VOLUME 20
ISSUE 3

VOX POP
Newsletter
of Political Organizations and Parties

An official section of the American Political Science Association
Produced by the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, The University of Akron

State Party Homepages in Election 2000

Rich Fender, *Kent State University*
Rick Farmer, *University of Akron*

With 58 percent of U.S. homes and 66 percent of American workers having Internet access, the web's importance to politics is increasing. We analyzed the 100 US state party websites as they appeared in November 2000 to see how those parties used the Internet to reach voters, volunteers, donors and others. The analysis of each state party website shows the trends that existed during the 2000 election cycle. Simply put, some US state political parties utilized the Internet more than others during the 2000 election.

Party websites should be evaluated on both their technical presentation and their effort to perform recognized party functions (Gibson and Ward 2000). Multiple indicators of technique and functions were proposed by various web content researchers (Benoit and Benoit 1999, Margolis et. al 1999, Ireland and Nash 1999, Boerner et. al 2000, among others). Using these lists we developed a content analysis questionnaire seeking the presence or absence of over 100 indicators. All 100 state party web sites were examined by teams of coders.*

This research note reports preliminary results from a subset of these data. The state party comparisons are informative, but arise from limited data. This note focuses on those party function indicators that most often occurred or were linked from the state party homepages. Links from the homepage are essential for identification and navigation. Those not present or linked on the homepage are not likely to be easily found by visitors.

The top 10 functions are described below in the order of their prevalence. These measures are broadly defined and summarize multiple elements that may be present throughout the site. State parties are scored according to their usage of these 10 most popular functions in Table 1. Parties that score higher offer more links from their homepage to the measured functions than those who score lower.

The ten most common party functions either linked or appearing on state party homepages are listed and explained below: The first function is Contact Information, which appears on or is linked to 88 of the state party homepages. It is the presence of any of the following: phone, fax, and e-mail or mail address of the state party. Clearly, for a party to mobilize its political efforts, it must be easy to contact.

The next most common function is Links to Additional Political Websites such as political parties, candidates, or allied groups at the national, state, or local levels. These types of links appear on the homepages of 85 of the state party web sites. This function is significant as it allows for the possibility of coalition building.

With 80 of the state party web homepages referring to Volunteer Opportunities, it is the third most common party function and vital to a party's grass roots efforts. Volunteer opportunities are ways to assist a political party by doing such

(Continued on page 5)

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Dear POP Members:

I am pleased to report that POP's preparations for this year's APSA annual meeting in Boston are underway. John Gerring of Boston University has put together a strong slate of panels and posters. Committees are gearing up to select our award winners. And Jeff Stonecash of Syracuse will be organizing a short course to be offered Wednesday, August 28. More information on each of these points follows below.

APSA allocates POP a very small number of panels—only five total this year (co-sponsored panels count as one-half). The allocation is determined on a formula of some complexity—I think Russell Crowe was working on it in "A Beautiful Mind"—but the short story is that POP does not end up with many panels. The one thing we all can do to change this situation and open up more opportunities for POP faculty and graduated students to present their work is to **attend the POP panels**. Panel attendance is the most critical factor in the allocation formula, and POP has not done as well on this as it should. Attend early and often. Bring guests.

This year's panel lineup (3 sponsored, 4 co-sponsored) is as follows: Post-Communist Party Development; Parties and Party Leadership in Mexico and the US; Donkeys versus Elephants: Party Competition across the American Polity; Party Institutionalization in Varied Political Settings; Legislative Candidates and Campaign Contributors; Author Meets Critics: Paul Frymer's *Uneasy Alliances*; Parties and Interest Groups in American Political History.

In addition to the panels, POP has been allocated five traditional posters. And thanks to John's entrepreneurial efforts, POP is one of the sections participating in an experimental poster format—this gives us another eight poster slots. In this new format, a group of closely related papers are presented in a small room, with the audience seated in the middle and a very brief presentation from each poster presenter. This is followed by informal discussion among those present. POP's poster collection for this experimental format is titled "Interest Groups and Lobbying: Comparing the US Case with Other Western Democracies."

One of the most pleasant parts of any APSA meeting is the awarding of POP prizes. Our committees are hard at work. If you have books that you want to be certain are considered for the Leon Epstein book prize (must have publication date of 2000 or 2001), send an e-mail to the committee chair, Linda Fowler (linda.1.fowler@dartmouth.edu). Suggestions for the Jack Walker article award (journal article or book chapter with a publication date of 2000 or 2001 are eligible) should be directed to Jeff Stonecash, committee chair (jstone@maxwell.syr.edu). Dick Niemi (niemi@rochester.edu) is the committee chair for the Samuel Eldersveld award, given to someone "whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field." Lastly, Anna Harvey (anna.harvey@nyu.edu) is heading up the Emerging Scholar Award committee. This award is given to "a scholar who has received his or her Ph.D. within the last five years and whose career to date demonstrates unusual promise."

Other POP committees are at work also, but these committees will not need nominations sent to them. These committees include the Party Politics/POP Best Paper Aw for best paper presented on a POP panel at the preceding APSA meeting (Pradeep Chhibber, chair), and the Nominations Committee (Susan Scarrow, chair). The Nominations Committee will be recommending new members for the POP Executive Council and also faces the very difficult talk of replacing the years of excellent service and dedication provided by Diana Dwyre as POP's Secretary-Treasurer.

POP traditionally offers a "short course" at the APSA meeting. This year, Jeff Stonecash is organizing a short course that is tentatively titled, "Candidate Centered Versus Polarized Politics: Dealing With Two Paradigms." As Jeff reports, "this short course will examine whether there is a growing contradiction between two paradigms. On one hand we say campaigns and elections are candidate-centered, which implies that candidates distance themselves from parties. On the other hand, we see strong party voting in Congress, and many scholars arguing that members give the leadership more authority to pressure members to vote with the party. These two views of elections and members are in conflict. The candidate-centered view has been dominant the last 25 years, and it may be time to reconsider its applicability to present politics." The workshop will be a roundtable with propon s of both approaches. Importantly, it will also consider the practical implications of the debate for those beginning new research. If you are a graduate student contemplating a dissertation, or a faculty member embarking on a new project, what does the "growing contradiction between two paradigms," if indeed there is one, mean for the practical question of designing and conducting this research? More information will be forthcoming on this short course, including the availability of stipends to help graduate students offset the cost of attending the short course.

One final APSA meeting note: this year, POP will be giving graduate students a chance to meet a scholar over breakfast or lunch at the APSA meeting. We'll have more information on the procedure for this soon.

I am always interested in hearing ways in which POP can better serve its faculty or graduate student members, so please feel free to send me a message to pass along an idea (coleman@polisci.wisc.edu). If you've come up with an idea, or if there are good ideas we can "borrow" from other sections, let me know!

Last, but certainly not least, I need volunteers to serve on the POP Web Development Committee. I also need someone to serve as POP's Webmaster to replace Scott Furlong, who has done a great job. The needs here are immediate, so p e let me know very soon if you'd be willing to perform this service for POP.

Sincerely,
John Coleman
Chair, POP

FROM HEADQUARTERS:

POP Panels and Posters for APSA, 2002

Donkeys versus Elephants: Party Competition across the American Polity
Leon D. Epstein, chair
John Bruce, "An Examination of Patterns in Party Competition across Constituency Levels"
Shannon Jenkins, "Variations in the Influences in Roll Call Voting in State Legislatures: Examining Voting in Different Issue Areas"
Nicole Mellow, "Partisan Politics by Other Means: Explaining Bipartisanship in American Political History"
Jeff Smith, "Trading Places: The Two Parties in the Electorate, 1980-2000"
Howard Reiter, discussant

Party Institutionalization in Varied Settings
Nic van de Walle, chair and discussant
Dawn Brancati, "Decentralization and Political Parties"
Jana Morgan Kelly, "The Implications of Party System Decline for Representation: The Case of Venezuela"
Michelle Kuenzi, "Party System Institutionalization and Democracy in Asia and Africa"
David Myers, "Explaining Party System Collapse"

Parties and Party Leadership in Mexico and the US
Eric Schickler, chair
Robert Mickey, "National Parties, State Parties, and the Struggle for Brand Autonomy in the US South"
Alejandro Poire, "Gubernatorial Candidate Selection in Mexico's PRI, 1988-2000"
Robert P Van Houweling, "Legislators, Policy Preferences, and the Selection of Party Leaders"
John Aldrich, discussant

Parties and Interest Groups in American Political History (co-sponsored with Division 7)
David Robertson, chair
Amy Bridges, "Parties in the American West"
Kenneth Gaalswyk, "Electoral Success and Institutional Failure: The Case of the Populists in the US House of Representatives"
Byron Shafer, "Economic Development, Legal Desegregation, and Partisan Change in the Post-War American South"
Daniel Tichenor and Richard Harris, "The Lost Years: Interest Group Formation, Attrition, and Influence Over Time"
Andrew Polsky, discussant

ROUNDTABLE.
Author Meets Critics: Paul Frymer's *Uneasy Alliances* (co-sponsored with Division 7)
Thomas Kim, chair
Michael Jones-Correa, discussant
Sidney Milkis, discussant
David Plotke, discussant
John Skrentny, discussant
Carol Swain, discussant
Paul Frymer, respondent

Post-Communist Party Development (co-sponsored with Division 13)
Henry Hale, chair
Thomas Klobucar, "Party Activists in Post Soviet Democracies"
Steven Roper, "The Influence of Party Finance in Post-Communist Party System Consolidation"
Regina Smyth, "Constructing Constituencies: State Intervention and Party System Development in Transitional Systems"
Ingrid van Biezen, "Patterns of Party Organization in New Democracies: Southern and East-Central Europe Compared"

Legislative Candidates and Campaign Contributions (co-sponsored with Division 22)
Victoria Farrar-Myers, chair
Justin Buchler, "The Effect of Member-to-Member Campaign Contributions on Parties in the House"
Jennifer Steen, "Playing Both Sides: PAC Contributions and Representation"
Michael Malbin, "Members of Congress as Contributors, When Every Race Counts"
Christine Day and Charles Hadley, "Contributors and Women's PACs: Motivations and Characteristics"
Eric Heberlig, discussant

POSTERS
Maryann Barakso, "The Scope of Democratic Governance in Interest Group Associations"
Stephen Borrelli, "Where Do 'Important Laws' Come From? Relating Mayhew's Dataset to Party Platforms"
Tom Brunell, "Sincere & Strategic Donations: Patterns of Interest Group Contributions"
Quan Li, "A Simultaneous Equation Modeling of Party Strength in the US House of Representatives, 1887-1971"
Douglas D. Roscoe, "The Impact of Campaign Contributions on Legislative Behavior: A Meta-Analysis"

POSTER COLLOQUIUM
"Interest Groups and Lobbying: Comparing the US Case with Other Western Democracies"
Clive S. Thomas, moderator
Conor McGrath, "Comparative Lobboying Practices Washington, London, Brussels"
Irina Michalowitz, "Similar but not the Same: EU and US Lobbying, a Comparison of Literature and Practice"
Adam J Newmark, "Personal and Professional Relationships Between Lobbyists and Legislators: Individual and Interest-System Differences in the States"
Suzanne Robbins, "Exit or Voice? Interest Group Tactics in Environmental Policy?
Vanessa Ruget, "Environmental Groups and the New Administration"
Lisa A. Solowiej, "Friend or Foe? A Reconsideration of Counteractive Lobbying"
Christopher Witko, "Member goals, Legislative Decisionmaking, and PAC Influence"

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Political Organizations and Parties Committees 2001-2002

Leon Epstein Best Book Award
Linda Fowler, Dartmouth College, Chair
John Aldrich, Duke University
David Lowery, University of North Carolina

Jack Walker Best Article Award
Jeff Stonecash, Syracuse University, Chair
Christina Wolbrecht, University of Notre Dame
Kevin Hula, Loyola College

POP/Party Politics Award
Pradeep Chhibber, University of California - Berkeley, Chair
Amy Bridges, University of California - San Diego
Kay Schlozman, Boston College

Nominations Committee
Susan Scarrow, University of Houston, Chair
Bill Mayer, Northeastern University
Beth Leech, Rutgers University - New Brunswick

Eldersveld Career Achievement Award
Dick Niemi, University of Rochester, Chair
Sarah Morehouse, University of Connecticut
Paul Beck, Ohio State University

Emerging Scholar Award
Anna Harvey, New York University, Chair
Frank Baumgartner, Penn State University
Sid Milkis, University of Virginia

SPECIAL INTERESTS

Fullbright Offers Lecturing/Research Grants in 140 Countries

The Fulbright Scholar Program is offering lecturing/research awards in some 140 countries for the 2003-2004 academic year. The competition opened March 1.

Opportunities are available not only for college and university faculty and administrators, but also for professionals from business and government, as well as artists, journalists, scientists, lawyers, independent scholars, and many others. There are awards in 37 different disciplines and professional fields, as well as in a variety of subdisciplines such as gender studies and peace studies.

Traditional Fulbright awards are available from two months to an academic year or longer. A new short-term grants program—the Fulbright Senior Specialists Program—offers two-to-six-week grants in a variety of disciplines and fields.

While foreign language skills are needed in some countries, most Fulbright lecturing assignments are in English. Some 80 percent of the awards are for lecturing.

Application deadlines for 2003-2004 awards are:

- May 1 for Fulbright Distinguished Chair awards in Europe, Canada and Russia.
- August 1 for Fulbright tradition lecturing and research grants worldwide.
- November 1 for the summer German Studies Seminar and for spring/summer seminars in Germany, Korea and Japan for academic and international education administrators.
- Fulbright Senior Specialists Program - rolling deadline.

For information, contact the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES) at 3007 Tilden Street, NW, Suite 5L, Washington, DC 20008-3009. Telephone: 202-686-7877; E-mail: apprequest@cies.iie.org. Information and an online application are also available on the Web at www.cies.org.

The Fulbright Scholar Program is sponsored by the United States Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

(Continued from page 1)

things as making phone calls and giving money.

Just a little less prevalent (78 sites) is Current Events. They new stories, quotes, photos, etc. of important party or political events that have occurred within the past month. Related to this is the fifth most common party function (75 sites), a Calendar of Events. This is a listing of key or upcoming activities like dinners or rallies and can be important for a party's grass roots efforts. On 72 party website homepages is a reference to a Directory of Personnel. This is a link to the listing of staff or other key individuals within the organization such as the executive director or political director.

Less common (58 sites) are Slate Cards. These are the listing of party endorsed candidates for various offices such as governor or state legislator. Voter Registration Information which assists people in registering to vote by providing such things as phone numbers, links or addresses where registration forms and assistance can be attained appears on or is linked to 47 state party homepages. Press Releases, stories prepared by a political party (party candidates, or supporting organizations, etc.) and sent to the media to get media coverage, appear on or are linked to the homepages of 44 of the state party sites. Lastly, appearing on or linked to the homepages of 40 sites is the Party Platform. This is the mission statement, list of goals, principles of a political party, or an essay explaining the party's philosophy.

Overall when using these criteria only 3 state parties included all 10 party functions on their homepage or linked them to their homepage. There were 17 state parties that provided 9 of the functions from their homepages. Of the top 20 sites, 11 were Democratic state party sites and 9 were Republican sites. Party Platforms and Press Releases were the most common items missing from the top 20 sites, as well as all sites. Each of the top 20 sites included Contact Information, Volunteer Opportunities, Current Events, and Calendar of Events.

There were 10 state party websites that had four or fewer party functions either on their homepages or linked from their homepages. Of the bottom 10 state party websites, 6 were Democratic websites and 4 were Republican websites. These sites generally offered Contact Information, Links to Additional Political Websites, Volunteer Opportunities and a Directory of Personnel.

These data indicate the broad range of state party websites. More than half of the homepages included access to 7 of the reported functions, indicating that parties are making an effort on the web. Yet nearly 25 percent had 5 or less of the functions, suggesting that some parties are falling behind.

Also, these data demonstrate that Republican and Democratic sites are at rough parity. While the Democrats had 2 more states in the top 20, they also had two more states in the bottom 10. The median for both parties was 7 functions.

Finally, these data provide an indication of which party functions are being preformed on the web. If the web is the medium of the future, those parties that are behind must catch-up if they hope to compete.

Table 1: State Parties' Usage of the 10 Most Prevalent Functions

Party	State	Score	Party	State	Score	Party	State	Score
D	AK	7	D	KY	7	D	NY	8
R	AK	4	R	KY	7	R	NY	5
D	AL	9	D	LA	5	D	OH	8
R	AL	9	R	LA	5	R	OH	5
D	AR	5	D	MA	6	D	OK	9
R	AR	5	R	MA	7	R	OK	6
D	AZ	7	D	MD	4	D	OR	9
R	AZ	6	R	MD	8	R	OR	9
D	CA	8	D	ME	3	D	PA	7
R	CA	7	R	ME	9	R	PA	6
D	CO	10	D	MI	4	D	SC	9
R	CO	8	R	MI	4	R	SC	6
D	CT	6	D	MN	7	D	SD	3
R	CT	5	R	MN	9	R	SD	7
D	DE	9	D	MO	9	D	TN	6
R	DE	8	R	MO	8	R	TN	7
D	FL	5	R	MS	7	D	TX	10
R	FL	9	D	MT	6	R	TX	7
D	GA	1	R	MT	7	D	UT	8
R	GA	8	D	NC	8	R	UT	8
D	HI	8	R	NC	7	D	VA	8
R	HI	10	D	ND	8	R	VA	9
D	IA	8	R	ND	6	D	VT	9
R	IA	5	D	NE	9	R	VT	8
D	ID	6	R	NE	8	D	WA	8
R	ID	7	D	NH	8	R	WA	9
D	IL	4	R	NH	5	D	WI	9
R	IL	6	D	NJ	7	R	WI	9
D	IN	7	R	NJ	5	D	WV	5
R	IN	6	D	NM	6	R	WV	7
D	KS	7	R	NM	8	D	WY	7
R	KS	4	D	NV	7	R	WY	6
			R	NV	2			

* As of August, 2001, MS-D, RI-D & RI-R did not have websites.

WANTED:
ABSTRACTS, RESEARCH REPORTS,
BOOK REVIEWS, RANDOM THOUGHTS

Just completed seminar research on parties or political organizations?
Got a wild idea you would like to run by fellow scholars?
Read any good (or bad) books lately?

WRITE SOMETHING FOR VOX POP?

Send your material to:
John Green, Editor, Vox Pop
Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics
The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-1914
Phone: 330-972-5182, Fax: 330-972-5479,
Email: green@uakron.edu.

FROM THE FIELD

VOTE SMART SEMESTER ACADEMIC INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

The Vote Smart Semester Academic Internship Program represents an extraordinary transfer credit option for students interested in hands-on work in practical politics in an nonpartisan context.

By combining political science coursework with an internship, the Vote Smart Semester allows students to earn 12 semester hours of credit. Included are six semester hours of coursework, accredited by the University of Montana as well as six more hours earned through an internship at our research center.

The two courses are Campaign and Elections, and Political Parties and Interest Groups. Dr. Ned Schneier, who is currently the Charles Evans Hughes Visiting Professor at Colgate University, will be the instructor. Dr. Schneier brings 35 year of teaching and internship program experience to our inaugural semester.

The internship will be divided into two parts: work on the National Political Awareness Test (NPAT) and in Research and Hotline. These areas represent the two largest and most important divisions in the Project's organizational structure. Students will work in NPAT for the first half of the semester and rotate into research as the election draws near.

The $2,500 tuition fee is very competitive. Students receive free room and board at our Great Divide Ranch facility located in the Montana Rocky Mountains as well as an official transcript from the University of Montana upon completion of the program.

The University of Montana accredits the program through its Continuing Education Department. An on-site instructor will live on the ranch full-time. The instructor will administer the courses, oversee the requirements of the internship and assign letter grades to each student. These will be reported to the University of Montana's Continuing Education Department, which will then produce official transcripts for each student. The cost of this service is included in the $2,500 tuition fee.

Application Process:

To apply for the Vote Smart Semester students must:

- Fill out an application form
- Send a resume
- Provide three reference letters or contact information

A member of the PVS staff will contact all applicants for an interview within one week. Upon acceptance, students will receive an acceptance packet by mail within two weeks.

The acceptance packet includes travel information, the reading list and the Student Acceptance Form. Students are required to complete and return it along with a $100 deposit. This deposit will go towards tuition. It will not be refunded if students decide not to participate.

The remainder of the $2,500 tuition fee is due September 30. Failure to pay will result in the student being dropped from the class list. Students will be able to complete the internship, but will not receive a transcript from the University of Montana.

Key Dates:

Application Deadline - June 30
Arrival at Great Divide Ranch - August 7-11
Classes begin - August 12
Tuition Deadline - September 30
Last day of Internship - November 4
Election Day - November 5
Final Exams - November 6-8
Program Ends - November 8

For more information, contact Vote Smart Semester at 1-888-Vote-Smart, e-mail: intern@vote-smart.org or visit the website: www.vote-smart.org.

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

2002: A YEAR FOR PRIMARIES

Rhodes Cook

In most election years, the primaries are no more than a small hurdle for congressional incumbents on their path to re-election. But in years following congressional redistricting, such as this one, that hurdle can become very high for a number of House members.

Since the end of World War II, no fewer than nine House incumbents have been defeated for renomination in the post-redistricting year. And in 1992, the number swelled to a postwar record of 19.

No one is expecting the number of incumbent primary losers to be that high this year. Ten years ago, many members were tainted by the House banking scandal, and the widespread perception of recession weakened a number of others.

In addition, anti-incumbent sentiment- on the rise in 1992 - has been on the wane in recent years. And one of the major themes of the current round of redistricting has been the success of incumbents of both parties in getting lines drawn to their advantage. In elections, it is said, voters pick the candidates. In redistricting, candidates pick the voters. And the most interested of candidates in the decennial line drawing are usually incumbents.

Yet the accuracy of the comment for 2002 has yet to be proved. A post-redistricting election is much more volatile that those that immediately precede it for the simple reason that the district lines change for virtually every member. To comply with the "one man, one vote" mandate requiring districts of equal population, some incumbents must shed constituents, some must add new ones. And in states that have lost a seat or two by reapportionment, incumbents sometimes find themselves paired against each other in the same district - either in a primary or the general election.

Clues to the nature of this primary season should not be long in coming. In March, three of the largest states held their primaries - California, Texas, and Illinois. By the end of June, half the states will have completed their nominating process.

continued on page 7

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

continued from page 6

Illinois, in particular, was a bellwether of the turmoil that would pervade the 1992 primary season. Four House incumbents were beaten in the primary that year, as was the state's two-term Democratic senator, Alan J. Dixon.

This year, no congressional incumbents were beaten in Illinois. And the only one to lose at all in March was a predictable casualty, the ethically challenged Gary A. Condit of California. His bid for a sixth full term in the U.S. House was soundly rejected by Democratic primary voters.

The basic outline of Condit's political resume, however, is not unlike the bulk of the 19 House incumbents who were denied renomination in 1992. They were not new, politically inexperienced members. Fourteen had served at least 10 years in the House. Five had serious ethics problems, having "bounced" at least 300 checks at the House bank. Four had been paired against another incumbent. Only one was a freshman.

Some who lost that year should have seen it coming, having won their primary or general election two years earlier with less than 55 percent of the vote. But a number were blindsided, having won easy renomination and re-election for years.

The 1992 congressional primaries took a particularly heavy toll on the Democrats. Fourteen Democratic incumbents were beaten, compared to just five Republicans. But among the latter was Guy Vander Jagt of Michigan, the chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee. And among the successful Democratic challenges was Martin T. Meehan of Massachusetts, currently one of the more prominent players on Capitol Hill.

The incumbent Republican primary losers in 1992 were geographically scattered from Michigan to California. The Democratic members that lost their primaries that year, though, were more closely clustered geographically. Nine were in a band of Frost Best industrial states that extended from Massachusetts westward to Illinois. The other five were in the South.

One might think that the amount of turmoil in the primaries had a dramatic effect on the general election in 1992. Yet in partisan terms, that was not the case. While the defeat of 19 incumbents in the primaries created a plethora of open seats, only four of them switched party hands in November. The result was a wash: two seats switched to the Democrats; two seats went to the Republicans.

Compared to the House, the primaries for senators and governors in recent years have been a tranquil backwater. The last incumbent senator to lose a primary was Sheila Frahm. She had been appointed in the spring of 1996 to fill the vacancy created when Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole abruptly resigned his seat to devote full time to his presidential campaign. But Frahm held the seat for less than two months before losing the Republican Senate primary to Rep. Sam Brownback.

The last elected senator to lose a primary was Democrat Dixon of Illinois. He was beaten in 1992 by Carol Moseley-Braun, the first strike in what became known as the "year of the woman."

Meanwhile, no sitting governor has been denied his party's nomination since 1994, when Democrat Bruce G. Sundlun of Rhode Island and Republican Walter D. Miller of South Dakota were both rejected by their party's voters.

Sundlun was completing his second two-year term as governor. But his stock had plummeted after a series of controversies, the most colorful an out-of-court settlement of a paternity suit. He lost badly in the Democratic primary to a state legislator, Myrth York, who went on to lose to Republican Lincoln Almond that fall.

As for Miller, he was filling out the term of his predecessor, George S. Mickelson, who had died in a plane crash the previous year. Miller was seeking a full term of his own in 1994 but was beaten in the GOP primary by William J. Janklow, a former governor who was in the midst of making a successful comeback.

Of the governors and senators up for election this year, only Republican Robert C. Smith of New Hampshire - at this point - appears to be in serious danger of being beaten in a primary. Yet even if none of them suffers a headline-making defeat at the hands of their party's voters, the results of the upcoming primary season could still be quite instructive. A governor or senator who has a close call in their primary, or even gives up an unexpectedly large share of the primary vote, could be sending an early signal of vulnerability in the November election.

On that score, stay tuned . . . and look for the devil in the details.

The preceding piece appeared in the March issue of "The Rhodes Cook Letter," a bimonthly political newsletter that analyzes voting trends in presidential, congressional, and gubernatorial elections.

For more than two decades, Mr. Cook was a political reporter and columnist for Congressional Quarterly, and is currently the author of "America Votes," a biennial compilation of nationwide election results published by CQ Press.

There is a special, discounted academic rate of $59 for a year's worth of six issues of "The Rhodes Cook Letter" - $40 off the regular price of a subscription. And issues can be copied for classroom use.

To receive a sample copy of the latest issue, email rhodescook@aol.com or send a note to "The Rhodes Cook Letter," P.O. Box 574, Annandale, VA 22003. And please indicate whether you would like it sent to you in electronic or printed form.

FROM THE FIELD:

Congressional District Data

This message is to inform interested researchers that I have now (finally) created a website to provide my data on the characteristics of congressional districts.

The dataset includes a wide range of economic, social, and geographic information for every U.S. congressional district, from 1943-1998. The variables range from such basic information as size of each district (in square miles), the population, and the number unemployed (at the time of each census) to much more specialized information like the number of beds in Veterans' Administration/Dept. of Veterans' Affairs hospitals in the district or whether the district is coastal. Most of the data are specific to each congressional district, but occasionally I have included statewide data where district-level information was unavailable.

Along with individual files for each congressional term, I have also included a codebook and a table describing which variables are included in which files.

For further information and access to the district data, go to: http://socsci.colorado.edu/~esadler/districtdatawebsite/congressionalDistrictDatasetwebpage.htm

If you have any questions, please contact Scott Adler, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science, University of Colorado, 131B Ketchum Hall, Campus Box 333, Boulder, CO 80309, Phone: (303) 492-6659, Fax: (303) 492-0978, e-mail: esadler@colorado.edu.

The University of Akron

Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics
Akron, OH 44325-1914