

The Effect of Detailed Instructions and Composition Format on
Relative Uniqueness in User Generated Public Policy Correspondence

Andrew J. Roback

COM 601

Dr. Bauer

December 11, 2009

Abstract

Many non-profit and advocacy websites contain form letters advocating a position on a topic of public policy debate that they wish users to personalize and send to government officials. While the uniqueness of user generated content is questionable when writing to elected legislators, it is necessary when commenting on proposed regulations in the realm of e-rulemaking, a publicly accessible forum. The proposed study seeks to test whether a detailed definition of the word “personalize” will lead to greater uniqueness of user generated written products, while also examining whether different formats for composing correspondence result in different levels of uniqueness in the final, written products.

The Effect of Detailed Instructions and Composition Format on
Relative Uniqueness in User Generated Public Policy Correspondence

In technical communication discourse, the last ten years have seen a dramatic increase in both interest and number of studies concerning how citizens interact with the government through written communication, especially in reports (Rude, 2004), environmental impact statements (Graham and Linderman, 2005), and local and national policies (Kniewel, 2008; Wallace, 2003; Williams, 2009). Additionally, other studies have focused on how non-governmental organizations, non-profit organizations, and politically motivated activist groups, and media designers have sought to influence public opinion and increase civic engagement (Tillery, 2003; Spoel, Goforth, Cheu, & Pearson, 2009). This interest in the interaction between concerned citizens, public interest/activist groups, and elected government officials or organizations has explored several avenues of how language is used to reveal or obfuscate scientific or technical information, and how language can be used to slant scientific facts to favor one position over another. However, a growing concern among scholars interested in technical communication and public policy debate is the role of the average citizen in utilizing available tools to voice her opinion to government officials and exert civic authority to make substantive changes to policies that affect her on a personal level, whether those policies affect involve local, national, or global action on the part of the government.

One such study by Michelle Sidler and Natasha Jones (2009) rhetorically analyzes the website for The Innocence Project, a non-profit organization dedicated to using genetic testing to exonerate falsely accused inmates on death row. In their study, they discuss a now standard web page on non-profit websites allows users to write to elected officials and voice their concerns over an issue of contention, in this case, whether or not an inmate should be executed before a

genetic test is conducted to question his guilt (Sidler & Jones, 2009). Sidler and Jones argue that such a tool removes traditional technological barriers to letter writing (e.g. “a printer, letterhead, and fax [machine]”), and also contend that this technology allows users to “include their own personal experiences and information directly on the screen” (p. 43). They argue that such an approach gives people who are personal stakeholders “an opportunity to make their stories known and actively engage themselves in the discussion of public policies and ideally participate in the creation of the policies” (Sidler & Jones, 2009, p. 43). However, while the authors rightly point to the fact that web-enabled submission forms do remove several barriers to the submission process, they do not necessarily provide a high degree of “participation” (letters sent to elected official are often a one-way street) and do not necessarily guarantee the creation of “personal” narratives. The page sampled by the authors on The Innocence Project website instructs the user to “Personalize the subject line and message” of the email “if you wish” (Sidler & Jones, 2009, p. 44).

This paper will propose an experimental approach to test whether instructions such as those found in The Innocence Project email campaign actually influence persons that Sidler and Jones dub “user-citizens” to personalize their public policy correspondence¹. To develop the issue at stake, I will examine the significance of public involvement in online policy deliberation (specifically in e-rulemaking) and whether personalization of correspondence is relevant to such debates (i.e. in what context does quality of correspondence matter over quantity).

¹ It should be noted that although “correspondence” implies two-way communication, I use the word to describe a one-time communication (that is potentially repeated) by the user without expectation of a reply from the recipient. I use this term rather than “letter” or “email” because of the changeable and often multiple types of media which users’ written products are translated into (e.g. words written in a text box on a website translated into an email whose text is put into a database).

Quantity versus Quality: The Issue of Personalization

The topic of this paper, personalization of website user-generated public policy correspondence, is, by necessity, hybridized as a result of existing research. Firstly, no specific research has been done on whether personalized correspondence is more effective than bulk correspondence (e.g. petitions, postcards) in influencing the decisions made by elected officials. Research is confined to broader topics such as broad lobbying methods and strategies. Therefore, it is questionable whether personalization is necessary in correspondence of this type. However, a review of ten advocacy websites² found that all of the email writing campaign pages on those sites encouraged some form of personalization (see appendix A for excerpts of personalization instructions). Thus, a paradox exists within the advocacy sphere: although there is no apparent data to support personalization of form letters as a more effective way to influence an elected official's opinion, all of the email writing campaign sites recommend personalization. Hence, although there is no factual evidence to support personalization as an effective means of persuasion, the presence of personalization recommendations on the email writing campaign websites certainly supports the notion that there is a *perception* of the efficacy of personalization.

Secondly, this topic is hybridized because of the lack of extant websites promoting user-generated public policy discourse concerning e-rulemaking. E-rulemaking is the process by which the government enacts specific regulatory rules that carry out the work of much broader legislation, such as specific levels of pollutants that may be emitted by a coal burning power plant so that it meets federal laws concerning air pollution (Carlitz & Gunn, 2005). In January 2003, the government enacted an online forum for citizens to comment on proposed rules, a

² Only ten websites were surveyed due to the time constraints of this proposal. An actual study based on this proposal would be better served to survey one hundred websites that advocate emailing elected officials to provide additional data on both the inclusion of personalization instructions, as well as the types of instructions used (i.e. levels of the independent variable).

process that was previously only available through paper or in-person presentation of comments at regulatory hearings (<http://www.regulations.gov>) (Carlitz & Gunn, 2005). One of the main benefits of this site is that it facilitates widespread access, which presents the possibility of user-citizens being able to more freely participate in the rule forming process by submitting their comments on proposed rules (Carlitz & Gunn, 2005; Mulberger, 2006). This development supposedly benefits advocacy groups as well, since they have the ability to implement rule comment writing campaigns in a very similar fashion to the current web-enabled email writing campaign sites. However, as of this writing, searches for examples of rule comment writing sites revealed that very few of these sites existed, and of those that were available, most had been disabled. I suspect there are two reasons for the lack of rule comment campaign sites. First, e-rulemaking is still a relatively obscure practice and despite the presence of a publicly accessible website, most people are unaware that e-rulemaking exists (Schulman, 2004, p. 15). Second, proposed rules are only open to public comment for a short time, usually 60 days. The relatively short turnaround time on rulemaking means that websites are probably erected and dismantled in short order, so a long-term study (of, perhaps, one year) would be required to locate and archive such websites, a study that is outside the timeframe of writing this proposal. However, there is a great expectation that with the expansion of e-rulemaking throughout various departments of the federal government, there will be a high potential for an explosion in rule comment campaign websites in the future (Carlitz & Gunn, 2005; Mulberger, 2006; Shulman, 2004). Indeed, comments on individual proposed rules on [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) have, in the past, exceeded several thousand (Yang & Callan, 2006).

Finally, while the effectiveness of quantity versus quality is debatable in email writing campaigns to legislators, quantity is not a variable in e-rulemaking. By law, regulating agencies

must take into account every distinct perspective, but individual comments are not counted as votes; duplicate or near-duplicate comments are grouped together and addressed by category of perspective, meaning the sheer volume of duplicates has no impact on the consideration given to that perspective (Yang & Callan, 2006). Hence, the filtering out of large quantities of duplicate or near-duplicate comments has become a concern; one such study (Yang & Callan, 2006) on this filtering process was inspirational in developing the metric for my study, as I will explain later when I discuss my methods of analysis.

Hence the topic of this study is the effect of instructions on personalization of user-generated public policy discourse, but it draws examples of instructions from email writing campaign websites (due to the lack of rule comment campaign websites) and uses those instructions to purport the need for personalization in rule comment campaign websites (since the efficacy of personalization, or quality of comments, is not proven in writing to elected officials, whereas personalization is critical in e-rulemaking to avoid being grouped together with similar comments). The similarity of submission techniques between proposed comment writing websites and email writing websites (both offer “one-click” submissions) lends validity to such comparisons.

The Issue: Definitions of “Personalization”

As stated above, there is virtually no research on the effect of instructions on the personalization of form letters; however, there is a great deal of research devoted to asking questions in surveys and interviews. Fowler (1992) questions whether unclear terms in surveys can lead to skewed results due to a lack of participant understanding. One of Fowler’s concerns is whether unclear terms in healthcare surveys result in incorrect responses from participants, specifically whether there is an “a priori reason” for differences in results when a potentially

unclear term is better defined in a later interview (1992, p. 225). In those healthcare surveys, defining terms like “exercise” to mean “physical activity [...] including walking” will lead to a greater accuracy in responses, more specifically a higher number of participants responding that they regularly “exercise” (p. 222, 225).

Drawing on this concept, I assert that the issue in public policy correspondence concerns the definition of the word “personalize” or similar verbiage in the instructions of email writing campaign websites. In almost all of the websites I surveyed, no specific instructions were present to indicate what “personalize” means. For the purposes of e-rulemaking, personalize has a highly contextual definition: writing a comment that presents a perspective in such a way as to avoid getting grouped into broader, more general topics. The paradox of personalization that I mentioned above leads to the conclusion that because the efficacy of personalization has not been proven in email writing campaigns, definitions or strategies for personalization are not provided. However, I assert that if personalization is called for, the citizen-user will have difficulty carrying out personalization if there is no clear avenue of accomplishing personalization or no benchmark by which to compare his or her final, written correspondence. The user-citizen is left to determine what constitutes personalization to her; however, as Fowler (1992) would say, there are some situations where an open ended resolution to unclearly defined terms are not sufficient to generate adequate response from the participant (i.e. “What does it mean to you?” isn’t necessarily productive when factual responses are required, or as I would argue, when a specific level of personalization is necessary) (p. 219). At issue in this study is whether specific definitions of personalization will result in user-citizens effecting a higher degree of personalization in their public policy correspondence.

In addition to the issue of personalization, different websites utilize different formats for their email writing campaign websites to encourage personalization. Given the lack of research done in this area, I draw my knowledge of these instruction types from my survey of extant email writing campaign websites (appendix A). There are three main types of formats for these sites. First, many sites offer a form letter in a text box that is alterable by the user prior to submission. Second, at least one website I encountered allowed users to insert a paragraph of their own writing into an otherwise static form letter. Third, some websites listed talking points or an example letter and suggested that user-citizens utilize this information when composing their email. This issue of differential formatting is also important because it may impact the degree to which a user-generated correspondence is different from the original source material of the form letter or talking points, the uniqueness of the correspondence. Uniqueness is a significant concern in e-rulemaking in determining whether a comment is considered apart from a broader issue, and ultimately whether individual narratives are considered independently or grouped into a broad issue and made impotent to affect regulators.

Research Questions

To test the impact of the definition of “personalization” on the composition of unique content by users, this study will investigate how an enhanced definition of the concept of personalization impacts the uniqueness of the correspondence.

Question One:

Will instructions that specifically define the term “personalization” and offer strategies for personalizing form letters lead to a higher degree of uniqueness in user generated content than websites that simply instruct the user to personalize the text and do not provide a definition or personalization strategies.

The format of the webpage may also impact the degree of uniqueness in user generated correspondence. To test the impact of different formats on the uniqueness of user generated correspondence, this study will compare the relative uniqueness of correspondence generated under the guidance of the three specific formats mentioned above.

Question Two:

Will different webpage formats result in different levels of uniqueness of user generated content?

Hypotheses

It is expected that uniqueness of user generated correspondence will be greater with a clear definition of personalization and in a composition format that forces the user to start with a blank composition and draw from a sample letter when composing his or her correspondence.

H₀: Neither the presence of a detailed definition of “personalization” and techniques for personalization nor the format that participants use to generate content will have any impact on the relative uniqueness of user generated correspondence.

H₁: The presence of a detailed definition of “personalization” and techniques for personalization in the instructions will result in a significantly greater amount of uniqueness in user generated correspondence when compared to user generated correspondence composed in the same format, but lacking a detailed definition.

H₂: A format that requires users to generate their correspondence from a sample letter as opposed to modifying or manipulating an existing form letter will result in greater uniqueness of the final, written correspondence.

Although these hypotheses appear at first glance to be a foregone conclusion, I assert that these questions are currently answerable through anecdotal or axiomatic evidence only, and therefore

must be tested in a controlled setting. The hypotheses, therefore, can be considered analogous to the a priori explanations that Fowler (1992) uses to explain different response rates in his healthcare survey study; what this study will test is whether or not these a priori explanations match the data collected from participants.

Participants

Subjects will be chosen at random from the regular population using random digit dialing or a similar approach. To aid in obtaining volunteers, a token reward will be offered. In order to assure that participants have roughly the same education level and writing ability, the study will be limited to persons who speak and write primarily in English and have obtained a degree from a four year university. While this restricts the pool of potential subjects, it will ensure that a wide disparity does not occur between two or more groups in the experiment in terms of education level or writing ability. Additionally, this study is not interested in whether demographics influence uniqueness in user generated public policy correspondence, only whether the level of definition of “personalization” in the instructions and formatting of the composition method have an effect on uniqueness. As long as all subjects have a roughly equivalent exposure to writing instruction and a similar education level, the subjects should be equivalent. Through random number generation, participants will be placed into six groups as shown in figure one.

	Insertion of a Block of User Comments into a Static Form Letter	Alterable Form Letter in Text Box	Composition in Blank Text Box from Non-alterable Sample Letter
Basic Instructions (Unclear Definition of “Personalize”)	n=5	n=5	n=5
Detailed Instructions (Detailed Definition of “Personalize”)	n=5	n=5	n=5

Figure 1: Ideal distribution of participants into experimental groupings.

A matched group design could also be used for this experiment to control for demographics (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity), but since there are six groups, there is little chance of finding enough participants. Likewise, there are no discernable benefits from this approach as it will not aid in isolating the independent variables and demographics should have no impact on the dependent variables.

All written products will need to be from the same prompt and source material to make comparisons of the dependent variable; therefore, a within-subjects design is excluded since the carryover effect from writing on the same subject twice would influence the results. As such, a 2x3 between-subjects experimental design is warranted in this situation with six experimental groups of at least five participants.

Procedure

To ensure that the instructions and procedures are acceptable, a pilot study will be conducted where the experimenters run through the entire procedure of the experiment with one participant for each experimental group. If a problem occurs, additional pilot participants will complete the experiment in the problem group until the procedural problem is corrected and an acceptable result is obtained.

The experiment will take place in an unadorned room, similar to a higher education testing facility. The participants will sit at a desk with a computer, keyboard, and mouse. Participants will first complete a survey asking them about any potential factors that would impede or influence their ability to complete the writing task (e.g. inability to type). If a participant is found to have any issue that would taint the data, they will complete the experiment but their results will be discarded prior to analysis.

In order to replicate the exact formatting of a real-life website, a simple html document can be created to approximate the appearance of the three standard formatting types found in the survey of email writing campaign web pages. In the case of the alterable form letter, all of the text will appear inside a text box. For the paragraph insertion groups, the static form letter will appear on one half of the page with a blank text box on the other. The static form letter will have a notation that indicates where the user's typed comments will be inserted. For the sample letter group, the screen will again be divided in half, one side containing the non-alterable sample letter and the other containing a blank text box. Copy and past functionality will not be disabled, since this is a potential real-life composition strategy. The interfaces will be complete with a "submit" button that will store the user's information and redirect them to a second html screen thanking them for their participation. In each case, the form letter will be identical.

Participants will be told that they have up to thirty minutes to write and that they should click the submit button when they are finished, and they may then leave. The purpose of the study will be explained to the participants as an attempt by a local non-profit organization to gauge public opinion on a particular issue. Other than that, they will be given no instructions other than what is on the screen. Sample instructions are given in figure two.

Basic Instructions: Unclear Definition of "Personalize"	Detailed Instructions: Detailed Definition of "Personalize"
<p>The following letter is provided to help you express your opinion on this topic. Imagine that your letter will be read by government officials that are in a position to take action. Please personalize this letter by adding your own words.</p> <p>When you are satisfied with your letter, please click "submit."</p>	<p>The following letter is provided to help you express your opinion on this topic. Imagine that your letter will be read by government officials that are in a position to take action. Please personalize this letter by sharing a story about how this issue has affected you or someone you know, or by describing how this issue impacts people in your city or town. Personalized letters should contain information about your individual position on this topic in your own words.</p> <p>When you are satisfied with your letter, please click on "submit."</p>

Figure 2: Example of the two different types of instructions.

Although the change in the instructions is small, Fowler (1992) (drawing on prior, prolific research about the difference between responses to “not allow” and “forbid”) points out that even minor changes in wording can produce significant differences in participant response (p. 228). Since the goal is to examine behavior of participants based on their interpretation of the instructions, the participants will not be allowed to ask questions or talk during the experiment.

Method of Analysis

Yang and Callan (2006) have developed software which analyses sets of documents and identifies duplicates or near-duplicate documents. It is not necessary to utilize their software to analyze the results of this experiment; any document analysis software that performs a similar function may be used, such as software from a plagiarism detection site. However, their criteria for duplicates is highly relevant to this experiment, as the software was developed to detect near-duplicates in e-rulemaking to facilitate easier grouping of similar documents (Yang & Callan, 2006). In order to ensure that a correspondence is considered separately from a grouping of similar correspondence, it should ideally deviate sufficiently from the source material (the form letter) so that it does not fall into any of the categories found in figure three.

- Block Added: Add one or more paragraphs (<200 words) to a document;
- Block Deleted: Remove one or more paragraphs (<200 words) from a document;
- Key Block: Contains at least one paragraph from a document;
- Minor Change: A few words altered within a paragraph (<5% or 15 word change in a paragraph) ;
- Minor Change & Block Edit: A combination of minor change and block edit;
- Block Reordering: Reorder the same set of paragraphs;
- Repeated: Repeat the entire document several times in another document;
- Bag-of-word similar: >80% word overlap (not in above categories); and
- Exact: 100% word overlap.

Figure 3: Criteria for spotting near-duplicate documents reproduced from Yang and Callan, 2006, p. 422.

All final, written products will be analyzed by document analysis software to determine the amount of original content that has been added by the participant to determine relative uniqueness in each group to other groups. When comparing the groups, the mean, median, and mode of deviation scores will all be reported in the final study, but selective comparison may be warranted if outliers are present. Although Yang and Callan discuss using document metadata (server origin, email address domain, etc.), that part of their analysis does not apply to this study since it is primarily used to detect spam comments and this study is focusing on surface level changes to content, as opposed to whether or not the documents originated from the same author. The Yang and Callan study considers the positioning of text (i.e. rearranging text to make it appear unique) an important characteristic, but I assert that the most important measure of uniqueness will most likely be *percentage of word overlap* and the *total number of words* when compared to the original form letter. In the user generated written product, the lower the percentage of word overlap and the greater the deviation in number of words from the original form letter, the greater the uniqueness. It is unlikely that individual users, writing out of a spirit of sharing their opinions, would be motivated to rearrange existing content to make it appear new without actually adding new content.

Expected Outcomes

Each user generated final, written product is at risk for possessing one or more of the criteria found in figure three, except, I would argue, the “Exact” criterion (it is doubtful that anyone would submit their correspondence without making a single change to the form letter). This experiment compares written products across not only the differing instructions, but also the composition format types presented in the sample of web pages. Hence, each group will be rated in uniqueness based on the percentage of word overlap with the original form letter and number

or words in comparison with the word count of the original form letter. The reason for comparing groups using these two separate metrics is that written products with a great deal of personalization may have similar word counts simply because the stock language of the form letter is deleted and replaced with original content. Similarly, a written product might have drastically more or less words than the original form letter, but a small amount of original content.

I expect, according to my theory about basic versus detailed instructions, that all experimental groups that receive the detailed instructions will have produce products that, on average, possess a greater degree of uniqueness than those who received the basic instructions. The differences of percentage of uniqueness and comparative word count will need to be proven statistically significant when comparing written products in the basic and detailed instruction groups within format types.

To respond to research question two, whether format type impacts uniqueness, both metrics will have to be compared across format type within the type of instruction, basic or detailed. Since this independent variable was introduced to mirror the existing interfaces in the surveyed websites, there is no theoretical basis for predicting which format will generate the most unique content. It seems unlikely that the paragraph insertion format will generate the most unique compositions, however, since much of the form letter is unchangeable and users would have to generate a great deal of original content to change the percentage of original material. However, between the two remaining formats, we may be able to ask whether having text already in the text box versus reading from the sample letter and inputting text in a blank text box has anything to do with uniqueness. Again, any comparison would have to be proven statistically significant.

To summarize the expected outcomes in this study, I expect to find that the detailed instruction group will achieve a greater degree of personalization across the format groups. In a comparison of format groups to one another within instruction type, it is less clear which group will have the greatest degree of uniqueness.

Conclusions and Applications

The existence of many different formats and types of instructions suggests that a need for additional study exists, especially given the potential for greater amounts of user-citizen interaction in e-rulemaking and future e-government applications. Applications for this research will be useful not only to non-profit organizations and activist groups who wish to increase the personalization of user-citizen comments in appropriate contexts, but also to government agencies in order to avoid grouping individual user feedback with intentionally rehashed form letters.

Further research on the nature of instructions given to persons composing persuasive and personal correspondence to elected officials is in great need, and a study such as the one I am proposing here would fill a large research gap in technical communication. Usability studies exploring the interfaces I described here along with rhetorical analysis of the user generated written products these sites elicit are also interesting lines of research that would benefit from this study.

Appendix A

Organization and URL	Excerpts from Instructions	Format of Page
Physicians for a National Health Care Program http://salsa.democracynation.org/o/307/t/9290/campaign.jsp?campaign_KEY=27743	<p>Please Support Rep. Anthony Weiner's Single-Payer Amendment</p> <p>Use the form below to automatically send a letter supporting Rep. Anthony Weiner's single-payer amendment to your U.S. representative. We have sample text already in place, but feel free to modify it (e.g. by adding some details of your own experience or locale). After you have entered in your address information (so we know which representative to send your letter to), just click "Send My Message."</p>	Form letter in a text box
California Society of Anesthesiologists http://www.csahq.org/news_read.php?read=true&news=97	<p>In addition as President of the CSA, I have sent a letter to each and every congressional representative from California. A copy of the letter is pasted at the end of this Gasline and appears on the CSA Web Site. You should use the information on the ASA Web Site and in this letter as your talking points when you call or e-mail your representatives.</p>	Sample letter provided. User writes email independent of the website.
Health Care for America NOW! http://healthcareforamericanow.org/page/speakout/affordability	<p>Write a personal letter to your Representative, urging them to vote for a health care plan that makes care affordable.</p> <p>First, explain that rising health care costs are hurting you, all Americans, and our business. Feel free to include a personal health care story.</p> <p><i><<Talking points were present after each suggested topic, but were deleted from this Appendix>></i></p> <p>Next, explain that raising taxes for those who make more than \$250,000 per year is a fair way to pay for health care reform:</p> <p>Lastly, explain the benefits of the House bill, HR 3200 – America's Affordable Health Choices Act:</p> <p>Conclude by reminding your Representatives that they have a chance to make history by passing a health reform bill that truly makes health care affordable for all of us, or they could choose to side with the millionaires.</p> <p>Urge them to pass HR 3200, America's Affordable Health Choices Act.</p>	Blank text box (no form letter). Talking points and sample text provided
Democrats.com http://www.democrats.com/single-payer-petition	<p>Add your own personal message to your Congress:</p> <p><i><<text box>></i></p> <p>This is an important section. Your members of Congress want to know what you think. All comments should be appropriately respectful and in acceptable taste. The way to have maximum impact is by sending voting invitations to as many of your fellow constituents as possible and encourage them to make their voices heard also.</p>	Inserts personalized paragraph into otherwise static form letter

Restore Fairness http://action.restorefairness.org/o/6023/t/7236/p/dia/action/public/?action_KEY=1088	<<in text box>> [use our sample letter below or write your own here]	Form letter in a text box with a notation to insert a personalized paragraph (all text in the text box is alterable)
The Declaration of Peace http://declarationofpeace.org/campaign-updates/may-9-2009-tell-congress-stop-paying-for-war-mi	Send an e-mail to your Representative during the next three days. Tell him or her to vote “NO” on the “2009 Supplemental Appropriations” bill. We have provided a sample “Stop the War Funding” message. for your use. Click here. Even better: Write your message in your own words. Be direct. Express your passion for Peace! E-mail your Representative today!	Sample letter provided, but also talking points for writing a letter independent of the website
American Civil Liberties Union https://secure.aclu.org/site/Advocacy?pagename=homepage&id=1480&page=UserAction&JServSessionIdr004=y4jn5mgpu1.app26a	* Please personalize your message	Form letter in text box
American Farmland Trust http://action.farmland.org/site/PageServer?pagename=ActionSendALetter	Send concise, timely, factual and unemotional letters that are written in your own words.	No form letter→Just vague pointers for writing legislators.
American Jewish World Service https://secure.ajws.org/site/Advocacy?cmd=display&page=UserAction&id=461	Please personalize your message	Form letter in text box
Citizens Against Government Waste https://secure2.convio.net/cagw/site/Advocacy?cmd=display&page=UserAction&id=609	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete the form below with your information. 2. Make your letter stand out! Please take a moment to personalize the subject and text of the message on the right with your own words, if you wish. 3. Click the Next Step button to send your letter to these decision makers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Your Senators ○ Your Representative 	Form letter in text box

References

- Carlitz, R. & Gunn, R. (2005). e-Rulemaking: a New Avenue for Public Engagement. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 1(1), article 7.
- Fowler, F. (1992). How Unclear Terms Affect Survey Data. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 56, p. 218-231.
- Graham, Margaret B. & Lindeman, N. (2005). The Rhetoric and Politics of Science in the Case of the Missouri River System. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 19(4), 422-447.
- Kniesel, M. (2008). Rupturing Context, Resituating Genre: A Study of Use-of-Force Policy in the Wake of a Controversial Shooting. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 22(3), 330-363.
- Muhlberger, P. (2006). Should E-Government Design for Citizen Participation?: Stealth Democracy and Deliberation. *Proceedings of the 2006 International Conference on Digital Government Research*, p. 53-61.
- Rude, Carolyn D. (2004) Toward an Expanded Concept of Rhetorical Delivery: The Uses of Reports in Public Policy Debates. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 13(3), 271-288.
- Spoel, P., Goforth, D., Cheu, H., & Pearson, D. (2009). Public Communication of Climate Change Science: Engaging Citizens Through Apocalyptic Narrative Explanation. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 18(1), 49-81.
- Sidler, M. & Jones, N. (2009). Genetics Interfaces: Representing Science and Enacting Public Discourse in Online Spaces. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 18(1), 28-48.
- Shulman, S. The Internet Still Might (but Probably Won't) Change Everything: Stakeholder Views on the Future of Electronic Rulemaking. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.

- Tillery, D. (2003). Radioactive Waste and Technical Doubts: Genre and Environment Opposition to Nuclear Waste Sites. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 12(4), 405-421.
- Williams, M. (2009). Understanding Public Policy Development as a Technological Process. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 23(4), 448-462.
- Wallace, D. (2003). Writing and the Management of Power: Producing Public Policy in New Zealand. In Charles Bazerman and David R. Russell (Eds.), *Writing Selves/Writing Societies: Research from Activity Perspectives* (pp. 159-178). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse. Taken 14 October 2009 from http://wac.colostate.edu/books/selves_societies/.
- Yang, H. & Callan, J. (2006). Near-Duplicate Detection by Instance-Level Constrained Clustering. *Proceedings of the 29th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, p. 421-428.