorical dynamics of gender harassment on-line. *The Information Society*, 15(3), 151–67.
- (2001). *Gender and Power in Online Communication*. Bloomington: Center for Social Informatics Working Papers.

- (2002). Cyber violence: recognizing and resisting abuse in online environments. *Asian Women*, 14, 187–212.
- Herring, S. C., Johnson, D. & DiBenedetto, T. (1995). This discussion is going too far! Male resistance to female participation on the internet. In: M. Bucholtz & K. Hall (eds.), *Gender Articulated: language and the socially constructed self*. New York: Routledge.
- Herring, S. C., Kouper, I., Scheidt, L. A. & Wright, E. (2004). Women and children last: the discursive construction of weblogs. In: L. Gurak, S. Antonijevik, L. Johnson, C. Ratliff & J. Reyman (eds.), *Into the Blogosphere: rhetoric, community, and culture of weblogs*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota online publication: <http://blog.lib.umn.edu/blogosphere/> Retrieved November 23, 2007.
- Hersh, S. (1997). *The Dark Side of Camelot*. New York: Little Brown.
- Heydemann, S. (ed.). (2004). *Networks of Privilege in the Middle East: the politics of economic reform revisited*. New York: Palgrave.
- Hick, S. F. & McNutt, J. G. (eds.). (2002). *Advocacy, Activism and the Internet: community organization and social policy*. Chicago: Lyceum Books.
- Hickson, D., MacMillan, C., Azumi, K. & Horvath, D. (1979). The grounds for comparative organization theory. In: C. Lammers & D. Hickson (eds.), *Organizations Alike and Unlike*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., McMillan, C. J. & Schwitter, J. P. (1974). The culture-free context of organizational structure: a trilateral comparison. *Sociology*, 8(1), 59–80.
- Hill, K. A. & Hughes, J. E. (1998). *Cyberpolitics: citizen activism in the age of the internet*. New York, NY: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hiller, H. H. & Franz, T. M. (2004). New ties, old ties and lost ties: the use of the internet in diaspora. *New Media and Society*, 6(6), 731–52.
- Hindman, M. (2005). The real lessons of Howard Dean: Reflections on the first digital campaign. *Perspectives on Politics*, 3(1), 121–28.
- Hirji, F. (2006). Common concerns and constructed communities: Muslim Canadians, the internet and the war in Iraq. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 30(2), 125–41.
- Ho, K. C., Kluver, R. & Yang, K. (eds.). (2003). *Asia.Com: Asia encounters the internet*. London: Routledge.
- Hobolt, S. B. (2006). Direct democracy and European integration. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(1), 153–66.
- (2007). Taking cues on Europe? Voter competence and party endorsements in referendums on European integration. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(2), 151–82.
- Hodkinson. (2004). Problems @ labour: towards net internationalism. In: R. K. Gibson, A. Rommele & S. Ward (eds.), *Electronic Democracy: mobilisation, organisation and participation via new ICTs*. London: Routledge.
- Hoff, J. (2004). The democratic potentials of information technology: attitudes of European MPs towards new technology. *Information Polity*, 9(2) 55–66.
- Hoff, J., Horrocks, I. & Tops, P. W. (2000). *Democratic Governance and New Technology: technologically mediated innovations in political practice in Western Europe*. London: Routledge.
- (2000). Introduction. In: J. Hoff, I. Horrocks & P. W. Tops (eds.), *Democratic Governance and New Technology: technologically mediated innovations in political practice in Western Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Hoffman, A. (1999). Institutional evolution and change: environmentalism and the US chemistry industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 351–71.
- Hoffman, D. L., Novak, T. P. & Schlosser, A. E. (2001). The evolution of the digital divide: examining the relationship of race to internet access and usage over time. In: B. M. Compaine (ed.), *The Digital Divide: facing a crisis or creating a myth?*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hoffman, L. H. (2006). Is internet content different after all? A content analysis of mobilizing information in online and print newspapers. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83(1), 58–76.
- Holbrook, T. M. (1996). *Do Campaigns Matter?* Thousand Oaks, California; London: Sage Publications.
- Holmes, D. (1997). Introduction: virtual politics, identity and community in cyberspace. In: D. Holmes (ed.), *Virtual Politics: identity and community in cyberspace*. London: Sage.
- Hood, C., James, O. & Scott, C. (2000). Regulation of government: has it increased, is it increasing, should it be diminished? *Public Administration*, 78(2), 283–304.

- Hood, C. & Margetts, H. (2007). *The Tools of Government in the Digital Age*. London: Palgrave.
- Hoogvelt, A. (2001). *Globalization and the Postcolonial World: the new political economy of development*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hopkins, H. (2006). *BBC favoured news source: but Wikipedia and Flickr growing in importance*. Retrieved January 5, 2006, from www.hitwise.co.uk
- Hopkins, K. & Matheson, D. M. (2005). Blogging the New Zealand election: the impact of new media practices on the old game. *Political Science*, 57(2), 93–105.
- Horrigan, J. (2004). *Broadband Penetration on the Upswing*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- (2006). *Online News: for many home broadband users, the internet is a primary news source*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life.
- (2007). *A Typology of Information and Communication Technology Users*. Washington DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Horrigan, J., Garrett, K. & Resnick, P. (2004). *The Internet and Democratic Debate*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Horrigan, J. & Rainie, L. (2002a). *The Broadband Difference: how online behavior changes with high-speed internet connections*. Washington DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Horrigan, J. B. & Rainie, L. (2002b). *Counting on the Internet*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Houston, F. (1999). What I saw in the digital sea. *Columbia Journalism Review*, (July/August), 34–7.
- Howard, P. N. (2001). Can technology enhance democracy? The doubters answer. *Journal of Politics*, 63(3), 949–55.
- (2003). Digitizing the social contract: Producing American political culture in the age of new media. *Communication Review*, 6(3), 213–45.
- (2004). Embedded media: who we know, what we know, and the context of life online. In: P. N. Howard & S. Jones (eds.), *Society Online: the internet in context*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- (2005). Deep democracy, thin citizenship: the impact of digital media in political campaign strategy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 597, 153–70.
- (2006). *New Media Campaigns and the Managed Citizen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howard, P. N., Carr, J. & Milstein, T. (2005). Digital technology and the market for political surveillance. *Surveillance and Society*, 3(1), 59–73.
- Howard, P. N., Rainie, L. & Jones, S. (2001a). Days and nights on the internet: the impact of a diffusing technology. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(3), 383–404.
- (2001b). Days and nights on the internet: The impact of a diffusing technology. In: B. Wellman & C. Haythornthwaite (eds.), *The Internet in Everyday Life*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Howard, P. N. & World Information Access Project (2006). *World information access report 2006*. Seattle: University of Washington.
- (2007). *World information access report 2007: wired states*. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Howes, M. (2002). Reflexive modernization, the internet and democratic environmental decision making. *Organization & Environment*, 15(3), 328–35.
- Huang, Z. (2006). E-government practices at local levels: an analysis of US counties' websites. *Issues in Information Systems*, 7(2), 165–70.
- Huckfeldt, R., Johnson, P. E. & Sprague, J. (2004). *Political Disagreement: the survival of diverse opinions within communication networks*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Huckfeldt, R. & Sprague, J. (1995). *Citizens, Politics, and Social Communication: information and influence in an election campaign*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hug, S. (2002). *Voices of Europe: citizens, referendums, and European integration*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hughes, D. M. (1999). The internet and the global prostitution industry. In: S. Hawthorne & R. Klein (eds.), *Cyberfeminism: Connectivity, Critique & Creativity*. Melbourne: Spinifex.
- (2004). The use of new communications and information technologies for sexual exploitation of women and children. In: D. D. Waskul (ed.), *Net.Sexxx: reading on sex, pornography, and the internet*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Human Rights Watch (2006). *Race to the Bottom: corporate complicity in Chinese internet censorship*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Hume, E. (1996). The new paradigm for news. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 546, 141–53.

- Hunter, D. (2001). Reason is too large: analogy and precedent in law. *Emory Law Journal*, 50 (Fall), 1197–264.
- (2003). Cyberspace as place and the tragedy of the digital anticommons. *California Law Review*, 91(2), 439–519.
- Huntington, S. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- i2 Inc (2007). *Denying criminals the use of the roads*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.i2.co.uk/company/press/default.asp?action=view&id=77](http://www.i2.co.uk/company/press/default.asp?action=view&id=77)
- Imfeld, C. & Scott, G. W. (2005). Under construction: measures of community building at newspaper web sites. In: M. B. Salwen, B. Garrison & P. D. Driscoll (eds.), *Online News and the Public*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ingber, S. (1984). The marketplace of ideas: a legitimizing myth. *Duke Law Journal*, 1984(1), 1–91.
- Inglehart, R. & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Initiative and Referendum Institute (2004). *Ballot watch 2004 election summary*. Los Angeles, CA: Initiative and Referendum Institute, University of Southern California.
- Institute for Applied Autonomy (2007). *Institute for applied autonomy*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.appliedautonomy.com/isee.html](http://www.appliedautonomy.com/isee.html)
- International Telecommunication Union (2005). *ICT statistics database*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/ey/Indicators/Indicators.aspx#](http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/ey/Indicators/Indicators.aspx#)
- (2006). *World Telecommunications Indicators Database*, 8th edn. Geneva: International Telecommunication Union.
- Internet Governance Project (2004). *Internet Governance: state of play. Working paper*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://dcc.syr.edu/miscarticles/MainReport-final.pdf>
- (2005). *What to do about ICANN: a proposal for structural reform. Working paper*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from <http://dcc.syr.edu/miscarticles/IGP-ICANNReform.pdf>
- Internet Systems Consortium (2004) *Internet Domain Survey, Jan 2004: number of hosts advertised in the DNS*. Redwood, CA: Internet Systems Consortium.
- Internet World Stats (2007). *Internet World Stats: usage and population statistics*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from [www.internetworldstats.com](http://www.internetworldstats.com)
- Introna, L. & Nissenbaum, H. (2000). Shaping the web: why the politics of search engines matters. *The Information Society*, 16(3), 1–17.
- Iyengar, S. (1990). Framing responsibility for political issues: the case of poverty. *Political Behavior*, 12(1), 19–40.
- Jackson, B. & Jamieson, K. (2004). Finding facts in political debate. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48, 229–37.
- Jackson, N. (2004). Email and political campaigning: the experience of MPs in Westminster. *Journal of Systemic Cybernetics and Informatics*, 2 (5), 1–6.
- Jacobs, L. R. & Skocpol, T. (2005). American democracy in an era of rising inequality. In: L. R. Jacobs & T. Skocpol (eds.), *Inequality and American Democracy: what we know and what we need to learn*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Jacobs, N. (ed.). (2006). *Open Access: key strategic, technical and economic aspects*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.
- Jaffe, J. M., Lee, Y., Huang, L. & Oshagan, H. (1995). *Gender, pseudonyms and CMC: masking identities and baring souls*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- (1999). Gender identification, interdependence, and pseudonyms in CMC. Language patterns in an electronic conference. *The Information Society*, 15(4), 221–34.
- Jalonick, M. C. (2006, August 22). YouTube catches candidates in compromising positions. *USA Today*.
- Jamieson, K. (1992). *Dirty Politics: Deception, Distraction, and Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. & Hardy, B. (2007). Unmasking deception: the capacity, disposition, and challenges facing the press. In: D. Graber, D. McQuail & P. Norris (eds.) *The Politics of News: the news of politics*, 2nd edn. Washington DC: CQ Press, pp. 117–38.
- Jamieson, K., Hardy, B. & Romer, D. (2007). The effectiveness of the press in serving the needs of American democracy. In: *Institutions of American Democracy: a republic divided*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 21–51.



- Jamieson, K. & Jackson, B. (2007). *Unspun: finding facts in a world of disinformation*. New York: Random House.
- Jamieson, K. & Waldman, P. (2003). *The Press Effect: politicians, journalists, and the stories that shape the political world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Janda, K. (1993). Comparative political parties: Research and theory. In: A. W. Finifter (ed.), *Political Science: the state of the discipline II*. Washington DC: American Political Science Association.
- Jankowski, N. W. & van Selm, M. (2000). The promise and practice of public debate in cyberspace. In: K. Hacker & J. van Dijk (eds.), *Digital democracy: issues of theory and practice*. London: Sage.
- Janssen, D. & Kies, R. (2005). Online forums and deliberative democracy. *Acta Politica*, 40 (3), 317–35.
- Jenkins, G. S. (2004). *Email marketing and the 2004 election*. Retrieved September 20, 2006, from [www.imediaconnection.com/content/4499.asp](http://www.imediaconnection.com/content/4499.asp)
- Jennings, M. K. & Zeitner, V. (2003). Internet Use And Civic Engagement. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 67(3), 311–34.
- Jensen, J. L. (2003). Public spheres on the internet: anarchic or government-sponsored – a comparison. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 26 (4), 349–74.
- (2003). Virtual democratic dialogue? Bringing together citizens and politicians. *Information Polity*, 8(1–2), 29–47.
- Jensen, M. J., Danziger, J. N. & Venkatesh, A. (2007). Civil society and cyber society: the role of the internet in community associations and democratic politics. *The Information Society*, 23(1), 39–50.
- Johnson, P. E. (1998). Interest group recruiting: finding members and keeping them. In: A. J. Cigler & B. A. Loomis (eds.), *Interest Group Politics*. Washington, DC: CQ 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.
- Johnson, T. J. & Kaye, B. K. (1998a). A vehicle for engagement or a haven for the disaffected? Internet use, political alienation, and voter participation. In: T. J. Johnson, C. E. Hays & S. P. Hays (eds.), *Engaging the Public: how the government and media can reinvigorate democracy*. Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.
- (1998b) Cruising is believing? Comparing internet and traditional sources on media credibility measures. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 75, 325–40.
- (2002). Webelievability: a path model examining how convenience and reliance predict online credibility. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(3), 619–42.
- (2004). Wag the blog: how reliance on traditional media and the internet influence credibility perceptions of weblogs among blog users. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(3), 622–42.
- Johnston, P. (2007, March 27). CCTV cameras get upgrade at police request. *Daily Telegraph*.
- Johnston, R., Hagen, M. G. & Jamieson, K. H. (2004). *The 2000 Presidential Election and the Foundations of Party Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, B. D. (1994). *Reconceiving Decision-Making in Democratic Politics: attention, choice, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, B. D. & Baumgartner, F. R. (2005). *The Politics of Attention: how government prioritizes problems*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, S. G. (1997). The internet and its social landscape. In: S. G. Jones (ed.), *Virtual Culture: identity and communication in cybersociety*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jones-Correa, M. (1998). *Between Two Nations: the political predicament of Latinos in New York city*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Jordan, A. G. (1998). Introduction. In: F. F. Ridley & A. G. Jordan (eds.), *Protest Politics: cause groups and campaigns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jordan, A. G. & Maloney, W. A. (1998). *The Protest Business? Mobilizing campaign groups*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Jordan, T. (2001). Hactivism: direct action on the electronic flows of information societies. In: K. M. Dowding, J. Hughes & H. Margetts (eds.), *Challenges to Democracy: ideas, involvement and institutions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Jordan, T. & Taylor, P. (1998). A sociology of hackers. *The Sociological Review*, 46(4), 757–80.
- Jordan Times (2000, July 11). Jordan IT industry to launch the reach initiative. *Jordan Times*.

- Juels, A. (2006). RFID security and privacy: a research survey. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 24(2), 381.
- Jung, J.-Y., Ball-Rokeach, S. J., Kim, Y. C. & Matei, S. (2007). ICTs and communities in the twenty-first century: challenges and perspectives. In: R. Mansell, C. Averou, D. Quah & R. Silverstone (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Information and Communication Technologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jung, J.-Y., Qiu, J. L. & Kim, Y. C. (2001). Internet connectedness and inequality: beyond the "Divide". *Communication Research*, 28(4), 507–35.
- Kaestle, D. F., Campbell, A., Finn, J. D., Johnson, S. T. & Mickulecky, L. J. (2001). *Adult literacy and education in America: four studies based on the national adult literacy survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Kahin, B. & Keller, J. (1997). *Coordinating the Internet*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kahn, R. & Kellner, D. (2004). New media and internet activism: from the "Battle of Seattle" to blogging. *New Media and Society*, 6(1), 87–95.
- Kaid, L. L. (2002). Political advertising and information seeking: comparing exposure via traditional and internet channels. *Journal of Advertising*, 31(1), 27–35.
- (2006). Political web wars: the use of the internet for political advertising. In: A. P. Williams & J. C. Tedesco (eds.), *The Internet Election: perspectives on the web in campaign 2004*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Kain, J. (1968). Housing segregation, negro employment and metropolitan decentralization. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 82(2), 175–97.
- Kalathil, S. & Boas, T. C. (2003). *Open Networks, Closed Regimes: the impact of the internet on authoritarian rule*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Kaldor, M. (2003). *Global Civil Society: an answer to war*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Kaldor-Robinson, J. (2002). The virtual and the imaginary: the role of diasporic new media in the construction of a national identity during the break-up of Yugoslavia. *Oxford Development Studies*, 30(2), 177–87.
- Kamalipour, Y. (ed.). (2006). *Global Communication*, 2nd edn. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Kamm, O. (2007, April 9). A parody of democracy. *The Guardian*.
- Kane, T. (2007). Economic freedom in five regions. In: Heritage Foundation (ed.). *2007 Index of Economic Freedom*. Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation.
- Kasarda, J. D. (1990). City jobs and residents on a collision course: the urban underclass dilemma. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 4(4), 286–307.
- Katz, E. (1981). Communications in the 21st century: in defense of media events. *Organizational Dynamics*, 10(1), 68–80.
- (1996). And deliver us from segmentation. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 546, 22–33.
- Katz, J. E. & Aspden, P. (1997). A nation of strangers. *Communications of the ACM*, 40(12), 81–6.
- Katz, J. E., Rice, R. E & Aspden, P. (2001). The internet, 1995–2000: access, civic involvement and social interaction. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(3), 404–19.
- Katz, J. E. & Rice, R. E. (2002). *Social Consequences Of Internet Use: access, involvement, and interaction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kaufmann, J. (1968). *Conference Diplomacy: an introductory analysis*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Kavanagh, D. (1995). *Election Campaigning: the new marketing of politics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kavanaugh, A. L. & Patterson, S. J. (2001). The impact of community computer networks on social capital and community involvement. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(3), 469–509.
- Kaye, B. K. & Johnson, T. J. (2004). A web for all reasons: uses and gratifications of internet components for political information. *Telematics and Informatics*, 21(3), 197–223.
- Kaye, K. (2006). *Online political ad spending down from '04 election*. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from [www.clickz.com/showPage.html?page=3623858](http://www.clickz.com/showPage.html?page=3623858)
- Kaylor, C., Deshazo, R. & van Eck, D. (2001). Gauging e-government: a report on implementing services among American cities. *Government Information Quarterly*, 18(4), 293–307.
- Kearney, J. D. & Merrill, T. (2000). The influence of amicus curia briefs on the supreme court. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 148 (January), 743–855.
- Keck, M. & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kelly, R. (2005). *Election Expense Limits*. London: House of Commons Library.

- Kendall, L. (1998). Are you male or female? In: J. O'Brien & J. Howard (eds.), *Everyday Inequalities: critical inquiries*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Kenix, L. (2007). In search of utopia: an analysis of non-profit web pages. *Information, Communication and Society*, 10(1), 69–94.
- Kensinger, L. (2003). Plugged in praxis: critical reflections on US feminism, internet activism, and solidarity with women in Afghanistan. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 5(1), 1–28.
- Kenski, K. & Jamieson, K. H. (2006). Issue knowledge and perceptions of agreement in the 2004 Presidential General Election. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 36(2), 243–59.
- Keohane, R. (1984). *After Hegemony*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Keohane, R. & Nye, J. (1989). *Power and Interdependence*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Kerbel, M. R. & Bloom, J. D. (2005). Blog for America and civic involvement. *Harvard International Journal of Press Politics*, 10(4), 3–27.
- Kerr, A. (2002). Representing users in the design of video games. In: F. Mäyrä (ed.), *Proceedings of computer games and digital cultures conference*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Kerr, O. S. (2003). The problem of perspective in internet law. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 91 (February), 357–405.
- Key, V. O. (1964). *Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups*, 5th edn. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Kibby, M. (2001). Women and sex entertainment on the internet: discourses of gender and power. *Mots Pluriels*, 19.
- Kibby, M. & Costello, B. (2001). Between the image and the act: interactive sex entertainment on the internet. *Sexualities: Studies in Culture and Society*, 4(3), 353–69.
- Kidd, D. (2003). Indymedia.Org: a new communications commons. In: M. McCaughey & M. Ayers (eds.), *Cyberactivism: online activism in theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Kim, J., Wyatt, R. O. & Katz, E. (1999). News, talk, opinion, participation: the part played by conversation in deliberative democracy. *Political Communication*, 16(4), 361–85.
- Kim, J. Y. (2006). The impact of internet use patterns on political engagement: a focus on online deliberation and virtual social capital. *Information Polity*, 11(1), 35–49.
- Kim, M. Y., Barbour, J., Hals, M., Lewkowicz, M. & Tewksbury, D. (2001). *Informational and participatory use of the internet and trust in the political system*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, Chicago, IL.
- Kim, Y. C. & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2003). *Koreans in Los Angeles: community and market*. Los Angeles: Korea Central Daily.
- (2006). Civic engagement from a communication infrastructure perspective. *Communication Theory*, 16(1), 1–25.
- Kim, Y. C., Jung, J.-Y. & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2002). *Ethnicity, place, and communication technology: geo-ethnic effect on multi-dimensional internet connectedness in urban communities*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Annual Conference. Seoul: Korea.
- Kim, Y.-C., Jung, J. E. L., Cohen, E. L. & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2004). Internet connectedness before and after 9/11. *New Media and Society*, 6(5), 611–31.
- Kim, Y. M. (2007). How intrinsic and extrinsic motivations interact in selectivity: investigating the moderating effects of situational information processing goals in issue publics' web behavior. *Communication Research*, 34(2), 185–211.
- Kimber, R. (2005). *UK general election 2005: election blogs and forums*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.psr.keele.ac.uk/area/uk/ge05/electionblogs.htm](http://www.psr.keele.ac.uk/area/uk/ge05/electionblogs.htm)
- Kinder, D. R. (2003). Communication and politics in the age of information. In: D. O. Sears, L. Huddy & R. Jervis (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- King Abdullah of Jordan. (2007). *Introduction to IT development*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.kingabdullah.jo/main.php?main\\_page=0&lang\\_hmka1=1](http://www.kingabdullah.jo/main.php?main_page=0&lang_hmka1=1)
- Kiousis, S. (2002). Interactivity: a concept explication. *New Media and Society*, 4(3), 355–83.
- Kirchner, H. (2001). Internet in the Arab world: a step towards information society? In: K. Hafez (ed.), *Mass Media, Politics and Society in the Middle East*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Kirsch, I. S., Jungeblut, A., Jenkins, L. & Kolstad, A. (2002). *Adult Literacy in America: a first look at the findings of the national adult literacy survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

- Kitschelt, H. (1986). Political opportunity structures: anti nuclear movements in four democracies. *British journal of political science*, 1(16), 57–85.
- Klapper, J. T. (1960). *The Effects of Mass Communication*. New York: Free Press.
- Klein, H. (2004). Understanding WSIS: an institutional analysis of the UN World Summit on the Information Society. *Information Technology and International Development*, 1(3–4), 3–14.
- Kleiner, A. & Lewis, L. (2003). *Internet access in US public schools and classrooms: 1994–2002*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Education.
- Kling, R. (1996). Hopes and horrors: technological utopianism and anti-utopianism in narratives of computerization. In: R. Kling (ed.), *Computerization and Controversy*. Boston: Academic Press.
- Klingemann, H.-D. (1999). Mapping political support in the 1990s: a global analysis. In: P. Norris (ed.), *Critical Citizens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klotz, R. J. (2004). *The Politics of Internet Communication*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Kluyer, R. (2004). Political culture and information technology in the 2001 Singapore general election. *Political Communication*, 21(4), 435–58.
- (2005). Political culture in online politics. In: M. Consalvo & M. Allen (eds.), *Internet Research Annual*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kluyer, R. & Banerjee, I. (2005). Political culture, regulation and democratization: the internet in nine Asian countries. *Information, Communication, and Society*, 8(1), 30–46.
- Kluyer, R., Jankowski, N. W., Foot, K. A. & Schneider, S. M. (eds.). (2007). *The Internet and National Elections: a comparative study of web campaigning*. New York: Routledge.
- Knobloch, S., Hastall, M., Zillman, D. & Callison, C. (2003). Imagery effects on the selective reading of internet news magazines. *Communication Research*, 30(1), 3–29.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S., Sharma, N., Hansen, D. L. & Alter, S. (2005). Impact of popularity indications on readers' selective exposure to online news. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 49(3), 296–313.
- Kobayashi, T., Ikeda, K. & Miyata, K. (2006). Social capital online: collective use of the internet and reciprocity as lubricants of democracy. *Information, Communication and Society*, 9(5), 582–611.
- Kohut, A. (2000). Internet users are on the rise: but public affairs interest isn't. *Columbia Journalism Review*, 38(5), 68–69.
- (2003). *Perceptions of partisan bias seen as growing – especially by Democrats: cable and internet loom large in fragmented political news universe*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Koster, M. (1997). *A method for web robots control: networking working group, internet engineering task force* from [www.robots.txt.org/wc/norobots-rfc.html](http://www.robots.txt.org/wc/norobots-rfc.html)
- Kraemer, K. & King, J. (1986). Computing and public organisations. *Public Administration Review*, 46(6), 488–96.
- (2006). Information technology and administrative reform: will e-government be different? *International Journal of E-government Research*, 2(1), 1–20.
- Kraemer, K. & Kling, R. (1985). The political character of computerization in service organizations: citizens interests or bureaucratic control. *Computers and the Social Sciences*, 1(2), 77–89.
- Kranich, N. (2004). *The information commons: a policy report*. New York: NYU School of Law.
- Kranzberg, M. (1985). The information age: evolution or revolution? In: B. Guile (ed.), *Information Technologies and Social Transformation*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Krasner, S. (ed.). (1983). *International Regimes*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Krasner, S. D. (1982). Structural causes and regime consequences: regimes as intervening variable. *International Organization*, 36(3), 185–205.
- Kraut, R., Kiesler, S., Boneva, B., Cummings, J. & Helgeson, V. (2002). Internet paradox revisited. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(1), 49–74.
- Kraut, R., Lundmark, V., Patterson, M., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T. & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: a social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, 53(9), 1017–31.
- Krebs, K. (2002, November 25). Homeland security bill heralds IT changes. *The Washington Post*.
- Kreimer, S. F. (2001). Technologies of protest: insurgent social movements and the first amendment in the era of the internet.

- University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 150(1), 119–71.
- Kretchmer, S. & Carveth, R. (2001). The color of the net: African-Americans, race, and cyberspace. *Computers and Society*, 31(3), 9–14.
- Kriesi, H., Koopmans, R., Duyvendak, J. W. & Giugni, M. G. (1995). *New Social Movements in Western Europe: a comparative analysis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kroløkke, C. H. (2003). Grrl explorers of the world wild web. *Nora: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, 11(3), 140–48.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Government policy and citizen passion: a study of issue publics in contemporary America. *Political Behavior*, 12(1), 59–92.
- Krueger, B. S. (2002). Assessing the potential of internet political participation in the United States. *American Politics Research*, 30(5), 476–98.
- (2006). A comparison of conventional and internet political mobilization. *American Politics Research*, 34(6), 759–76.
- Kulikova, S. V. & Perlmutter, D. D. (2007). Blogging down the dictator? The Kyrgyz revolution and samizdat websites. *Gazette*, 69(1), 29–50.
- Kush, C. (2000). *Cybercitizen: how to use your computer to fight for all the issues you care about*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kwak, N., Poor, N. & Skoric, M. M. (2006). Honey, I shrunk the world! The relation between internet use and international engagement. *Mass Communication and Society*, 9(2), 189–213.
- Kwak, N., Williams, A. E., Wang, X. & Lee, H. (2005). Talking politics and engaging politics: an examination of the interactive relationships between structural features of political talk and discussion engagement. *Communication Research*, 32(1), 87–111.
- Kyllonen, P. & Christal, R. (1990). Reasoning ability is (little more than) working-memory capacity? *Intelligence*, 14(4), 389–433.
- Lacharite, J. (2002). Electronic decentralisation in China: a critical analysis of internet filtering policies in the People's Republic of China. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 37(2), 333–46.
- Lægran, A. S. (2004). Just another boys' room? Internet cafés as gendered technosocial spaces. In: M. Lie (ed.), *He, She and IT Revisited: new perspectives on gender in the information society*. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lander, M. (2005, December 14). Tech firms find home in revived Estonia. *The International Herald Tribune*.
- Landes, W. M. & Posner, R. A. (2004). *The Political Economy of Intellectual Property Law*. Washington, DC: AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies.
- Lane, F. (2000). *Obscene Profits: the entrepreneurs of pornography in the cyber age*. London: Routledge.
- Lane, G. & Thelwall, S. (2005). *Urban Tapestries: public authoring, place and mobility*. London: Proboscis.
- Langman, L. (2005). From virtual public spheres to global justice: a critical theory of internet-networked social movements. *Sociological Theory*, 23(1), 42–74.
- Lappin, T. (1995). Trucking. *Wired*, January, 119–23.
- LaRose, R. & Eastin, M. S. (2004). A social cognitive theory of internet uses and gratifications: toward a new model of media attendance. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 48(3), 358–77.
- Lasch, C. (1979). *The Culture of Narcissism*. New York: Norton and Company.
- (1987). The degradation of the political arts. In: S. Goldberg & C. Strain (eds.), *Technological Change and the Transformation of America*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, pp. 79–90.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: an introduction to actor network theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laudon, K. (1974). *Computers and Bureaucratic Reform*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lawson-Borders, G. & Kirk, R. (2005). Blogs in campaign communication. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(4), 548–59.
- Lazer, D. & Mayer-Schönberger, V. (eds.). (2007). *From E-gov to I-gov: governance and information technology in the 21st century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Leadbeater, C. & Mulgan, G. (1997). Lean democracy and the leadership vacuum. In: G. Mulgan (ed.), *Life After Politics: new thinking for the twenty first century*. London: Fontana.
- Leake, C. (2007, February, 11). The tiny airline spy that spots bombers in the blink of an eye. *Mail on Sunday*, p. 52.

- Lebert, J. (2003). Wiring human rights activism: Amnesty International and the challenges of information communication technology. In: M. McCaughey & M. D. Ayers (eds.), *Cyberactivism: online activism in theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Leblebici, H., Salancik, G. R., Copay, A. & King, T. (1991). Institutional change and the transformation of interorganizational fields: an organizational history of the US radio broadcasting industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3), 333–63.
- LeDuc, L. (2003). *The Politics of Direct Democracy: referendums in global perspective*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.
- Lee, E. (1997). *The Labour Movement and the internet: the new internationalism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Leib, E. J. (2006). Can direct democracy be made deliberative? *Buffalo Law Review*, 54, 903–25.
- Leiner, B. M., Cerf, V. G., Clark, D. D., Kahn, R. E., Kleinrock, L., Lynch, D. C., et al. (2003). *A Brief History of the Internet*. Reston, VA: Internet Society.
- Lemley, M. A. (2003). Place and cyberspace. *California Law Review*, 91(2), 521–42.
- Lenhart, A. (2003). *The ever-shifting internet population: a new look at internet access and the digital divide*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Lenhart, A. & Fox, S. (2006). *Bloggers: a portrait of the internet's new story tellers*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Lerner, D. (1962). *The Passing of Traditional Society*. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press.
- Lessig, L. (1999). *Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace*. New York: Basic Books.
- (2001). *The Future of Ideas*. New York: Random House.
- (2004). *Free Culture*. New York: Penguin Press.
- (2006). *Code: version 2.0*. New York: Basic Books.
- Leston-Bandeira, C. (forthcoming). The Impact of the Internet on Parliaments: a legislative studies framework. *Parliamentary Affairs*.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2(4), 34–46.
- Lewis, H. (2006). The wild wild web: international internet regulation. *Harvard Political Review*, 33(1), 12–13.
- Li, C. (2004). Internet content control in China. *International Journal of Communications Law and Policy*, 8(1).
- Li, Q. (2005). Gender and CMC: a review on conflict and harassment. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 21(3), 382–406.
- Li, X. (1998). Web page design and graphic use of three US newspapers. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 75(2), 353–65.
- (2006). Introduction. In: X. Li (ed.), *Internet Newspapers: the making of a mainstream media*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Libicki, M. C. (1998). Information war, information peace. *Journal of International Affairs*, 51(2), 411.
- Liff, S. (2004). *Locating civil society participation in WSIS*. Oxford Internet Institute Seminar Paper. Oxford Internet Institute, Oxford.
- Lijphart, A. (1984). *Democracies: patterns of majoritarian and consensus government in twenty-one countries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lillie, J. J. M. (2004). Cyberporn, sexuality, and the net apparatus. *Convergence*, 10(1), 43–65.
- Lim, J. (2006). A cross-lagged analysis of agenda setting among online news media. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83(2), 298–312.
- Lin, N. (2001). *Social Capital: a theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public Opinion*. New York: Free Press.
- Lipton, J. (2004). Mixed metaphors in cyberspace: property in information and information systems. *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal*, 35, 235–74.
- Lizza, R. (2002, November 18). Head count: how the GOP learned voter turnout. *New Republic*.
- (2006, August 20). The YouTube election. *New York Times*.
- Lloyd, J. (2004). *What the Media are Doing to our Politics*. London: Constable.
- Locke, J. (1959). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. New York: Dover.
- London, S. (1993). *Electronic Democracy*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.
- Long, N. E. (1958). The local community as an ecology of games. *American Journal of Sociology*, 64(3), 251–61.
- Loughlan, P. (2006). Pirates, parasites, reapers, sowers, fruits, foxes. The metaphors of

- intellectual property. *The Sydney Law Review*, 28(June), 211–26.
- Lowrey, W. (2006). Mapping the journalism–blogging relationship. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 7(4), 477–500.
- Lowrey, W. & Anderson, W. (2005). The journalist behind the curtain: participatory functions on the internet and their impact on perceptions of the work of journalism. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10(3).
- Lowry, R. (2004, November 29). Bush's well-mapped road to victory: how Rove *et al.* pulled it off. *National Review*.
- Lupia, A. (1994). Shortcuts versus encyclopedias: information and voting behavior in California insurance reform elections. *American Political Science Review*, 88(1), 63–76.
- (2001). Dumber than chimps? An assessment of direct democracy voters. In: L. J. Sabato, H. R. Ernst & B. A. Larson (eds.), *Dangerous Democracy? The battle over ballot initiatives in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Lupia, A. & Matsusaka, J. G. (2004). Direct democracy: new approaches to old questions. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 463–82.
- Lupia, A. & McCubbins, M. D. (1998). *The Democratic Dilemma: can citizens learn what they need to know?* Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lupia, L. & Sin, G. (2003). Which public goods are endangered? How evolving technologies affect the logic of collective action. *Public Choice* (117), 315–31.
- Luskin, R. C., Fishkin, J. S., McAllister, I., Higley, J. & Ryan, P. (2005). *Deliberation and Referendum Voting*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Lusoli, W. & Ward, S. J. (2003). Virtually participating: a survey of party members online. *Information Polity*, 7(4), 1–17.
- (2004). Digital ranks and file: activists perceptions and the use of the internet. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 7(4), 453–70.
- (2006). Hunting protestors: mobilization, participation and protest online in the Countryside Alliance. In: S. Oates, D. M. Owen & R. K. Gibson (eds.), *The Internet and Politics: citizens, voters, and activists*. London: Routledge.
- Lynch, M. (2005). *Voices of the New Arab Public: Iraq, al-Jazeera, and Middle East politics today*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lyon, D. (ed.). (2002). *Surveillance as Social Sorting: privacy, risk, and automated discrimination*. London: Routledge.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- MacAskill, E. (2007, July 11 2007). McCain campaign hits crisis point. *The Guardian*.
- MacGregor, P. (2007). Tracking the online audience: metric data start a subtle revolution. *Journalism Studies*, 8(2), 280–98.
- Macintosh, A., Malina, A. & Whyte, A. (2002). Designing e-democracy in Scotland. *European Journal of Communications*, 27, 261–78.
- Mackenzie, A. (2006). *Cutting Code: software and sociality*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Maclean, D. (2004). *Herding Schroedinger's Cats: some conceptual tools for thinking about internet governance*. United Nations Information and Communications Technologies Task Force.
- Madar Research. (2002). PC penetration vs internet user penetration in GCC countries. *Journal of Knowledge, Economy and Research on the Middle East*, 1(October), 1–15.
- Madden, M. (2007). *Online video – July 2007*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Madison, M. J. (2005). Law as design: objects, concepts and digital things. *Case Western Reserve Law Review*, 56(Winter), 381–478.
- Magid, L. (2007, July 19). Global positioning by cellphone. *New York Times*.
- Maguire, S., Hardy, C. & Lawrence, T. B. (2004). Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 657–80.
- Mair, P. & Von Biezen, I. (2004). Party membership in twenty European democracies, 1980–2000. *Party Politics*, 7(1), 5–21.
- Malbin, M. J. & Cain, S. A. (2007). *The Ups and Downs of Small and Large Donors: a campaign finance institute analysis of pre- and post-BCRA contributions to federal candidates and parties, 1999–2006*. Washington DC: Campaign Finance Institute.
- Malina, A. (1999). Perspectives on citizen democratization and alienation in the virtual public sphere. In: B. Hague & B. Loader (eds.), *Digital Democracy: discourse and decision making in the information age*. New York: Routledge.
- Maltby, S. & Keeble, R. (eds.). (2007). *Communicating War: memory, media and military*. Bury St Edmunds: Arima Publishing.

- Manjoo, F. (2003). *Blogland's man of the people*. Retrieved July 20, 2006, from [http://archive.salon.com/tech/feature/2003/07/03/dean\\_web/index\\_np.html](http://archive.salon.com/tech/feature/2003/07/03/dean_web/index_np.html)
- (2004). *Howard Dean's fatal system error*. Retrieved July 20, 2006, from [http://dir.salon.com/story/tech/feature/2004/01/21/dean\\_inter\\_net/index.html](http://dir.salon.com/story/tech/feature/2004/01/21/dean_inter_net/index.html)
- Manovich, L. (2001). *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Marcella, R., Baxter, G. & Moore, N. (2002). An exploration of the effectiveness for the citizen of web-based systems of communicating UK parliamentary and devolved assembly information. *Journal of Government Information*, 29(6), 371–91.
- March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions: the organizational basis of politics*. New York: Free Press.
- March, L. (2006). Virtual parties in a virtual world: Russian parties and the political internet. In: S. Oates, D. M. Owen & R. K. Gibson (eds.), *The Internet and Politics: citizens, voters, and activists*. London: Routledge.
- Margetts, H. (1997). The National Performance Review: a new humanist public management. In: A. Massey (ed.), *Globalization and Marketization of Government Services: comparing contemporary public sector developments*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- (1999). *Information Technology in Government: Britain and America*. London: Routledge.
- (2006). Cyber parties. In: R. S. Katz & W. J. Crotty (eds.), *Handbook of Party Politics*. London: Sage.
- Margetts, H. & Yared, H. (2003). *Incentivization of E-Government*. London: National Audit Office.
- Margolis, M. & Resnick, D. (2000). *Politics as Usual: the cyberspace revolution*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Margolis, M., Resnick, D. & Levy, J. (2003). Major parties dominate, minor parties struggle: US elections and the internet. In: R. K. Gibson, P. Nixon & S. J. Ward (eds.), *Political Parties and the Internet: net gain?* London: Routledge.
- Margolis, M., Resnick, D. & Tu, C. (1997). Campaigning on the internet: parties and candidates on the world wide web in the 1996 primary season. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 2(1), 59–78.
- Margulis, S. (2003). On the status and contribution of Westin's and Altman's theories of privacy. *Journal of Social Issues*, 59(2), 411–29.
- Martin, C. H. & Stronach, B. (1992). *Politics East and West: a comparison of Japanese and British political culture*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Marvin, C. (1988). *When Old Technologies Were New*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marwell, G. & Oliver, P. (1993). *The Critical Mass in Collective Action: a micro-social theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Massey, B. L. & Luo, W. (2005). Chinese newspapers and market theories of web journalism. *Gazette*, 67, 359–71.
- Massey, D. S. & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American Apartheid: segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Matei, S. & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2001). Real and virtual social ties: connections in the everyday lives of seven ethnic neighborhoods. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(3), 550–63.
- Matsusaka, J. G. (2004). *For the Many or the Few: the initiative, public policy, and American democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- May, C. (2005). The academy's new electronic order? Open source journals and publishing political science. *European Political Science*, 4(1), 14–24.
- (2007). *The World Intellectual Property Organization*. London: Routledge.
- May, C. & Sell, S. (2005). *Intellectual Property Rights: a critical history*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Mayo, E. & Steinberg, T. (2007). *The Power of Information*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Mayor's Advisory Council on Closing the Digital Divide. (2007). *The City that Networks: transforming society and economy through digital excellence*. Chicago: Office of the Mayor of Chicago.
- McCarthy, J. & Zald, M. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: a partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), 1212–41.
- McCaughy, M. & Ayers, M. D. (2003). *Cyberactivism: online activism in theory and practice*. New York; London: Routledge.
- McChesney, R. (1995). The internet and US communication policy-making in historical and critical perspective. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 1(4).



- (2004). Media policy goes to main street: the uprising of 2003. *Communication Review*, 7 (3), 223–58.
- McChesney, R. W. (2004). *The Problem of the Media: US communication politics in the 21st century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- McCombs, M. E., Shaw, D. L. & Weaver, D. L. (1997). *Communication and Democracy: exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda-setting theory*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McFarland, A. (2007). *Participation as civic innovation*. Paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Conference, Chicago, IL.
- McFerrin, R. & Wills, D. (2007). High noon on the western range: a property rights analysis of the Johnson County war. *Journal of Economic History*, 67(1), 69–92.
- McGowan, D. (2005). *The trespass trouble and the metaphor muddle (University of Minnesota Law School legal studies research paper series)*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Law School.
- McKay, D. (2005). *American Politics and Society*, 6th edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McLeod, J. M. & McDonald, D. G. (1985). Beyond simple exposure: media orientations and their impact on political processes. *Communication Research*, 12(1), 3–33.
- McLeod, J. M., Scheufele, D. A., Moy, P., Horowitz, E. M., Holbert, R. L., Zhang, W. et al. (1999). Understanding deliberation: the effects of discussion networks on participation in a public forum. *Communication Research*, 26 (6), 743–74.
- McNair, B. (2002). *Striptease Culture: sex, media and the democratization of desire*. New York: Routledge.
- (2006). *Cultural Chaos: journalism, news and power in a globalized world*. London: Routledge.
- (2007). *An Introduction to Political Communication*, 4th edn. London: Routledge.
- Melucci, A. (1994). A strange kind of newness: what's "new" in new social movements. In: E. Laraña, H. Johnston & J. Gusfield (eds.), *New Social Movements: from ideology to identity*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- (1996). *Challenging Codes: collective action in the information age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Menjívar, C. (2003). Religion and immigration in comparative perspective: Catholic and Evangelical Salvadorans in San Francisco, Washington, DC, and Phoenix. *Sociology of Religion*, 64(1), 21–45.
- Merrill, J. C. & Lowenstein, R. L. (1979). *Media, Messages, and Men: new perspectives in communication*, 2nd edn. New York, NY: Longman.
- Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 440–63.
- Meyer, J. W. & Scott, W. R. (1983). *Organizational Environments: ritual and rationality*. London: Sage.
- Michelin (2006). *Michelin researcher honored for RFID advancements*. Retrieved August 15, 2007, from [www.michelinmedia.com/pressSingle/value=MCH2006042061739](http://www.michelinmedia.com/pressSingle/value=MCH2006042061739)
- Michels, R. (1915). *Political Parties: a sociological study of the oligarchical tendencies of modern democracy*. New York: The Free Press.
- Milbank, D. & Van de Hei, J. (2004, May 31, 2004). From Bush, unprecedented negativity: scholars say campaign is making history with often-misleading attacks. *Washington Post*, p. 1.
- Mill, J. S. (1998). *On Liberty and other Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, J. (2004, February 9). Online extra: congress rebuffs e-gov fund, centralized hiring site in '04 spending. *Government Computer News*.
- Miller, T. (2007). *Cultural Citizenship*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Miller, W. E. & Shanks, J. M. (1996). *The New American Voter*. Cambridge, MA: Boston Press.
- Milner, H. (2006). The digital divide: the role of political institutions in technology diffusion. *Comparative Political Studies*, 39(2), 176–99.
- Milner, H. V. (2003). *The diffusion of the internet globally: the role of political institutions*. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.
- Ministers of the European Union (2006). *Ministerial declaration on e-inclusion (Riga declaration)*. Riga, Latvia.
- Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications of Estonia (2006). *Information technology in public administration of Estonia yearbook 2005*. Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications of Estonia.
- Ministry of Finance Government of Singapore (2007). *Singapore e-government 2006*. Singapore.
- Mitra, A. (1997a). Diasporic web sites: ingroup and outgroup discourse. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 14(2), 158–81.

- (1997b). Virtual community: Looking for india on the internet. In: S. G. Jones (ed.), *Virtual Culture: identity and communication in cybersociety*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- (2001). Diasporic voices in cyberspace. *New Media and Society*, 3(1), 29–48.
- (2005). Creating immigrant identities in cybernetic space: examples from a non resident Indian website. *Media, Culture and Society*, 27, 371–90.
- Mobbs, P. (2000). Internet disintermediation and campaign groups: a study of the development of the internet, its effects on grassroots campaigning and larger campaign groups. *Ecos*, 21 (1), 25–32.
- Monge, P. R. & Contractor, N. S. (2003). *Theories of Communication Networks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Monge, P. R. & Fulk, J. (1999). Communication technologies for global network organizations. In: G. DeSanctis & J. Fulk (eds.), *Communication Technologies and Organizational Forms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Monge, P. R., Fulk, J., Kalman, M., Flanagan, A., Parnassa, C. & Rumsey, S. (1998). Production of collection action in alliance-based interorganizational communication and information systems. *Organizational Science*, 9, 411–33.
- Moody, G. (2001). *Rebel Code: Linux and the open source revolution*. London: Allen Lane.
- Moon, M. (2002). The evolution of e-government among municipalities rhetoric or reality. *Public Administration Review*, 62(4), 424–33.
- MORI (2001). *Attitudes to voting and the political process survey*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.mori.com/polls/2001/elec\\_comm.shtml](http://www.mori.com/polls/2001/elec_comm.shtml)
- Morley, D. & Robins, K. (1995). *Spaces of Identity: global media, electronic landscapes and cultural boundaries*. London: Routledge.
- Morris, D. (1999). *Vote.Com: how big-money lobbyists and the media are losing their influence, and the internet is giving power back to the people*. Los Angeles: Renaissance Books.
- Mosquera, M. (2001). *New Senate balance of power won't change high-tech outlook*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://web.archive.org/web/20030426050718/http://www.interweek.com/story/INW20010525S0002>
- Mossberger, K., Kaplan, D. & Gilbert, M. (2006). *How concentrated poverty matters for the "digital divide": motivation, social networks, and resources*. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.
- Mossberger, K., Kaplan, D. & McNeil, R. (2007). *Digital Citizenship: the internet, society and participation*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. & Gilbert, M. (2006). Race, place and information technology. *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(5), 583–620.
- Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J. & McNeal, R. S. (2008). *Digital Citizenship: the internet, society, and participation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J. & Stansbury, M. (2003). *Virtual Inequality: beyond the digital divide*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Mouffe, C. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso.
- (2005). *On the Political*. London: Routledge.
- MoveOn. (2007). *Election 2006: people powered politics*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://pol.moveon.org/2006report>
- Moy, P., Manosevitch, E., Stamm, K. & Dunsmore, K. (2005). Linking dimensions of internet use and civic engagement. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(3), 571–86.
- Mubarak, H. (2000). *A message from His Excellency President Mohammed Hosni Mubarak of Egypt*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.mideastinfo.com/documents/Mubarak\\_letter.htm](http://www.mideastinfo.com/documents/Mubarak_letter.htm)
- (2004). *Opening speech by President Hosni Mubarak to the Arab reform conference*. Arab Reform Conference. Alexandria, Egypt
- Mueller, M. (2002). *Ruling the Root: internet governance and the taming of cyberspace*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mulgan, G. (1997). *Life after Politics: new thinking for the twenty-first century*. London: Fontana.
- Murphy, E. (2006). Agency and space: the political impact of information technologies in the gulf Arab states. *Third World Quarterly*, 27(6), 1059–83.
- Murray, S. (2006, August 9). Lamont relies on netroots – and grassroots. *Washington Post*.
- Mutz, D. C. (2006). *Hearing the Other Side: deliberative versus participatory democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mutz, D. C. & Martin, P. S. (2001). Facilitating communication across lines of political difference. *American Political Science Review*, 95(1), 97–114.

- Myers, D. (1999). Demographic dynamism and metropolitan change: comparing Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Washington, DC. *Housing Policy Debate*, 10(4), 915–54.
- Naficy, H. (1993). *The Making of Exile Cultures: Iranian television in Los Angeles*. Minneapolis: Univeristy of Minnesota Press.
- Nagel, J. (1981). Politics and the organization of collective: the case of Nigeria, 1960–75. *Political Behavior*, 3(1), 87–116.
- Nahapiet, J. & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242–66.
- Napoli, P. M. (1999). The marketplace of ideas metaphor in communications regulation. *Journal of Communication*, 49(4), 151–69.
- NASCIO (2005). *The states and enterprise architecture: how far have we come?* Lexington, KY: National Association of State Chief Information Officers.
- (2006). *NASCIO's survey on IT consolidation and shared services in the states: a national assessment*. Lexington, KY: National Association of State Chief Information Officers.
- National Academy of Science (1993). *National laboratories: applying information technology for scientific research*. Computer Science and Telecommunications Board, National Academies Press.
- National Performance Review (1993). *From red tape to results: creating a government that works better and costs less. Report of the National Performance Review*. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of the Vice President.
- National Republican Senatorial Committee (2007). *Excerpts from the National Republican Senatorial Committee campaign internet guide*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from www.politico.com/pdf/PPM44\_nrsce excerpts.pdf
- National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) (1995). *Falling through the net: a survey of the "have nots" in rural and urban America*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- (1998). *Falling through the net II: new data on the digital divide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- (2002). *A nation online: how Americans are expanding their use of the internet*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- (2004). *A nation online: entering the broadband age*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Naughton, J. (1999). *A Brief History of the Future: the origins of the internet*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Ned Lamont For Senate (2006). *On the air!* Retrieved November 23, 2007, from http://nedlamont.com/blog/168/on-the-air
- Nee, V. & Ingram, P. (1998). Embeddedness and beyond: institutions, exchange, and social structure. In: M. C. Brinton & V. Nee (eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Sociology*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Negrine, R. & Papathanassopoulos, S. (1996). The "Americanization" of political communication: a critique. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 1(2), 45–62.
- Negroponce, N. (1995). *Being Digital*. New York: Knopf.
- (1998). Beyond digital. *Wired*, December.
- Neu, C. R., Anderson, R. H. & Bikson, T. K. (1999). *Sending Your Government a Message: e-mail communication between citizens and government*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Neuman, S. B. & Celano, D. (2006). The knowledge gap: implications of leveling the playing field for low-income and middle-income children. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(2), 176–201.
- Neuman, W. R. (1991). *The Future of the Mass Audience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neuman, W. R., McKnight, L. & Solomon, R. J. (1998). *The Gordian Knot: political gridlock on the information superhighway*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Neustadt, R. E. (1997). The politics of mistrust. In: J. N. Nye, P. D. Zelikow & D. C. King (eds.) *Why People Don't Trust Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 197–202.
- Newell, J. (2001). Italian political parties on the web. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 6(4), 60–87.
- Newhagen, J. E. & Rafaeli, S. (1996). Why communication researchers should study the internet: a dialogue. *Journal of Communication*, 46(1), 4–13.
- Nie, N. H. (2001). Sociability, interpersonal relations, and the internet: reconciling conflicting findings. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45, 420–35.

- Nie, N. H. & Erbring, L. (2000). *Internet and society: a preliminary report*. Stanford Institute for the Quantitative Study of Society.
- Nielsen/NetRatings (2006). *YouTube US web traffic grows 75 percent week over week*. Retrieved March 20, 2007, from [http://64.233.167.104/search?q=cache:1PoVUO5z5vwJ:www.nielsen-netratings.com/pr/pr\\_060721\\_2.pdf+youtube+unique+visitors&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us](http://64.233.167.104/search?q=cache:1PoVUO5z5vwJ:www.nielsen-netratings.com/pr/pr_060721_2.pdf+youtube+unique+visitors&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us)
- (2007). *Online newspaper blog traffic grows 210 per cent year over year*. Retrieved January 17, 2007, from [www.nielsen-netratings.com](http://www.nielsen-netratings.com)
- Nissenbaum, H. (2004). Hackers and the contested ontology of cyberspace. *New Media and Society*, 6(2), 195–217.
- (2004). Technology, values, and the justice system: privacy and contextual integrity. *Washington Law Review*, 79, 119–57.
- Nixon, P. G., Ward, S. J. & Gibson, R. K. (2003). Conclusions. In: R. K. Gibson, P. Nixon & S. Ward (eds.), *Political Parties and the Internet: net gain?* London: Routledge.
- Noam, E. M. (2005). Why the internet is bad for democracy. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(10), 57–8.
- Noguchi, Y. (2006, October 29). In teens' web world, MySpace is so last year, social sites find fickle audience. *Washington Post*.
- Nohria, N. & Berkley, J. D. (1994). The virtual organization: bureaucracy, technology, and the implosion of control. In: C. C. Heckscher & A. Donnellon (eds.), *The Post-Bureaucratic Organization: new perspectives on organizational change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- NOI (2006). *Transcript of online strategies in the 2006 election*. Washington, DC: Centre For American Progress Action Fund.
- Nokia (2007). *Nokia Europe technical specifications*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://europe.nokia.com/A4307095>
- Noland, M. (2005). *Explaining Middle Eastern Authoritarianism*. Washington, DC: Institute of International Economics.
- Norris, C. & Armstrong, G. (1999). *The Maximum Surveillance Society: the rise of CCTV*. Berg: Oxford.
- Norris, D. F. & Moon, M. J. (2005). Advancing e-government at the grassroots: tortoise or hare? *Public Administration Review*, 65(1), 64–75.
- Norris, P. (1998). Virtual democracy. *Harvard International Journal of Press Politics*, 3(2), 1–4.
- (2000). *A Virtuous Circle: political communications in postindustrial societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2001a). A failing grade? The news media and campaign 2000. *Press/Politics*, 6(2), 3–9.
- (2001b). *Digital Divide: civic engagement, information poverty, and the internet worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2002). *Democratic Phoenix: reinventing political activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2003). Preaching to the converted? Pluralism, participation and party websites. *Party Politics*, 9(1), 21–46.
- (2004). The bridging and bonding role of online communities. In: P. N. Howard & S. Jones (eds.), *Society Online: the internet in context*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Norton, A. R. (1999a). Associational life: civil society in authoritarian political systems. In M. Tessler (ed.), *Area Studies and Social Science: strategies for understanding Middle East politics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- (1999b). The new media, civic pluralism, and the slowly retreating state. In: D. F. Eickelman & J. W. Anderson (eds.), *New Media in the Muslim World: the emerging public sphere*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Norton, P. (2007). Four models of political representation: British MPs and the use of ICT. *Journal of Legislative Studies*, 13(3), 354–69.
- Nye, J. S. & Owens, W. A. (1996). America's information edge. *Foreign Affairs*, 75(2), 20–8.
- O'Brien, J. (1999). Writing in the body: gender (re)production in online interaction. In: P. Kollock & M. A. Smith (eds.), *Communities in Cyberspace*. London: Routledge.
- O'Toole, L. (1999). *Pomocopia: porn, sex, technology and desire*. London: Serpent's Tail.
- Oates, S., Owen, D. M. & Gibson, R. K. (2006). *The Internet and Politics: citizens, voters, and activists*. London: Routledge.
- Oberschall, A. (1973). *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Office of the Vice President (1993). *Reengineering through information technology: National Performance Review accompanying report*. Washington, DC: Office of the Vice President.
- Oliver, M. (2007). *Minister says road zones solve privacy problem*. Retrieved March 2, 2007, from [www.guardian.co.uk/transport/Story/0,2025299,00.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/transport/Story/0,2025299,00.html)

- Olivers, D. (2004). Counter hegemonic dispersions: the World Social Forum model. *Antipode*, 36(2), 175–83.
- O'Loughlin, B. (2001). The political implications of digital innovations: the internet and trade-offs of democracy and liberty in the developed world. *Information, Communication and Society*, 4(4), 595–614.
- Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action: public goods and the theory of groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Olson, M. & Zeckhauser, R. (1966). An economic theory of alliances. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 48(3), 266–79.
- OpenNet Initiative (2004). *Bulletin 007*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from www.opennetinitiative.net/bulletins/007/
- (2005a). *Country report: Tunisia*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from www.opennetinitiative.net/studies/tunisia/
- (2005b). *Internet filtering in China in 2004–2005, a case study*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from www.opennetinitiative.net/studies/china/
- (2005c). *Internet filtering in Iran in 2004–2005*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from www.opennetinitiative.net/studies/iran/
- (2005d). *Special report: election monitoring in Kyrgyzstan*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from www.opennetinitiative.net/special/kg/
- (2006). *The internet and elections: the 2006 presidential elections in Belarus*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from www.opennetinitiative.net/studies/belarus/ONI\_Belarus\_Country\_Study.pdf
- OpenStreetMap (2007). *FAQ – openstreetmap*. Retrieved August 15, 2007, from http://wiki.openstreetmap.org/index.php/FAQ
- O'Reilly, T. (2005). *What is Web 2.0? Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software*. Retrieved November 12, 2007, from www.oreilly.com/lpt/a/6228
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2006). *OECD broadband statistics to December 2006*. Paris: OECD.
- Ortony, A. (1993). *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd edn. Cambridge and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2003). The politics of migrants' transnational political practices. *International Migration Review*, 37(3), 760–86.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: the evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ott, D. (1998). Power to the people: the role of electronic media in promoting democracy in Africa. *First Monday*, 3(4).
- Overholser, G. & Jamieson, K. H. (eds.) (2005). *Institutions of American Democracy: the press*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oye, K. A. (1986). Explaining cooperation under anarchy: hypotheses and strategies. In: K. A. Oye (ed.), *Cooperation Under Anarchy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Paasonen, S. (2006). Email from nancy nut-sucker: representation and gendered address in online pornography. *European Journal of Cultural studies*, 9(4), 403–20.
- Paasonen, S., Nikunen, K. & Saarenmaa, L. (eds.) (2007). *Pornification: sex and sexuality in media culture*. London, UK: Berg.
- Padovani, C. & Tuzzi, A. (2005). Communication governance and the role of civil society: words and networks in the World Summit on the Information Society. Reflections on participation and the changing scope of political action. In: J. Servaes & N. Carpentier (eds.), *Towards a Sustainable Information Society: deconstructing WSIS*. Bristol: Intellect.
- Page, B. I. (1996). *Who Deliberates? Mass media in modern democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Palser, B. (2004). The online frontier. *American Journalism Review*, 78.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2002). The virtual sphere: the net as a public sphere. *New Media and Society*, 4(1), 5–23.
- (2007). The blogger revolution? Audiences as media producers. In: M. Tremayne (ed.) *Blogging, Citizenship, and the Future of Media*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Parasuraman, A. & Zinkhan, G. M. (2002). Marketing to and serving customers through the internet: an overview and research agenda. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 30(4), 286–95.
- Pare, D. (2003). *Internet Governance in Transition: who is the master of this domain?* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Park, H. W. (2002). The digital divide in South Korea: closing and widening divides in the 1990s. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 12(1–2).

- Park, H. W., Barnett, G. A. & Kim, C.-S. (2000). Political communication structure in internet networks: a Korean case. *Sungkok Journalism Review*, 11, 67–89.
- Paterson, C. (2006). *News agency dominance in international news on the internet*. Leeds: Centre for International Communications Research, University of Leeds.
- Patterson, T. (1993). *Out of Order*. New York: Knopf.
- Patterson, T. E. (1980). *The Mass Media Election: how Americans choose their president*. New York: Praeger.
- Patterson, T. E. & Seib, P. (2005). Informing the public. In: G. Overholser & K. H. Jamieson (eds.) *The Press*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pavlik, J. V. (1994). Citizen access, involvement, and freedom of expression in an electronic environment. In: F. Williams & J. V. Pavlik (eds.), *The People's Right to Know: media, democracy, and the information highway*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- (2001). *Journalism and New Media*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- (2004). A sea-change in journalism: convergence, journalists, their audiences and sources. *Convergence*, 10(4), 21–9.
- Pederson, K. & Saglie, J. (2005). New technology in ageing parties. *Party Politics*, 11(3), 359–77.
- Peng, F. Y., Tham, N. I. & Xiaoming, H. (1999). Trends in online newspapers: a look at the U.S. web. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 20(2), 52–63.
- Penn, I. (2007, July 28, 2007). Invasive IDS? *St. Petersburg Times*.
- Pentland, B. & Feldman, M. (2007). Narrative networks: patterns of technology and organization. *Organization Science*, 18(5), 781–95.
- Perelman, M. (2002). *Steal this Idea: intellectual property rights and the corporate confiscation of creativity*. New York: Palgrave.
- Peretti, J. (2001). *Email correspondence with customer service representatives at Nike*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from <http://shey.net/niked.html>
- (2003). *Culture jamming, memes, social networks, and the emerging media ecology: the Nike sweatshop e-mail as an object to think with*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://depts.washington.edu/ccce/polcommcampaigns/peretti.html>
- Perloff, R. M. (2003). *The Dynamics of Persuasion: communication and attitudes in the 21st century*, 2nd edn. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pew Internet and American Life Project (2004). *2004 post-election tracking survey*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- (2005). *Buzz, blogs, and beyond*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- (2006). *Daily tracking survey—November 2006*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- (2007). *Internet activities*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Pew Research Center for the People and the Press (2003). *Bottom line pressures now hurting coverage say journalists*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.
- (2004). *News audiences increasingly politicized*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.
- (2007). *How young people view their lives, futures, and politics: a portrait of generation next*. Washington DC: Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.
- Pharr, S. J. & Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Disaffected Democracies: what's troubling the trilateral countries?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Phillips, D. J. (2005). Texas 9-1-1: emergency telecommunications, deregulation, and the genesis of surveillance infrastructure. *Telecommunication Policy*, 29(11), 843–56.
- Phillips, H. (2007). *Strengthening democracy: fair and sustainable funding of political parties: the review of the funding of political parties*. London: HMSO.
- Pianta, M. (2003). Democracy vs globalization: the growth of parallel summits and global movements. In: D. Archibugi (ed.), *Debating Cosmopolitanism*. London: Verso.
- Pianta, M. & Silva, F. (2003). Parallel summits of global civil society: an update. In: M. Kaldor, H. Anheier & M. Glasius (eds.), *Global Civil Society Yearbook 2003*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pickard, V. W. (2006). United yet autonomous: indymedia and the struggle to sustain a radical democratic network. *Media, Culture and Society*, 28(3), 315–36.
- Pickerill, J. (2000). Environmentalists and the net: Pressure groups, new social movements and new ICTs. In: R. K. Gibson & S. J. Ward

- (eds.), *Reinvigorating Democracy? British politics and the internet*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- (2001). Weaving a green web: environmental protest and computer mediated communication in Britain. In: F. Webster (ed.), *Culture and Politics in the Information Age: a new politics?* London: Routledge.
- (2003). *Cyberprotest: environmental activism online*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- (2006). Radical politics on the net. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 59(2), 266–82.
- Piott, S. L. (2003). *Giving Voters a Voice: the origins of the initiative and referendum in America*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Pitkin, H. F. (1967). *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Plant, S. (1995). The future looms: weaving women and cybernetics. *Body and Society*, 1 (1), 45–64.
- (1996). On the matrix: cyberfeminist simulations. In: R. Shields (ed.), *Cultures of internet: virtual spaces, real histories, living bodies*. London: Sage.
- (1997). *Zeros and Ones. Digital women and the new technoculture*. London: Fourth Estate.
- Pleyers, G. (2004). The social forums as an ideal model of convergence. *International Social Science Journal*, 56(182), 507–17.
- Podlas, K. (2000). Mistresses of their domain: how female entrepreneurs in cyberporn are initiating a gender power shift. *Cyber Psychology and Behavior*, 3 (5), 847–54.
- Poindexter, P. M., Heider, D. & McCombs, M. E. (2006). Watchdog or good neighbor? The public's expectations of local news. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 11(1), 77–88.
- Polat, R. K. (2005). The internet and political participation: exploring the explanatory links. *European Journal of Communication*, 20(4), 435–59.
- Polletta, F. (1998). "It was like a fever ..." Narrative and identity in social protest. *Social Problems*, 45(2), 137–59.
- (2006). *It Was Like a Fever: storytelling in protest and politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pollitt, C. (2003). Joined-up government: a survey. *Political Studies Review*, 1(1), 34–49.
- Pollitt, C. & Boukhaert, G. (2004). *Public Management Reform: a comparative analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Popkin, S. L. (1994). *The Reasoning Voter: communication and persuasion in presidential campaigns*, 2nd edn. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- Porter, D. (1997). Introduction. In: D. Porter (ed.), *Internet Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Portes, A. & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and immigration: notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(6), 1320–50.
- Portes, A. & Zhou, M. (1992). Gaining the upper hand: economic mobility among immigrant and domestic minorities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15(4), 491.
- Post, D. & Johnson, D. R. (2006). The great debate: law in the virtual world. *First Monday*, 11(2).
- Postelnicu, M., Martin, J. & Landreville, K. (2006). The role of candidate web sites in promoting candidates and attracting campaign resources. In: A. P. Williams & J. C. Tedesco (eds.), *The Internet Election: perspectives on the web campaign in 2004*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Poster, M. (1995). The internet as a public sphere? *Wired*, January.
- (2001). *What's the Matter with the Internet?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Potter, W. J. & Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1999). Rethinking validity and reliability in content analysis. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27(3), 258–84.
- Powell, W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: network forms of organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, (12), 295–336.
- PQMedia (2006). *Media companies to come out winners as 2006 political media spending heads for the record books*. Retrieved November 2, from [www.pqmedia.com/about-press-20061109-pmb2006.html](http://www.pqmedia.com/about-press-20061109-pmb2006.html)
- Preece, J. (2000). *On-line Communities: designing usability and supporting sociability*. New York: Wiley.
- Price, V. & Cappella, J. N. (2002). Online deliberation and its influence: the electronic dialogue project in campaign 2000. *IT and Society*, 1(1), 303–29.
- Price, V., Cappella, J. N. & Nir, L. (2002). Does more disagreement contribute to more deliberative opinion? *Political Communication*, 19(1), 95–112.
- Prior, M. (2003). Any good news in soft news? The impact of soft news preference on political knowledge. *Political Communication*, 20, 149–71.

- (2005). News vs. entertainment: how increasing media choice widens gaps in political knowledge and turnout. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(3), 577–92.
- Project for Excellence in Journalism (2004). *The state of the news media: an annual report on American journalism 2003*. Washington, DC: Project for Excellence in Journalism.
- (2006). *The state of the news media: an annual report on American journalism 2005*. Washington, DC: Project for Excellence in Journalism.
- (2007). *The state of the news media: an annual report on American journalism 2006*. Washington, DC: Project for Excellence in Journalism.
- Putnam, R. (1994). *Making Democracy Work: civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (1996). The strange disappearance of civic America. *American Prospect*, 24, 34–48.
- (2000). *Bowling Alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Putnam, R. D., Feldstein, L. & Cohen, D. (2003). *Better Together: restoring the American community*. London: Simon and Schuster.
- Putnam Commission on the Communication of Parliamentary Democracy (2006). *Members Only? Parliament in the Public Eye*. London: Hansard Society.
- Pye, L. W. (1985). *Asian Power and Politics: the cultural dimensions of authority*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Qvortrup, M. (2002). *A Comparative Study of Referendums: government by the people*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Radin, M. J. (2006). A comment on information property and its legal milieu. *Cleveland State Law Review*, 54, 23–39.
- Rainie, L., Cornfield, M. & Horrigan, J. (2005). *The internet and campaign 2004: the internet was a key force in politics last year as 75 million Americans used it to get news, discuss candidates in emails, and participate directly in the political process*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Rainie, L. & Horrigan, J. (2007). *Election 2006 online – January 2007*. Washington DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Rainie, L. & Kohut, A. (2000). *Tracking online life: how women use the internet to cultivate relationships with family and friends*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Rappoport, P. N. & Alleman, J. (2003). The internet and the demand for news: Macro- and microevidence. In: A. M. Knott (ed.), *Crisis in Communications: lessons from September 11*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Rash, W. (1997). *Politics on the Nets: wiring the political process*. New York: W. H. Freeman & Co.
- Rathmann, T. A. (2002). Supplement or substitution? The relationship between reading a local print newspaper and the use of its online version. *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research*, 27(4), 485–98.
- Rattray, G. J. (2001). *Strategic Warfare in Cyberspace*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ray, A. (2007). *Naked on the internet: hookups, downloads and cashing in on internet sexploration*. Emeryville: Seal Press.
- Reese, S. D., Rutigliano, L., Hyun, K. & Jeong, J. (2007). Mapping the blogosphere: professional and citizen-based media in the global news arena. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 8(3), 235–62.
- Reid, E. M. (1993). Electronic chat: social issues in internet relay chat. *Media Information Australia*, 67, 62–70.
- Rennie, D. (2005, January 28). Britons “Ignorant and hostile” Over EU constitution. *Daily Telegraph*.
- Reporters Without Borders (2006). *List of 13 internet enemies in 2006*. Retrieved July 11, 2006, from [www.rsf.org/print.php3?id\\_article=19603](http://www.rsf.org/print.php3?id_article=19603)
- (2007a). *Annual report 2007*. Paris: Reporters Without Borders.
- (2007b). *Blogger arrested and held for reporting on torture of detainees*. Retrieved April 17, 2007, from <http://allafrica.com/stories/printable/200704180322.html>
- (2007c). *The Dailymotion video-sharing website is accessible again*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.rsf.org/article.php3?id\\_article=21528](http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=21528)
- Resnick, D. (1998). The normalization of cyberspace. In: C. Toulouse & T. W. Luke (eds.), *The Politics of Cyberspace: a new political science reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Resnick, P. (2001). Beyond bowling together: sociotechnical capital. In: J. Carroll (ed.), *HCI in the New Millennium*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Resnick, P. & Shah, V. (2002). *Photo Directories: a tool for organizing sociability in neighborhoods*



- and organizations: working paper. Ann Arbor, MI: School of Information, University of Michigan.
- Rhee, J. W. & Cappella, J. N. (1997). The role of political sophistication in learning from news: measuring schema development. *Communication Research*, 24(3), 197–233.
- Rheingold, H. (1991). *Virtual Reality*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- (1993). *The Virtual Community: homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- (1995). *The Virtual Community: finding connection in a computerized world*. London: Minerva.
- (2002). *Smart Mobs: the next social revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Basic Books.
- Rhine, R. J. (1967). The 1964 presidential election and curves of information seeking and avoiding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5(4), 416–23.
- Richard, M. (2004). Modeling the impact of internet atmospherics on surfing behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(2), 1632–42.
- Richardson, J. E. & Franklin, B. (2004). Letters of intent: election campaigning and orchestrated public debate in local newspapers' letters to the editor. *Political Communication*, 21(4), 459–78.
- Rittberger, V. (ed.). (1993). *Regime Theory and International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rivera, R. (2007, March 1). Council acts to make clubs safer. *New York Times*.
- Rochidi, N. (2004). Interview by Deborah L. Wheeler. World Trade Center Building, ICT Dar Project Office Cairo, Egypt.
- Rockwell, S. & Singleton, L. (2002). The effects of computer anxiety and communication apprehension on the adoption and utilization of the internet. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 12(1).
- Rodan, G. (1998). The internet and political control in Singapore. *Political Science Quarterly*, 113(1), 63–89.
- Rodgers, J. (2003). *Spatializing International Politics: analysing activism on the internet*. London: Routledge.
- Rodgers, S. & Harris, M. A. (2003). Gender and e-commerce: an exploratory study. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 43(3), 322–9.
- Roe Smith, M. (1994). Technological determinism in American culture. In: M. Roe Smith & L. Marx (eds.), *Does Technology Drive History: the dilemma of technological determinism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovations*, 4th edn. New York: Free Press.
- (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations*, 5th edn. New York: Free Press.
- Rogers, R. (2002). Operating issue networks on the web. *Science as Culture*, 11(2), 191–214.
- (2004). *Information Politics on the Web*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rommens, E. (2002). *Gender Scripts and the internet: the design of Amsterdam's digital city*. Enschede: Twente University Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. & Czempiel, E. O. (eds.). (1992). *Governance without Government: order and change in world politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenthal, L. E. (2007). *Information technology in the UAE*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.american.edu/carmel/lr2962a/geographics.html](http://www.american.edu/carmel/lr2962a/geographics.html)
- Ruggie, J. (1993). *Multilateralism Matters: the theory and praxis of an international form*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rugh, W. (2004). *Arab Mass Media: newspapers, radio, and television in Arab politics*. Westport: Praeger Publishers.
- Rutenberg, J. (2004, May 25). Campaign ads are under fire for inaccuracy. *New York Times*, p. 1.
- Sabato, L. J. (1991). *Feeding Frenzy: how attack journalism has transformed American politics*. New York: Free Press.
- Sakkas, L. (1993). Politics on the internet. *Interpersonal Computing and Technology: An Electronic Journal for the 21st Century*, 1(2).
- Salaverria, R. (2005). An immature medium: strengths and weaknesses of online newspapers on September 11. *Gazette*, 67, 69–86.
- Salter, L. (2005). Colonization tendencies in the development of the world wide web. *New Media and Society*, 7(3), 291–309.
- Sanchez-Franco, M. J. & Roldan, J. L. (2005). Web acceptance and usage model: a comparison between goal-directed and experiential users. *Internet Research*, 15(1), 21–49.
- Sassi, S. (2000). The controversies of the internet and the revitalizations of political life. In: K. L. Hacker & J. van Dijk (eds.), *Digital Democracy: issues of theory and practice*. London: Sage.
- (2005). Cultural differentiation or social segregation? Four approaches to the digital divide. *New Media and Society*, 7(5), 684–700.
- Savicki, V., Kelley, M. & Lingenfelter, D. (1996). Gender language style and group

- composition in internet discussion groups. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 2(3).
- Savin, R. (2006). Conspectus: major court decisions, 2005–6: in re application of the United States for an order (1) authorizing the use of a pen register and a trap and trace device and (2) authorizing release of subscriber information and/or cell site information, 396 f. Supp. 2d 294 (e.D.N.Y. 2005). *CommLaw Conspectus*, 14, 586.
- Scammell, M. (2000). The internet and civic engagement: the age of the citizen–consumer. *Political Communication*, 17(4), 351–55.
- Schaap, F. (2002). *The Words That Took Us There: ethnography in a virtual reality*. Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Schauer, T. (2005). Women’s porno: the heterosexual female gaze in porn sites “for women”. *Sexuality and Culture*, 9(2), 42–64.
- Schement, J. & Curtis, T. (1997). *Tendencies and Tensions of the Information Age: the production and distribution of information in the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Schement, J. R. & Scott, S. C. (2000). Identifying temporary and permanent gaps in universal service. *The Information Society*, 16(2), 117–26.
- Scheufele, D. A. (2003). *Media use survey*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Survey Research Institute.
- Scheufele, D. A. & Nisbet, M. C. (2002). Being a citizen online: new opportunities and dead ends. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 7(3), 55–75.
- Scheufele, D. A., Nisbet, M. C. & Brossard, D. (2003). Pathways to participation? Religion, communication contexts, and mass media. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 15(3), 300–24.
- Scheufele, D. A., Nisbet, M. C., Brossard, D. & Nisbet, E. C. (2004). Social structure and citizenship: examining the impact of social setting, network heterogeneity, and informational variables on political participation. *Political Communication*, 21(3), 315–38.
- Schiffauer, W. (1999). *Islamism in the diaspora: the fascination of political Islam among second generation German Turks. Working paper*. Transnational Communities Program, University of Oxford.
- Schiller, D. (1999). *Digital Capitalism: networking the global marketing system*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (2006). *How To Think About Information*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Schmitt, M. (2007). *Mismatching funds*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from www.democracy-journal.org/printfriendly.php?ID=6516
- Schmitz, J. (1997). Structural relations, electronic media, and social change: the public electronic network and the homeless. In: S. G. Jones (ed.), *Virtual Culture: identity and communication in cybersociety*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schoenbach, K., de Waal, E. & Lauf, E. (2005). Research note: online and print newspapers. *European Journal of Communication*, 20(2), 245–58
- Schönleitner, G. (2003). World social forum: making another world possible? In: J. Clark (ed.), *Globalizing Civic Engagement: civil society and transnational action*. London: Earthscan.
- Schudson, M. (1997). Why conversation is not the soul of democracy. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 14(4), 1–13.
- (1998). *The Good Citizen: a history of American civic life*. New York: Free Press.
- Schuler, D. & Day, P. (2004). *Shaping the Network Society: the new role of civil society in cyberspace*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1976). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, 5th edn. (new introduction by Tom Bottomore ed.). London: Allen and Unwin.
- Schwab, K. (2007). *Arab world competitiveness report press release*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from www.weforum.org/en/media/Latest%20Press%20Releases/AWCReportPR
- Schwartz, A., Flint, L., Mulligan, L. D., Suh, G., Mondal, I. & Dempsey, J. X. (2006). *Digital Search And Seizure: updating privacy protections to keep pace with technology*. Washington, DC: Center for Democracy and Technology.
- Science of Collaboratories (2007). *Science of collaboratories website*. Retrieved November 23, 2007, from www.scienceofcollaboratories.org
- Sciolino, E. (2005, May 31). The French decision. *New York Times*.
- Scott, A. & Street, J. (2001). From media politics to e-protest? The use of popular culture and new media in parties and social movements. In: F. Webster (ed.), *Culture and Politics in the Information Age: a new politics?* London: Routledge.
- Scott, B. (2005). A contemporary history of digital journalism. *Television and New Media*, 6 (1), 89–126.
- Scott, J. (2000). *Social Network Analysis: a handbook* (2nd edn.). London: Sage.

- Scott, W. R. (1987). The adolescence of institutional theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32(4), 493–511.
- (1995). *Institutions and Organizations: theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, W. R. & Christensen, S. (1995). *The Institutional Construction of Organizations: international and longitudinal studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, W. R. & Meyer, J. W. (eds.). (1994). *Institutional Environments and Organizations: structural complexity and individualism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- SCP (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau) (2001). *Trends in de tijd [Trends in time]*. The Hague: SCP.
- Sears, D. & Chafee, S. (1979). Uses and effects of the 1976 debates: an overview of empirical studies. In: S. Kraus (ed.) *The Great Debates*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Sears, D. O. & Freedman, J. L. (1967). Selective exposure to information: a critical review. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 31(2), 194–213.
- Sefyryn, J. (2005). *Understandings of gender and competence in ICT*. Paper presented at the 6th International Women into Computing Conference, University of Greenwich.
- Seifert, J. W. & McLoughlin, G. J. (2007). *State E-Government Strategies: identifying best practices and applications*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.
- Sell, S. (2003). *Private Power, Public Law: the globalization of intellectual property rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Semetko, H. A. & Krasnoboka, N. (2003). The political role of the internet in societies in transition. *Party Politics*, 9(1), 77–104.
- Servaes, J. & Carpentier, N. (eds.). (2005). *Towards a Sustainable Information Society: deconstructing WSIS*. Bristol: Intellect.
- Setälä, M. & Gronlund, K. (2006). Parliamentary websites: theoretical and comparative perspectives. *Information Polity*, 11(2), 149–62.
- Sey, A. & Castells, M. (2004). From media politics to networked politics: The internet and the political process. In: M. Castells (ed.), *The Network Society: a cross-cultural perspective*. London: Edward Elgar.
- Shade, L. R. (2002). *Gender and Community in the Social Construction of the Internet*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Shah, D., Kwak, N. & Holbert, R. (2001). “Connecting” and “disconnecting” with civic life: patterns of internet use and the production of social capital. *Political Communication*, 18(2), 141–62.
- Shah, D. V., Cho, J., Eveland Jr., W. P. & Kwak, N. (2005). Information and expression in a digital age: modeling internet effects on civic participation. *Communication Research*, 32(5), 531–65.
- Shah, D. V., McLeod, J. M. & Yoon, S. H. (2001). Communication, context, and community: an exploration of print, broadcast and internet influences. *Communication Research*, 28(4), 464–506.
- Shahin, J. & Neuhold, C. (2007). Connecting Europe: the use of “new” information and communication technologies within European Parliament standing committees. *Journal of Legislative Studies*, 13(3), 388–402.
- Shannon, V. (2007, February 20). Europe’s plan to track phone and net use. *New York Times*.
- Shapiro, C. & Varian, H. R. (1999). *Information Rules: a strategic guide to the network economy*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Shifman, L., Coleman, S. & Ward, S. J. (2007). Only joking? Online humour in the 2005 UK general election. *Information Communication and Society*, 10(4), 464–86.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Reese, S. D. (1996). *Mediating the Message: theories of influences on mass media content*. New York: Longman.
- Siapera, E. (2005). Minority activism on the web: Between deliberation and multiculturalism. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(3), 499–519.
- Siddiquee, A. & Kagan, C. (2006). The internet, empowerment, and identity: an exploration of participation by refugee women in a community internet project in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 16(3), 189–206.
- Sikkink, K. (2002). Restructuring world politics: the limits and asymmetries of soft power. In: S. Khagram, J. V. Riker & K. Sikkink (eds.), *Restructuring World Politics: transnational social movements, networks, and norms*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Silvester, C. (ed.). (1993). *The Penguin Book of Interviews*. London: Viking.

- Simon, H. A. (1962). The architecture of complexity. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 106 (December), 467–82.
- Simone, M. (2006). Codepink alert: mediated citizenship in the public sphere. *Social Semiotics*, 16(2), 345–64.
- Simonelis, A. (2005). A concise guide to the major internet bodies. *Ubiquity*, 6(5), 16–22.
- Singer, J. B. (2001). The metro wide web: changes in newspapers' gatekeeping role online. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(1), 65–80.
- (2003). Campaign contributions: online newspaper coverage of election 2000. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 80(1), 39–56.
- (2005). The political j-blogger: “normalizing” a new media form to fit old norms and practices. *Journalism*, 6(2), 173–98.
- (2006). Stepping back from the gate: online newspaper editors and the co-production of content in campaign 2004. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83(3), 265–80.
- Singer, J. B. & Gonzalez-Velez, M. (2003). Envisioning the caucus community: online newspaper editors conceptualize their political role. *Political Communication*, 20(4), 433–52.
- Skowronek, S. (1982). *Building a New American State: the expansion of national administrative capacities*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Slackman, M. (2007a, March 28). Charges of vote rigging as Egypt approves constitution changes. *New York Times*.
- (2007b, March 25). Egypt to vote on expanding powers of the presidency. *New York Times*.
- (2007c, March 27). Foregone conclusion appears to keep Egyptian voters home. *New York Times*.
- Smith, C. (2007). *One for the Girls! The pleasures and practices of reading women's porn*. Bristol: Intellect.
- Smith, M. A. (2002). Ballot initiatives and the democratic citizen. *Journal of Politics*, 64(3), 892–903.
- Snow, D. & Benford, R. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. In: B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi & S. Tarrow (eds.), *From Structure to Action: comparing social movements research across cultures*. Greenwich: JAI Press Inc.
- Snow, D., Rochford, E. B., Warden, S. & Benford, R. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, 51(4), 464–81.
- Songer, D. & Sheehan, R. (1993). Interest group success in the courts: amicus participation in the Supreme Court. *Political Research Quarterly*, 46(2), 339–54.
- Sorauf, F. J. (1992). *Inside Campaign Finance: myths and realities*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- South Korea Ministry of Information (2006). *Korea Internet White Paper 2006*. Seoul: South Korea Ministry of Information.
- Spar, D. L. (2001). *Ruling the Waves: cycles of discovery, chaos, and wealth from the compass to the internet*. New York: Harcourt.
- Sparks, C. (2000). From dead trees to live wires: the internet's challenge to the traditional newspaper. In: J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (eds.), *Mass Media and Society*, 3rd edn. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Spriggs, J. F. & Wahlbeck, P. (1997). Amicus curiae and the role of information at the supreme court. *Political Research Quarterly*, 50 (2), 365–86.
- Stanley, L. (2001). *Beyond Access*. San Diego, CA: UCSD Civic Collaborative.
- Stanyer, J. (2004). Politics and the media: a crisis of trust? *Parliamentary Affairs*, 57(2), 420–34.
- (2007). *Modern Political Communication: mediated politics in uncertain times*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Staples, B. (2003, November 10). Editorial observer: viewing California politics through the lens of a science fiction movie. *New York Times*.
- Starr, P. (1982). *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*. New York: Basic Books.
- (2004). *The Creation of the Media*. New York: Free Press.
- Stern, C. (2006, January 22). The coming tug of war over the internet. *Washington Post*.
- Stewart, A. (2007). *Theories of Power and Domination*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Steyaert, J. (2000). *Digitale Vaardigheden: getletterdheid in de informatiesamenleving (Digital Skills: literacy in the information society)*. The Hague, Netherlands: Rathenau Instituut.
- Stinchcombe, A. L. (1990). *Information and Organizations*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Stohl, C. (2005). Globalization theory. In: S. May & D. K. Mumby (eds.), *Engaging Organizational Communication Theory and Research: multiple perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Strangelove, M. (2005). *The Empire of Mind: digital piracy and the anti-capitalist movement*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Street, J. (1992). *Politics and Technology*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Stromer-Galley, J. (2000). Online interaction and why candidates avoid it. *Journal of Communication*, 50(4), 111–32.
- (2002). New voices in the public sphere: a comparative analysis of interpersonal and online political talk. *Javnost – The Public*, 9(2), 23–42.
- Stromer-Galley, J. & Baker, A. B. (2006). Joy and sorrow of interactivity on the campaign trail: blogs in the primary campaign of Howard Dean. In: A. P. Williams & J. C. Tedesco (eds.), *The Internet Election: perspectives on the web in campaign 2004*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Sum, N.-L. (2003). Informational capitalism and US economic hegemony: resistance and adaptations in East Asia. *Critical Asian Studies*, 35(2), 373–98.
- Sundar, S. S. (1999). Exploring receivers' criteria for perception of print and online news. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76(2), 373–86.
- (2000). Multimedia effects on processing and perception of online news: a study of picture, audio, and video downloads. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77(3), 480–99.
- Sundar, S. S., Kalyanaraman, S. & Brown, J. (2003). Explicating web site interactivity: impression formation effects in political campaign sites. *Communication Research*, 30(1), 30–59.
- Sundar, S. S. & Nass, C. (2001). Conceptualizing sources in online news. *Journal of Communication*, 51(1), 52–72.
- Sunstein, C. (1993). On analogical reasoning. *Harvard Law Review*, 106(3), 741–91.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2001). *Republic.Com*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Swanson, D. (2000). The homologous evolution of political communication and civic engagement: good news, bad news, and no news. *Political Communication*, 17(4), 409–14.
- Swartz, N. (2003). Estonia embraces cyberspace. *Information Management Journal*, (July–August).
- Swedberg, C. (2007, March 23). New RFID system takes security to heart. *RFID Journal*.
- Tanner, E. (2001). Chilean conversations: internet forum participants debate Pinochet's detention. *Journal of Communication*, 51(2), 383–403.
- Tarde, G. (1989). *L'opinion et la foule*. Paris: PUF.
- Tarrow, S. (1998). Fishnets, internets and catnets: globalization and transnational collective action. In: M. Hanagan, L. P. Moch & W. P. Brake (eds.), *Challenging Authority*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tarrow, S. G. (1998). *Power in Movement: social movements and contentious politics*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, P. (1984, August 13). Mondale says President's joke wasn't funny; Reagan's ad-lib on bombing gives foes ammunition. *Washington Post*.
- Tekwani, S. (2003). The Tamil diaspora, Tamil militancy, and the internet. In: K. C. Ho, R. Kluver & K. C. C. Yang (eds.), *Asia.Com: Asia encounters the internet*. New York: Routledge.
- TeleNav Inc. (2007). *TeleNav Track Features*.
- Tewksbury, D. (2003). What do Americans really want to know? Tracking the behavior of news readers on the internet. *Journal of Communication*, 53(4), 694–710.
- (2005a). *Online news reader specialization and its boundaries: implications for the fragmentation of American news audiences*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, New York.
- (2005b). The seeds of audience fragmentation: specialization in the use of online news sites. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 49(3), 332–40.
- (2006). Exposure to the newer media in a presidential primary campaign. *Political Communication*, 23(3), 313–32.
- Tewksbury, D. & Althaus, S. L. (2000a). An examination of motivations for using the world wide web. *Communication Research Reports*, 17(2), 127–38.
- (2000b). Differences in knowledge acquisition among readers of the paper and online versions of a national newspaper. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77(3), 457–79.
- Tewksbury, D. & Maddex, B. (2001). *Choosing what's right for you: a study of content personalization on the world wide web*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the US National Communication Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Tewksbury, D., Weaver, A. & Maddex, B. (2001). Accidentally informed: incidental news

- exposure on the world wide web. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(3), 533–54.
- Thalheimer, M. (1994). High tech news or just “Shovelware”? *Media Studies Journal*, 8(1), 41–51.
- Thierer, A. D. (2000). *How Free Computers are Filling the Digital Divide*. Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation.
- Thomas, J. C. & Streib, G. (2003). The new face of government: citizen-initiated contacts in the era of e-government. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(1), 83–102.
- Thompson, J. B. (2005). The new visibility. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 22(6), 31–51.
- Thompson, K. (2002). Border crossings and diasporic identities: media use and leisure practices of an ethnic minority. *Qualitative Sociology*, 25(3), 409–18.
- Thurman, N. (2007). The globalisation of journalism online: a transatlantic study of news websites and their international readers. *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism*, 8(3), 285–307.
- Tiefenbrun, S. W. (1986). Legal semiotics. *Cardozo Arts and Entertainment Law Journal*, 5, 89–156.
- Tiller, E. H. & Cross, F. (2005). *What is legal doctrine?* Chicago: Northwestern University School of Law Public Law and Legal Theory Research Paper Series.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Tkach-Kawasaki, L. M. (2003). Politics@Japan: party competition on the internet in Japan. *Party Politics*, 9(1), 105–23.
- Toennies, F. (1980). Gemeinschaft and gesellschaft [community and society]. In: L. Coser (ed.), *The Pleasures of Sociology*. New York: Mentor Books.
- Toft, A., Leuven, N. V., Bennett, W. L., Tomhave, J., Veden, M. L., Wells, C. et al. (2007). *Which way for the northwest social forum?* Seattle, WA: Centre for Communication and Civic Engagement.
- Tolbert, C. & McNeal, R. (2003). Unraveling the effects of the internet on political participation. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(2), 175–85.
- Tolbert, C. & Mossberger, K. (2006). The effects of e-government on trust and confidence in government. *Public Administration Review*, 66(3), 354–69.
- Townsend, A. M. & Bennett, J. T. (2003). Privacy, technology, and conflict: emerging issues and action in workplace privacy. *Journal of Labor Research*, 24(2), 195–205.
- Trammell, K. D. (2006). The blogging of the President. In: A. P. Williams & J. C. Tedesco (eds.), *The Internet Election: perspectives on the web in campaign 2004*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Trechsel, A. H. & Kriesi, H. (1996). Switzerland: the referendum and initiative as a centerpiece of the political system. In: M. Gallagher & P. V. Uleri (eds.), *The Referendum Experience in Europe*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Tremayne, M. (2004). The web of context: applying network theory to the use of hyperlinks in journalism on the web. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(2), 237–49.
- Tremayne, M. (ed.). (2006). *Blogging, Citizenship and the Future of Media*. New York: Routledge.
- Tremayne, M. & Dunwoody, S. (2001). Interactivity, information processing, and learning on the world wide web. *Science Communication*, 23(2), 111–34.
- Tremayne, M., Zheng, N., Lee, J. K. & Jeong, J. (2006). Issue publics on the web: applying network theory to the war blogosphere. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(1).
- Trend, D. (ed.). (2001). *Reading Digital Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Trippi, J. (2004). *The Revolution Will Not Be Televised: democracy, the internet, and the overthrow of everything*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making News: a study in the construction of reality*. New York: Free Press.
- Tucker, J. (2000). The information revolution. *Middle East Journal*, 54(3), 351–465.
- Turkle, S. (1995). *Life on the Screen: identity in the age of the internet*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Twist, J. (2006). *The year of the digital citizen*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/technology/4566712.stm>
- UAE Yearbook (2007). *IT and education*. Dubai: UAE National Media Council.
- U.K. Electoral Commission (2005). *Registers*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.electoralcommission.org.uk/regulatory-issues/registers.cfm](http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/regulatory-issues/registers.cfm)
- U.K. Prime Minister’s Strategy Unit and Department of Trade and Industry (2005). *Connecting the UK: the digital strategy*. London: Cabinet Office.
- United Nations (2004). *Human development report 2004*. Geneva: United Nations.

- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2003). *E-commerce and development report 2003*. New York: UNCTAD.
- United Nations Development Program (2004). *Arab human development report 2004: freedom and good governance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- United Nations General Assembly (2001). *56/183: World Summit on the Information Society*. New York: United Nations General Assembly.
- University of California, Los Angeles Center for Communication Policy (2001). *The UCLA internet report 2001: surveying the digital future, year two*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- (2003). *The UCLA internet report: surveying the digital future, year three*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- UNPAN and the Center for Administrative Innovation in the Euro-Mediterranean Region (2004). *Best practices in the European countries: The Netherlands*. New York: United Nations Online Network in Public Administration and Finance.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (2003). *E-stats: measuring the electronic economy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Census.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (2007). *The national animal identification system: pilot projects/field trials summary*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- U.S. Department of Defense (2003). *Information Operations Roadmap*. Washington, DC: Department of Defense.
- U.S. Executive Office of the President (2001). *The President's management agenda, 2002*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2002/mgmt.pdf
- Uslaner, E. M. (2000). Social capital and the net. *Communications of the ACM*, 43(12), 60–4.
- (2004). Trust, civic engagement, and the internet. *Political Communication*, 21(2), 223–42.
- Valentino, N. A., Hutchings, V. L. & Williams, D. (2004). The impact of political advertising on knowledge, internet information seeking, and candidate preference. *Journal of Communication*, 54(2), 337–54.
- Van Aelst, P. & Walgrave, S. (2002). New media, new movements? The role of the internet in shaping the “anti-globalization” movement. *Information, Communication and Society*, 5(4), 465–93.
- van de Donk, W., Loader, B., Nixon, P. & Rucht, D. (eds.). (2004). *Cyberprotest: new media, citizens and social movements*. London: Routledge.
- van de Donk, W., Tops, P. & Snellen, I. (eds.). (1995). *Orwell in Athens: A perspective on informatization and democracy*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- van der Wurff, R. (2005). The impacts of the internet on newspapers in Europe. *Gazette*, 67, 107–20.
- van Dijk, J. (1999). *The Network Society: social aspects of new media*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- (2000). Widening information gaps and policies of prevention. In: K. Hacker & J. v. Dijk (eds.), *Digital Democracy: issues of theory and practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- (2003). A framework for digital divide research. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 12(1).
- (2004). Divides in succession: possession, skills and use of the new media for participation. In: E. Bucy & J. Newhagen (eds.), *Media Access: social and psychological dimensions of new technology use*. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 233–54.
- (2006). *The Network Society: social aspects of new media*, 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- van Dijk, J., Hanenburg, M. & Pieterse, W. (2006). *Gebruik van nederlandse elektronische overheidsdiensten in 2006, een enquête naar motieven en gedrag van burgers [Usage of Dutch electronic government services in 2006, a survey of the motives and behavior of citizens]*. Enschede: University of Twente, Department of Behavioral Sciences.
- van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2005). *The Deepening Divide: inequality in the information society*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- (2007). De e-surfende burger: Is de digitale kloof gedicht? [The e-surfing citizen: has the digital divide closed?]. In: J. Steyaert & J. de Haan (eds.), *Gewoon digitaal, jaarboek ICT en samenleving*. Amsterdam: Boom.
- van Dijk, L., De Haan, J. & Rijken, S. (2000). *Digitalisering van de leefwereld [Digitization of everyday life: a survey of information and communication technology and social inequality]*. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- van Doorn, N., van Zoonen, L. & Wyatt, S. (2007a). Writing from experience: presentations of gender identity on weblogs. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 14(2), 143–59.

- (forthcoming). A body of text: gender and sexuality in text-based computer-mediated communication. *Feminist Media Studies*.
- van Slyke, C., Comunale, C. L. & Belanger, F. (2002). Gender differences in perceptions of web-based shopping. *Communications of the ACM*, 45(8), 82–86.
- Vanhanen, T. (2003). *Democratization: the comparative analysis of 170 countries*. New York: Routledge.
- Vargas, J. A. (2007a, February 17). Young voters find voice on facebook. *Washington Post*.
- (2007b, March 2). YouTube gets serious with links to candidates. *Washington Post*.
- Vedres, B., Bruszt, L. & Stark, D. (2004). Organizing technologies: genre forms of online civic association in eastern Europe. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 30, 1–18.
- Verba, S., Nie, N. H. & Kim, J.-O. (1987). *Participation and Political Equality: a seven-nation comparison*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Verba, S., Scholzman, K. L. & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and Equality: civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2001). Transnationalism and identity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4), 573–82.
- Villeneuve, N. (2006). The filtering matrix: integrated mechanisms of information control and the demarcation of borders in cyberspace. *First Monday*, 11(1).
- Virilio, P. (1997). *Open Sky*. London: Verso.
- von Hippel, E. (2005). *Democratizing Innovation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Vreese, C. H. d. (2007). *The Dynamics of Referendum Campaigns an International Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Wade, R. H. (2002). Bridging the digital divide: new route to development or new form of dependency. *Global Governance*, 8(4), 443–66.
- Wajcman, J. (2004). *Technofeminism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- (2007). From women and technology to gendered technoscience. *Information, Communication and Society*, 10(3), 287–98.
- Walgrave, S. & Rucht, D. (eds.). (2008). *Protest Politics: anti-war mobilization in western democracies*. Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Walker, J. L. (1991). *Mobilizing interest groups in America: patrons, professions and social movements*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wall, D. (1999). *Earth First! And the Anti-roads Movement: radical environmentalism and comparative social movements*. London: Routledge.
- Wall, M. (2005). Blogs of war: weblogs as news. *Journalism*, 6(2), 153–72.
- Wanta, W. (1997). *The Public and the National Agenda: how people learn about important issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ward, S. & Lusoli, W. (2005). From weird to wired: MPs, the internet and representative politics in the UK. *Journal of Legislative Studies*, 11(1), 57–81.
- Ward, S. J. (2005). The internet, e-democracy and the election: virtually irrelevant? In: A. Geddes & J. Tonge (eds.), *Britain Decides: the UK general election 2005*. London: Palgrave.
- Ward, S. J. & Francoli, M. (2007). Twenty-first century soapboxes? MPs and their blogs. Paper presented at the annual conference of the PSA, University of Bath. April 12–14, 2007.
- Ward, S. J. & Gibson, R. K. (2003). On-line and on message? Candidate websites in the 2001 general election. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 5(2), 188–205.
- Ward, S. J., Gibson, R. K. & Lusoli, W. (2003). Online participation and mobilization in the UK. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 56(4), 652–68.
- Ward, S. J., Owen, D., Davis, R. D. & Taras, D. (2007). Parties and election campaigning online: a new era? In: R. D. Davis, D. Owen, D. Taras & S. J. Ward (eds.), *Making a Difference? The internet and elections in comparative perspective*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Ward, S. J. & Vedel, T. (2006). Introduction: the potential of the internet revisited. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 59(2), 210–25.
- Ward, S. J. & Voerman, G. (2000). New media and new politics. Green parties, intra-party democracy and the potential of the internet (an anglo-Dutch comparison). In: *Jaarboek 1999 documentatiecentrum nederlandse politieke partijen*. Groningen: Universiteitsdrukkerij Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- Wardrip-Fruin, N. & Montfort, N. (2003). *The New Media Reader*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Ware, A. (1996). *Political Parties and Party Systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Warf, B. & Vincent, P. (2007). Multiple geographies of the Arab internet. *Area*, 39(1), 83–96.



- Warschauer, M. (2003). *Technology and Social Inclusion: rethinking the digital divide*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Washbourne, N. (2001). Information technology and new forms of organizing. In: F. Webster (ed.), *Culture and Politics in the Information Age: a new politics?* London: Routledge.
- Washington Poll (2006). *Public policy attitudes*. Seattle, Washington.
- Waskul, D. D. (ed.). (2004). *Net.Sexxx: readings on sex, pornography, and the internet*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Watts, D. (2003). *Six Degrees: the science of a connected world*. London: Heinemann.
- Watts, D. & Strogatz, S. (1998). Collective dynamics of a "small world" networks. *Nature*, 393, 440–2.
- Weare, C. & Lin, W. (2000). Content analysis of the World Wide Web: opportunities and challenges. *Social Science Computer Review*, 18, 272–329
- Webb, P. (2000). *The Modern British Party System*. London: Sage.
- Weber, S. (2004). *The Success of Open Source*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- WebSense Inc. (2007). *URL categories*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.websense.com/global/en/ProductsServices/MasterDataBase/URLCategories.php](http://www.websense.com/global/en/ProductsServices/MasterDataBase/URLCategories.php)
- Webster, F. (2002). *Theories of the Information Society*. London: Routledge.
- Webster, J. G. & Lin, S. F. (2002). The internet audience: web use as mass behavior. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 46(1), 1–12.
- Webster, J. G. & Phalen, P. F. (1997). *The Mass Audience: rediscovering the dominant model*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Weinberger, D. (2007). *Everything is Miscellaneous: the power of the new digital disorder*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Welch, E. W., Hinnant, C. & Moon, M. J. (2005). Linking citizen satisfaction with e-government with trust in government. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(1), 271–91.
- Wellman, B., Quan-Hasse, A., Boase, J., Chen, W., Hampton, K. N., de Diaz, I. I., et al. (2003). The social affordances of the internet for networked individualism. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 8(3).
- West, D. M. (2000). *Assessing e-Government: the internet, democracy, and service delivery by state and federal governments*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- (2003a). *State and federal e-government in the United States*. Providence, RI: Center for Public Policy, Brown University.
- (2003b). *Urban e-government, 2003*. Providence, RI: Center for Public Policy, Brown University.
- (2004). *Urban e-government, 2004*. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from [www.insidepolitics.org/egovt04city.html](http://www.insidepolitics.org/egovt04city.html)
- (2005). *Digital Government: technology and public sector performance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- (2006). *State and federal e-government in the United States, 2006*. Retrieved August 17, 2007, from [www.insidepolitics.org/egovt06us.pdf](http://www.insidepolitics.org/egovt06us.pdf)
- (2007). *State and federal e-government in the United States, 2007*. Retrieved August 20, 2007, from [www.insidepolitics.org/egovt07us.pdf](http://www.insidepolitics.org/egovt07us.pdf)
- Westerdal, J. (2007). *Dot xxx is voted down, dot xxx fires back*. Retrieved March 29, 2007, from <http://blog.domaintools.com/2007/03/dot-xxx-is-voted-down-dot-xxx-fires-back/>.
- Wheeler, D. (2001a). Beyond global culture: Islam, economic development and the challenges of cyberspace. *Digest of Middle Eastern Studies*, 10(1), 1–26.
- (2001b). New technologies, old culture: a look at women, gender and the internet in Kuwait. In: C. Ess & F. Sudweeks (eds.), *Culture, Technology, Communication: towards an intercultural global village*. New York: SUNY Press, 187–212.
- Wheeler, D. L. (2003a). Egypt: building an information society for international development. *Review of African Political Economy*, 30(98), 627–42.
- (2003b). Living at e-speed: a look at Egypt's e-readiness. In: I. Limam (ed.), *Challenges and Reforms of Economic Regulation in Mena Countries*. Cairo: University of Cairo Press.
- (2004). Blessings and curses: women and the Internet Revolution in the Arab world. In: N. Sakr (ed.) *Women and the Media in the Middle East*. London: IB Taurus, pp. 138–61
- (2006a). *Empowering Publics: information technology and democratization in the Arab world: lessons from internet cafes and beyond*. Oxford: Oxford Internet Institute.

- (2006b). *The Internet and the Middle East: global expectations and local imaginations in Kuwait*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Whitaker, C. (2004). The WSF as open space. In: J. Sen, A. Anand, A. Escobar & P. Waterman (eds.), *Challenging Empires*. New Delhi: Viveka Foundation.
- White, D. M. (1964). The gatekeeper: a case study in the selection of news. In: L. A. Dexter & D. M. White (eds.), *People, Society, and Mass Communications*. New York: Free Press.
- Whitehouse, A. (2006). Women, careers and information technology: an introduction. *Labour & Industry*, 16(3), 1–6.
- Wiklund, H. (2005). A Habermasian analysis of the deliberative democratic potential of ICT-enabled services in Swedish municipalities. *New Media & Society*, 7(5), 701–23.
- Wilding, F. (1998). *Where is the feminism in cyberfeminism?* Retrieved November 26, 2007, from [www.andrew.cmu.edu/user/fwild/faihwilding/wheremfem.pdf](http://www.andrew.cmu.edu/user/fwild/faihwilding/wheremfem.pdf)
- Wilhelm, A. G. (2000). *Democracy in the Digital Age: challenges to political life in cyberspace*. New York: Routledge.
- (2004). *Digital Nation: toward an inclusive information society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Williams, A. (2007, March 18). The future President, on your friends list. *New York Times*.
- Williams, A. P. & Tedesco, J. C. (eds.). (2006). *The Internet Election: perspectives on the web in campaign 2004*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Williams, F. (1994). On prospects for citizens' information services. In: F. Williams & J. V. Pavlik (eds.), *The People's Right to Know: media, democracy, and the information highway*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Williams, F. & Pavlik, J. V. (1994). Epilogue. In: F. Williams & J. V. Pavlik (eds.), *The People's Right to Know: media, democracy, and the information highway*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Williams, H. (2005). Driving the public policy debate: internet governance and development. In: W. J. Drake (ed.), *Reforming Internet Governance: perspectives from the working group on internet governance*. New York: United Nations ICT Task Force.
- Wilson, E. J. (2004). *The Information Revolution and Developing Countries*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Wilson, E. J. & Wong, K. R. (eds.). (2007). *Negotiating the Net in Africa*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Winneg, K., Kenski, K. & Jamison, K. (2005). Detecting the effects of deceptive presidential advertising in the spring of 2004. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49, 114–29.
- Winneg, K. & Stroud, T. (2005). *Using the Internet to Learn about the Presidential Candidates and Issue Positions in the 2004 Presidential Primary and General Election Campaigns*. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference.
- Winston, B. (1998). *Media Technology and Society: a history from the telegraph to the internet*. London: Routledge.
- Wise, C. R. (2002). Special report: organizing for homeland security. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 131–44.
- Witmer, D. F. & Katzman, S. L. (1997). On-line smiles: does gender make a difference in the use of graphic accents? *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 2(4).
- Witt, L. (2004). Is public journalism morphing into the public's journalism? *National Civic Review*, Fall, 49–57.
- Wojcieszak, M. & Mutz, D. (2007). *Online Groups and Political Deliberation: does the internet facilitate exposure to disagreement?* Paper presented at the Political Communication Division.
- Wolfinger, R. & Rosenstone, S. J. (1980). *Who Votes?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wolinsky, H. (2003, November 9). Chipping away at your privacy. *Chicago Sun-Times*.
- Working Group on Internet Governance (2005). *Report of the working group on internet governance*. Geneva: United Nations.
- World Summit on the Information Society (2002). *First meeting of the preparatory committee: World Summit on the Information Society* (No. WSIS03/PREP-(Rev.1)-E). Geneva: UNESCO/International Telecommunication Union.
- (2003a). *WSIS action plan* (No. WSIS-03/Geneva/doc/0005). New York: United Nations.
- (2003b). *WSIS declaration of principles* (No. WSIS-03/Geneva/doc/0004). New York: United Nations.
- (2005). *Tunis commitment* (No. WSIS-05/TUNIS/DOC/7-E). Paris: UNESCO and Geneva, ITU.
- World Summit on the Information Society Civil Society (2003). *Shaping information societies for human needs*. Paris: UNESCO and Geneva, ITU.

- (2005). *Much More Could Have Been Achieved*. Geneva: UNESCO/International Telecommunication Union.
- World Values Study Group (2000). *World values survey*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Wright, T., Boria, E. & Breidenbach, P. (2000). Creative player actions in FPS online video games: playing counter-strike. *The International Journal of Computer Game Research*, 2(2).
- Wring, D. & Horrocks, I. (2001). The transformation of political parties. In: B. Axford & R. Huggins (eds.), *New Media and Politics*. London: Sage.
- Wu, H. D. & Bechtel, A. (2002). Web site use and news topic and type. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(1), 73–86.
- Wu, T. (2006). The world trade law of censorship and internet filtering. *Chicago Journal of International Law*, 7(1), 263–87.
- Wulf, W. A. (1989). *The National Collaboratory: a white paper*. Paper presented at the Towards a National Collaboratory Workshop, Rockefeller University, New York, NY.
- Xenos, M. & Foot, K. A. (2005). Politics as usual, or politics unusual: position-taking and dialogue on campaign websites in the 2002 US elections. *Journal of Communication*, 55(1), 165–89.
- Yan, W. (2006). *Survey: more Brazilians gain access to internet*. Retrieved November 25, 2007, from [http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-11/24/content\\_5369766.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-11/24/content_5369766.htm)
- Yates, J. & Orlikowski, W. J. (1992). Genres of organizational communication: a structural approach to studying communication and media. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 299–326.
- Yervasi, C. (1996). Confessions of a net surfer: net chick and grrrls on the web. *Postmodern Culture*, 7(1).
- YouTube (2006). *Allen's listening tour*. Retrieved November 26, 2007, from [www.youtube.com/watch?v=9G7gq7GQ71c](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9G7gq7GQ71c)
- Yuan, Y., Fulk, J., Shumate, M., Monge, P. R., Bryant, J. & Matsaganis, M. (2005). Individual participation in organizational information commons: the impact of team level social influence and technology-specific competence. *Human Communication Research*, 31(2), 212–40.
- Yun, H. K. (2004). *Infocomm security: going offline is not an option*. *Cisco Security Summit*. Singapore: Cisco Systems.
- Zaller, J. R. (1992). *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zayani, M. (ed.). (2005). *The al-Jazeera Phenomenon*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Zewail, A. (2004). Roadmap to a muslim renaissance. *New Perspectives Quarterly*, Fall.
- Zhou, M. & Cai, G. (2002). Chinese language media in the United States: immigration and assimilation in American life. *Qualitative Sociology*, 25(3), 419–41.
- Zhou, Y. & Moy, P. (2007). Parsing framing processes: the interplay between online public opinion and media coverage. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 79–98.
- Zittel, T. (2003). Political representation in the networked society: the Americanization of European systems of responsible party government? *Journal of Legislative Studies*, 9(3), 32–53.
- Zittrain, J. L. (2006). The generative internet. *Harvard Law Review*, 119(7), 1974–2040.
- Zoonen van, L. (2002). Gendering the internet: claims, controversies and cultures. *European Journal of Communication*, 17(5), 5–23.
- Zukin, C. & Snyder, R. (1984). Passive learning: when the media environment is the message. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 48(3), 629–38.

## Legal cases

- Access Now v. Southwest Airlines*, 227 F. Supp. 2d 1312 (U.S. Dist. 2002).
- Arrow, K. et al. Brief of Amici Curiae, MGM v. Grokster*, 2004 U.S. Briefs 480 (2005).
- Association of American Publishers et al. Brief of Amici Curiae, U.S. v. ALA*, 2002 U.S. Briefs 361 (2003).
- ACLU et al. Brief of Amici Curiae, Universal City v. Corley*, 2000 U.S. 2nd Cir. Briefs 9185 (2001).
- Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976).
- Intel Corp. v. Hamidi*, 30 Cal 4th, 1342 (Sup. Ct 2003).
- Intel Corp. Brief of Amicus Curiae, MGM v. Grokster*, 2005 U.S. S. Ct. Briefs 480 (2005).
- Intellectual Property Professors et al. Brief of Amici Curiae, MGM v. Grokster*, 2004 U.S. Briefs 480 (2005).
- Lott, T. et al. Brief of Amici Curiae, U.S. v. ALA*, 2002 U.S. Briefs 361 (2003).
- Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios et al. Reply Brief, MGM v. Grokster*, 2004 U.S. Briefs 480 (2005).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- MGM v. Grokster*, 545 U.S. 913 (2005).
- Multnomah County Public Library *et al.* Brief, *U.S. v. ALA*, 2002 U.S. Briefs 361 (2003).
- National Venture Capitalists Association, Amicus Brief, 2004 U.S. Briefs 480 (2005).
- Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844, (1997).
- Smith, P., Testimony, oral argument, *U.S. v. ALA*, 2003 U.S. Trans Lexis 20 (2003).
- Sony v. Universal City*, 464 U.S. 417 (1984).
- Taranto, R., Testimony, oral argument, 2005 U.S. Trans Lexis 27 (2005).
- United States, Brief for Intervenor, 2000 U.S. 2nd Cir. Briefs 9185 (2001).
- United States v. ALA*, 539 U.S. 194 (2003).
- Universal City Studios v. Corley*, 273 F.3d 429 (2nd Cir. 2001).
- Universal City Studios v. Reimerdes*, 111 F. Supp. 2d 294 (U.S. Dist. 2000).

t&f proofs

# Routledge Handbook of Internet Politics

The politics of the internet has entered the social science mainstream. From debates about its impact on parties and election campaigns following momentous presidential contests in the United States, to concerns over international security, privacy, and surveillance in the post-9/11, post-7/7 environment; from the rise of blogging as a threat to the traditional model of journalism, to controversies at the international level over how and if the internet should be governed by an entity such as the United Nations; from the new repertoires of collective action open to citizens, to the massive programs of public management reform taking place in the name of e-government, internet politics and policy are continually in the headlines.

The *Routledge Handbook of Internet Politics* is a collection of over 30 chapters dealing with the most significant scholarly debates in this rapidly growing field of study. Organized in four broad sections: Institutions, Behavior, Identities, and Law and policy, the handbook summarizes and criticizes contemporary debates while pointing out new departures. A comprehensive set of resources, it provides linkages to established theories of media and politics, political communication, governance, deliberative democracy, and social movements, all within an interdisciplinary context. The contributors form a strong international cast of established and junior scholars.

This is the first publication of its kind in this field; a helpful companion to students and scholars of politics, international relations, communication studies and sociology.

**Andrew Chadwick** is Founding Director of the New Political Communication Unit at Royal Holloway, University of London. He is the author of *Internet Politics: States, Citizens, and New Communication Technologies* (Oxford University Press), which won the American Sociological Association's Communication and Information Technologies Section Outstanding Book Award.

**Philip N. Howard** is Associate Professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Washington, and directs the World Information Access Project ([www.wiareport.org](http://www.wiareport.org)). He is the author of *New Media Campaigns and the Managed Citizen* (Cambridge University Press), which won book awards from the American Sociological Association and the International Communication Association.