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Abstract
The aim of this thesis is to assess whether agency advocacy in newspapers debate articles has increased since the 1970’s and what forms agency advocacy take. This is done by investigating if the number or share of debate articles written by agencies increased from the 1970’s to the 2000’s, what types of communication approaches and subjects that are used over the years. The theoretical approach is based on research about new public management (NPM) and mediatisation through a normative institutionalist perspective. It is mainly a quantitative study where we collect debate articles from four different decades and code the content according to three ideal types: information, agency advocacy by promoting issue and agency advocacy by legitimating agency. The thesis finds that the share and to some extent the number of debate articles has increased over the years, which supports the NPM theory and in part mediatisation theory. All ideal types are present; agency advocacy exists in all analysed debate articles while information is highly absent. There is little change over the years which make it difficult to assess which theory that is supported.
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**Introduction and General Aim**

The Western democratic states circle around democracy and Sweden is no exception. Swedes have high trust in how the public administration works.¹ Most people are familiar with the classical understanding of democracy; citizens elect politicians to represent the public opinion and the politicians then make decisions that are implemented by the public administration.² The public administration is, in the classical understanding, staffed by neutral implementers of laws; this is one of the keys that bring legitimacy to the system.³ But how does this understanding explain the statement in a debate article written by the general director of Naturvårdsverket?

“What we are experiencing right now is how the Nordic environmental question is becoming politicised. Political co-operations and political programs aim primarily at reaching common successful plans and practical co-operation. But when it comes to the management of Nordic environment the development seems to be the opposite. An effective and intimate practical co-operation seems to be returned to discussions between politicians.” (DN; February 25, 1989)

Not only does the general director claim that the politicians are disturbing the public administration in its work but also that the politicians will tear down the current well-functioning system. Is not this a strange thing for a top civil servant to write in Sweden’s most distributed morning paper? Let us quote the end of the debate article:

“Nordic environmental agencies, experts and researchers know each other. We also know how to co-operate and where the co-operation is needed and will be most useful. This is the most important work, not the political superstructure, even if that is necessary.”

What is this? The general director seems to suggest that their work is better performed without political influences. This does not sound neutral at all, but like advocacy... Has something happened to the democratic chain? Rothstein, professor in political science, writes “through the development of a system with ideological agencies one turns this [the classical understanding of democracy] upside down and establishes the opposite principle – that democracy is when the people does what the state wants”.⁴

This societal problem of a backward democracy has been recognized by a handful of researchers that write that the state has come to reproduce itself by producing public opinions that are transferred to

---

¹ Rothstein (2010); 7-8
² Hall & Löfgren (2006); 139
³ Wennnergren (2004); 22
⁴ Kjellgren & Johansson (2008); 98
⁵ Rothstein (2005); 217
its citizens. The two-folded dilemma is that when we speak of "state" we mainly mean the agencies and civil servants in the public administration and not the democratically elected politicians. Rothstein writes in a study about public administration in Sweden that a shift occurred from the 1970’s to the 1990’s so that today’s agencies increasingly have become producers of ideology instead of implementers of law. The question of “who is in charge” is almost as old as bureaucracy itself, but this question is traditionally more directed towards the individual relationships between politicians and civil servants and not so much towards the conflicts between the independent agencies and the governing politicians as a group. Public administration is a well grounded topic in political science and this new critique against agencies calls for investigations.

With this thesis we aim to gain understanding of a new aspect of public administration namely agency advocacy. The term “agency advocacy” is still a new concept, so new that the definitions of it are overshadowed by the legal discussion. This thesis will not look at whether or not agency advocacy is right or wrong but how it looks and appears over time. It is interesting to investigate how agency advocacy appears in a time perspective since that can allow us to put agency advocacy in perspective to certain bureaucratic and societal changes. It is also interesting to see how it is used by agencies; could it be that we see the tip of an iceberg? And what does agency advocacy contain? It is not enough to say that an agency advocates in the same way as it is not enough to say that John Stuart Mill used to talk a lot since he was a philosopher; one also wants to know what he said.

This will be a descriptive thesis that will map the occurrence of agency advocacy in newspapers’ debate articles. Our thesis consists of six chapters. A literature review where we summarise the findings from previous research on agency advocacy, new public management and mediatisation. A theoretical approach where we describe the theories of new public management and mediatisation and connect them to the normative institutionalist perspective. The specified aim and research questions will guide our data collection and analysis. In the methods chapter we describe and motivate the methods we will use to collect data. In results/analysis we present the findings from our data collection and how these findings relate to our theories. In conclusions the findings and implications of our thesis are discussed and summarised.

---

5 Kjellgren (2002); 9
6 Rothstein (2005); 215-217
Literature Review

Something has changed...

Researchers in political science have noticed a change in how agencies work during the last decades; that they seem to have become increasingly advocating. There are few studies conducted on this topic and even fewer conducted in Sweden. Some of the main Swedish researchers are Rothstein, Kjellgren and Johansson. The topic has also been touched by Swedish Government Official Reports in SOU 2007:107, which looked at debate articles in newspapers between 1997 and 2007 and found an increase from 1997 to 2005 and after that a decrease. Swedish research has mainly focused on normative questions; whether advocacy is something agencies should perform and if it can be part of their information activities or if it is always state propaganda. SOU 2007:107 concludes that agency advocacy could be acceptable if the politicians have decided that it is part of the agency’s tasks or if it enables the agency to reach stated goals. Also Kjellgren and Johansson recognize that agencies could be assigned to advocate; leading to that normative stance depends on which perspective one has. Rothstein, on the other hand, points out that all types of agencies’ advocating activities are prohibited by the constitution and therefore illegal. Another researcher that has touched the subject of agency advocacy, but on an international level, is Yeung, professor at Kings College in London, who has investigated how agencies can use different strategies to legitimate themselves.

These researchers have different ways of looking at how agency advocacy is defined and explained. The fractured way in how agency advocacy has been investigated has led to that researchers have found different aspects of it. We will develop “agency advocacy” further in the theory chapter but as a short summary “agency advocacy” can be explained, by how Rothstein, SOU 2007:107 and Kjellgren and Johansson discuss it, as the external communication agencies use when they promote an issue or legitimates themselves. Promote/legitimating stands in this context in opposition to inform. Whether or not an agency informs or advocates it is still using a communication approach. Communication approaches will be the collective term for information and advocacy. Agency advocacy can take form in different ways; it can either be inward the state organisation or outward towards society. Our focus is on the external agency advocacy that mainly takes form through media. Media is a wide

---

7 Rothstein (2005)
Kjellgren (2002)
Kjellgren & Johansson (2008)
8 SOU (2007); 10
9 SOU (2007); 9 and 81
10 Kjellgren & Johansson (2008); 99
11 Blomqvist & Rothstein (2000); 19 and 24
Rothstein (2005); 216-217
12 Yeung (2009)
concept that includes not only TV, radio and newspapers but also internet and telephones. Said in a simplified way, media is the channel that enables communication to function. We will only focus on the mass media, which is characterised by being a one-way, impersonal and public form of communication, which should reach everyone at the same time.

**Reasons for increased agency advocacy?**

Swedish research has tried to explain the assumed increase in agency advocacy in different ways. SOU 2007:107 points to the development of the information society and media. Rothstein relates the development to the changed bureaucratic structure. Kjellgren and Johansson acknowledge both factors as influencers. Few studies are made but the researchers are supported in their claims by research covering bureaucratic reform and mediatisation.

**Bureaucratic reforms in the late 20th century**

Agency advocacy can be connected to the reformation of bureaucracy. Rothstein claims that there has been a shift of purpose in Swedish agencies; that they during the 1970’s were created to implement political decisions; something that changed in the 1990’s when the main purpose became more connected to ideology production. Ideology production is traditionally a task for political parties as they produce policies but as Rothstein claims it is today also a task that agency directors perform.

The traditional view of bureaucracy is the one held by Max Weber; strictly hierarchical, ruled by law and staffed with *impersonal and neutral civil servants*. But during the 1980’s a major international reform emerged known as New Public Management (NPM); the idea was that state agencies should be run more like private companies. The agencies became more decentralized and autonomous as they moved further away from the ministries. One of the main NPM changes was the new emphasis on management by goals and results instead of management by detailed laws. Some researchers state that when management by goals and results is in use it can be argued that agencies are *supposed* to participate in advocacy and policy making. NPM was an international reform but it was

---

13 Berglez & Olausson (2009); 10
14 Nord & Strömbäck (2004); 17
15 SOU (2007); 24
16 Rothstein (2005); 215
17 Kjellgren & Johansson (2008); 98 and 100
18 Rothstein (2005); 215
19 Rothstein (2005); 213
20 Kjellgren & Johansson (2008); 100
21 Peters (2004); 326
22 Peters (2004); 314
23 Wennergren (2004); 2
implemented to different degrees by different countries. All agencies must therefore, in an international perspective, be expected to differ from one another. Nevertheless, Peters provides a general summary of what purpose an agency should have; it should be relatively autonomous from the politicians, have a single-purpose character with the task of implementing political decisions in a “business-like manner”. A definition provided by Swedish researchers on Swedish agencies is that an agency is a part of the state with activities based on instructions that are provided by parliament or government. It is important for us to distinguish between national and international research since we will only collect data from Swedish agencies. One must be careful when using international research but it can be applied on Swedish agencies on a general level; Weber’s view of bureaucracy constitute the international framework of public administration and Yeung’s study gives the aspect that advocacy among agencies is an international phenomenon. In research about NPM Sweden is often clustered with the other Nordic countries and the Netherlands, therefore, Sweden is included in international research – but on a general level.

To come back to bureaucratic reform and NPM in Sweden, Sweden is a specific case in the way that one implemented something one already had. Sweden has used agencies since the 15th century and the agencies have a long tradition of being highly independent. The part of NPM that was implemented was the shift to management by goals and results instead of management by detailed rules. Swedish agencies have worked with management by goals and results since the beginning of the 1980’s, which could support Rothstein’s statement that Swedish agencies in the 1990’s changed their directions towards ideology production. This contrasts to the traditional purpose of agencies, international as well as national, which is to implement political decisions. An important implication with this new system is that the increased distance between state and agency makes it harder for the politicians to control what the agencies actually do, even though the politicians are those ultimately responsible.

Kjellgren & Johansson (2008); 100
Pollitt & Bouckaert (2004); 98
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Premfors et al (2009); 162
Yeung (2009)
Pollitt & Bouckaert (2004); 97
Wennnergren (2004); 30
Pollitt & Bouckaert (2004); 287
Hall & Löfgren (2006); 208
Peters (2004); 137
Hall & Löfgren (2006); 147
Peters (2004); 214
Blomqvist & Rothstein (2000); 16
Hall & Löfgren (2006); 89
Agency reform research supports Rothstein, Kjellgren and Johansson claims about agency advocacy and is therefore important to include. The agency advocacy we will study is mainly visible in newspapers, a development that can be explained by mediatisation.

**The relevance of mediatisation**

Agency advocacy is not only related to research about bureaucratic reform but also to how agencies communicate and deal with media. Some researchers recognize that a connection could be drawn between research in political science and communication, this link is however not fully developed. Esaiasson et al. note that research in social science is often restricted to its different areas and that researchers often adhere to these fields of specialty, even though new combinations of fields could bring new findings.\(^{32}\) Research in political science and communication has started to combine their efforts but, as we see it, communication researchers tend to view the state in a simplified way; as a single unit, missing the complexity of the state-agency relationship. And researchers in political science tend to miss how mediatisation influences agencies communication activities; that one must be visible in media in order to matter.\(^{33}\) Rothstein mentions that Swedish agency managers often are seen as newspaper debaters and Yeung that agencies “adopt distinctive presentational styles” and that the hired PR staff “translate the agency’s messages into accessible, media-friendly formats”.\(^{34}\) But they both see agencies communication approaches in newspapers more like working procedures and not that mediatisation could be an underlying reason for agency advocacy. SOU 2007:107 and Kjellgren mention parallels between the development of the information society and the development of media, but in very wide perspectives.\(^{35}\) Only Kjellgren and Johansson use both bureaucracy and mediatisation as possible factors for the assumed agency advocacy development, even if the term “mediatisation” is not used directly.\(^{36}\)

International research of mediatisation can on a general level, just as bureaucratic reform, be applied on Sweden. Among Nordic researchers Hjarvard is a leading name when it comes to explaining mediatisation. Hjarvard notes that mediatisation is not only a political topic, but a general societal change where media has become “an independent institution that stands between other cultural and social institutions and coordinates their mutual interaction.”\(^{37}\) This means that mediatisation is acknowledged as an important influencer when it comes to societal actions and therefore we mean

\(^{32}\) Esaiasson et al. (2007); 31-32

\(^{33}\) Strömberg (2009); 23

\(^{34}\) Falkheimer & Heide (2007); 93

\(^{35}\) Yeung (2009); 289 and 291

\(^{36}\) Kjellgren & Johansson (2008)

\(^{37}\) Hjarvard (2008); 106
that mediatisation must be included in the agency advocacy research area. Mediatisation, as a concept, is relatively new; first mentioned by Asp in 1986 in the sense that politicians increasingly need to adapt to the conditions stated by media in order to reach the citizens. This explains that there is a media dependency. Most mediatisation researchers share Asp’s basic definition but there is some variation to whether the focus is on a political or a general level.

Communication researchers summarize the importance of their subject in a very clear way; that communication influences the entire society. Firstly by that “One cannot choose to not communicate” and secondly that “communication is never neutral” since one must always select what to say. When this is put in context with an independent media one understands that media always select what to publish which naturally leads to a biased view of society. Media was once mainly a tool of the state but is today an independent institution. This combined with the fact that mass-communication is said to be the main medium politicians and agencies must go through when advocating, could be seen as a sign of mediatisation. Since the state nowadays cannot use media as a tool it must catch media’s attention. To be able to catch media’s attention actors must be skilled in information and pr, which is often directly linked to the “media logic”. The media logic is shortly explained the conditions the politicians must adapt to and consists of different techniques and strategies.

**Gap**

In the literature over conducted studies we have noticed a few things; one of the major gaps is that:

1. One has not investigated whether or not there has been a change over time in agency advocacy, rather this has been taken for granted.

---

38 Hjarvard (2008); 106
39 Larsson (2005); 29
Berglez & Olausson (2009); 26
Strömbäck (2004); 290
40 Strömbäck (2009); 9
41 Strömbäck, p. 242
42 Hjarvard (2008); 106
43 Strömbäck (2009); 237
Yeung (2009); 288
44 Falkheimer & Heide (2007); 13
Bäck & Larsson (2008); 59
Strömbäck (2009); 157 and 248 and 244
45 Strömbäck (2009); 248
46 Hjarvard (2008); 107
Nord & Strömbäck (2004); 15
Rothstein is very clear over that there has been a change, and he does exemplify his findings with real world examples. But he chooses his cases in a selective way; automatically confirming his claims. He does not perform any time-studies or larger surveys to see how common it is for agencies to advocate. SOU 2007:107 does look at agencies appearances in debate articles, but the time span 1997-2007 is too short to be used as a tool to analyze change over time in the way we intend to do it. They have also chosen to limit their study by only including articles written by the managers of 50 agencies. We will in the first research question look at all articles, signed by both managers and employees, presenting both author and agency. Kjellgren looks at state information in general and does not take agencies into special consideration. Kjellgren and Johansson will look at debate articles from one election year for each decade (1970-2010), but they will not look at if the number of debate articles has increased but rather how the content has changed. Yeung does not look at Swedish agencies, she looks at press releases and not debate articles and the only years she investigates is 1998 – 2005. SOU 2007:107 and Yeung have chosen agencies in advance or had a fixed number of agencies to investigate. We will in our study look at the articles written by agencies that are in the newspapers debate articles. Our sample will be collected from the years we have chosen to investigate and not from pre-decided agencies. We have chosen to do it this way since we do not know which agencies we could expect to advocate. SOU 2007:107 has performed a random sample with 50 agencies and should therefore be able to detect agency advocacy. We will however detect all agency advocacy in debate articles (in DN) in our chosen years.

The discussion about information and advocacy becomes a bit vague since the meaning of agency advocacy shifts between the studies;

2. There is no clear distinction of the concept “agency advocacy”.

The studies performed by the Swedish researchers about agency advocacy are mainly about whether or not it is wrong for agencies to advocate. The discussion about the term itself is not as developed as the normative views concerning right/wrong. Based on what we have read there seem to exist different kinds of agency advocacy. The distinctions between different kinds of agency advocacy are, however, not fully developed and this gap invites us to sharpen the concept and how it better can be understood. As we will develop further in the theory chapter, agency advocacy is not a solid concept but, by looking at previous research, contains two sub-categories.

47 Kjellgren & Johansson (2008); 103
48 Yeung (2009); 278
Our contribution

We will in our thesis contribute by covering the above stated gaps. It is mainly an empirical contribution since we will investigate if there has been a development over time or not. We will also investigate what the different sub-categories in agency advocacy look like. The latter part will be more of a theoretical contribution since it will help to clarify the meaning of “agency advocacy”. Another theoretical contribution will be that we connect mediatisation with the research about agency advocacy. We will not investigate whether agency advocacy is right or wrong but rather how it looks. This is something else, not investigated in previous research.

Theoretical approach

How does NPM and mediatisation increase agency advocacy?

In our investigation of whether there has been a change over time in agency advocacy or not we rely on research about bureaucratic reform and mediatisation. As shown in figure 1 the causal claim in this thesis is that bureaucratic reforms and mediatisation both create institutional norms in agencies that increase the use of agency advocacy. The question asked is if there has been an increase in agency advocacy or not and in that case what kind of advocacy.

![Figure 1 Causal Relationship between Bureaucratic Reform, Mediatisation and Agency Advocacy](image)

We will not look at the relationship *between* bureaucratic reform and mediatisation but how both can be applied in an institutionalist perspective to explain the same phenomenon. The explanations go in the same direction and can both explain why agency advocacy should increase. However, they measure *increase* differently. Shortly explained; NPM supports an increase in both share and number of debate articles written by agencies. Rothstein has written that agencies, some more than others, have come to see debate as an important tool that they increasingly use.\(^{49}\) This means that not only should the number of articles written by agencies increase but the share of articles should as well. That the share increases means that the number of articles written by agencies increases in relation to articles written by other actors; the agency *wins* space. Mediatisation explains why there should

---

\(^{49}\) Rothstein (2005); 210-211
be an increase in articles written by agencies and other actors. Therefore, mediatisation explains increase in number of articles but not in share. We will not put much focus on the relationship between cause and effect but rather establish if the effects (agency advocacy) are present. We will use the normative angle of new institutionalism, developed by March and Olsen, which regards institutions as independent social forces but also as human products.\textsuperscript{50} Normative institutionalism relates to our study since it recognizes that “seemingly neutral rules and structures actually embody values (and power relationships), and determine ‘appropriate’ behaviour within given settings”.\textsuperscript{51} Lowndes has summarized normative institutionalism as a study of “how the norms and values embodied in political institutions shape the behaviour of individuals”.\textsuperscript{52} As we see it, not only bureaucracy should be regarded as an institution, but also the media. Political institutions are no longer equated with political organizations but instead “stable, recurring pattern of behaviour”.\textsuperscript{53} New institutionalism can be placed under the meta-theory of realism with which it share several aspects; that there are formal structures that can be studied directly, but also hidden structures, embedded in the system, that affect everyday life and must be studied by inference.\textsuperscript{54} This relates to our study since we do not study the influence of bureaucratic reforms and mediatisation on agency advocacy directly, instead we can see it through the number, share and content of debate articles in newspapers.

**Bureaucratic reform: NPM and normative institutionalism**

Rothstein mentions a shift in Swedish agencies’ purpose, a statement which is supported by Pollitt and Bouckaert and Premfors et al. as they write that Swedish agencies during the mid 1990’s received more delegated power from the politicians than previously.\textsuperscript{55} Premfors et al.’s book about public administration also supports Rothstein as it explains that management by goals and results was introduced in Sweden during the late 1980’s and has been emphasized since then, with extra stress during the first half of the 1990’s.\textsuperscript{56} Many researchers, nationally as well as internationally, agree that agencies have received increased responsibilities and also add that agencies, due to lack

\textsuperscript{50} Lowndes (2002); 65 and 76
\textsuperscript{51} Lowndes (2002); 65
\textsuperscript{52} Lowndes (2002); 65
\textsuperscript{53} Lowndes (2002); 61
\textsuperscript{54} Lowndes (2002); 71
\textsuperscript{55} Pollitt & Bouckaert (2004); 89
\textsuperscript{56} Premfors et al. (2009); 285
of detailed instructions, are required to make their own political judgements. 57 Thus, there seems to be a trend in modern society to delegate responsibility away from the state to independent agencies; agencification. The distance between state and agencies could, according to Yeung, have led to that agencies “may be under considerable pressure to demonstrate the legitimacy of their decisions and the regime they administer.” 58 At a Swedish level, Kjellgren and Johansson also point out that legitimacy could be part of agency advocacy. 59 NPM could thus lead to agency advocacy either by promoting issues, as agencies are required to make own judgments, or by legitimating the agency itself.

When it comes to bureaucracy as institutions, March and Olsen argue that “the bureaucratic agency [...] are arenas for contending social forces [...] that define and defend interests. They are political actors in their own right.” 60 This can explain why there is agency advocacy and that agencies often act on their own, as they are separated from the politicians. Normative institutionalists put focus on how institutions evolve over time; they do, however, not deny the possibility that reforms can be initiated by individual actors but then notes that it is hard to control the effects when institutions are changed rapidly, as in the NPM reform. 61 March and Olsen write that “the organization of political life makes a difference”. 62 This means that the structure which NPM has gives outcomes that would not have come if NPM had not been introduced. This may sound obvious but one can think of it like this; the aim of the Swedish NPM reform was to increase efficiency by decentralising, an unexpected outcome is that agencies suddenly seem to advocate independently from the politicians. Normative institutionalists do not deny that people can be driven by “rational choices” but emphasize that it is more common to be driven of what can be called “appropriate behaviour” taking e.g. factors such as duty, obligations, rules, beliefs and roles into account. 63 According to this view, NPM may have made agency advocacy an appropriate behaviour since agencies got more delegated power.

Mediatisation: the evolvement of a new institution

Swedish research state that there is no doubt that “politics has become increasingly mediatisated” during the last decades and that politics during the last 20 years increasingly has been regarded as

57 Hall & Löfgren (2006); 207
Peters (2004); 196
Wennergren (2004); 42
Molander et al. (2002); 9
58 Yeung (2009); 274
59 Kjellgren & Johansson (2008); 103
March & Olsen (1984); 738
60 March & Olsen (2002); 76
61 March & Olsen (1984); 747
62 March & Olsen (1989); 22
mediatised. Three concepts are important here: media, which is a tool for communication, mediation, which means that communication takes place through media instead of face to face and mediatisation, which is a process through which media gains influence over society. Strömbäck agrees with Hjarvard that basic mediatisation is not only a political concept, but something that concerns the whole society and adds that political actors, media and the public nowadays are interdependent. When we speak about mediatisation we focus on the political mediatisation; a theory about “the increased influence media have over politics, political process and advocacy”.

Communication researchers make the claim that media has become the main supplier of information. This goes in line with mediatisation and that one must be visible in order to matter, explaining why media appearance is so important. The trend in society to be more visible in media has led to that there is a limited media space, conflicting with an overload of external communication. This development has led to media selecting news and publishing what they think people will be interested in at the same time as those who strive for media space adjust their “information” to the media logic; making it more likely that their information is selected. Therefore, information must be interesting to read; the more intense the better. This could explain why advocacy has become a factor. The stress to be seen in media means that agencies must communicate strategically. “Strategic communication” is used by agencies for many reasons; one of the most important is to legitimize themselves. By using external communication one does not only remind actors outside the agency why it is necessary for the agency to exist but one also creates and redefines what the agency stands for both in- and outward, reminding everyone why the agency matters. Therefore, mediatisation can lead to that agencies legitimate themselves.

Normative institutionalism allows the evolvement of mediatisation. When media became an independent actor, a “recurring pattern of behaviour” took form and slowly evolved into an institution. March and Olsen are mainly concerned with political organisations, but their theory can also be used to explain mediatisation and the role of media. They write that “political institutions

---

64 Strömbäck (2009); 244 and 239
65 Strömbäck (2009); 239-240
Berglez & Olausson (2009); 10
66 Strömbäck (2009); 237
67 Strömbäck (2009); 239
68 Nord & Strömbäck (2004); 14-15
69 Hjarvard (2008); 107
70 Strömbäck (2009); 241
71 Asp (1986); 360-361
72 Falkheimer & Heide (2007); 119-120
73 Crozier (2008); 8 and 13
Chouliaraki & Morsing (2010); 1
Falkheimer & Heide (2007); 13 and 91
affect the distribution of resources, which in turn affects the power of political actors, and thereby affects political institutions”.

Media can be included in their definitions of political institutions since media has become an important actor in the field of politics. Since media decide what to publish, they are in charge of the distribution of communication resources, something that affects the power of political actors, which affects the institutions. Our view of media as independent institution is supported by Hjarvard. His work in describing how mediatisation functions is in many ways connected to March and Olsen’s work about institutions. That mediatisation, as well as the state, has a dual structure; it is created by society at the same time as it independently coordinates and influences society. According to normative institutionalism, political actors often work according to “standard operational procedure” (specific rules of behaviour that has become standardized for agents). This can be connected to the media logic which is also a type of “standard operational procedure” when it comes to gaining media space. The strive for media space could similarly be explained as something subconscious as institutions “simplify political life by insuring that some things are taken as given in deciding other things”. Most agencies today have highly skilled communication staff as well as media trained directors which shows that mediatisation has created an appropriate behaviour when it comes to communicating.

Analytical framework: what is agency advocacy?
Previous research and our theories about bureaucratic reforms, mediatisation and new institutionalism have explained why agency advocacy is likely to occur. They do, however, not develop or look deeper into the concept of “agency advocacy” and, as we have already mentioned, the concept could be further developed; something we will contribute with. Previous research by Rothstein, SOU 2007:107 and Kjellgren and Johansson has pointed out what seems to be two main categories within agency advocacy (advocacy by promoting issues and advocacy by legitimating agency) and one category that contrasts to it (information). As mentioned in the literature review, information is never neutral. However, all researchers studying agency advocacy agree that agencies can handle information impartially. Rothstein is the one who contrasts advocacy with information most strictly; according to him everything besides impersonal information about laws and regulations is illegal and equivalent to agency advocacy. SOU 2007:107 and Kjellgren and
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Johansson, on the other hand, distinguish more between information and *propaganda*. They recognize that an agency could be asked to advocate by the State to either actively inform about certain issues or about the agency’s activities, making agency advocacy something that could be legal since it becomes a part of the agency’s information activity.⁸² The focus is many times on whether agency advocacy is to be seen as legal or not. Since we are not interested in the normative discussion about legality/illegality but the concept of agency advocacy we have chosen Rothstein’s perspective where agency advocacy is a distinct category. Rothstein’s perspective only allows information to be defined in the narrowest way; impartially about laws and decisions taken by politicians, legislative proposals and other actors. This definition of information allows us to use a rather broad definition of agency advocacy. Agency advocacy is everything that an agency communicates that could produce or affect opinions.

We have clarified “agency advocacy” by dividing it into two categories. These categories were found in Kjellgren and Johansson’s definition. They define advocacy as “the part of an agency’s communication with the surrounding society which aims to affect people’s opinions, attitudes and values in different questions or to offer a positive image of the agency’s activities.”⁸³ From this we understand that agencies both could *promote issues* and *legitimate themselves*. Promoting issues can be defined as advocacy that tries to affect people’s values and behaviour related to certain issues (first part of Kjellgren and Johansson’s definition). These issues could be explained as being of a thematic character; e.g. debate about couple relations and sparsely populated areas.⁸⁴ Legitimating advocacy can be defined as advocacy that puts focus on the agency in the way that everything is in relation to the agency’s future or past activities (second part of Kjellgren’s and Johansson’s definition). SOU 2007:107 highlights the same features of agency advocacy by promoting issue as Kjellgren and Johansson, but not agency advocacy by legitimating agency.⁸⁵ Rothstein does not provide a clear definition of agencies advocacy, but seems to focus on agency advocacy by promoting issue since he brings up that agency advocacy is illegal and should only be performed by politicians.⁸⁶ Yeung is the one who mainly looks at agency advocacy by legitimating agency.⁸⁷ To summarize the communication approaches, the ideal for information is communication that only consists of completely impartial and neutral text about other actors and laws. Legitimating advocacy is in its purest form when one *only* discusses the agency’s right to exist and nothing else. The ideal for
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advocacy by promoting issue is when the agency only discusses the issue and not how the issue relates to the agency.

**Our pre-stated subjects**

To be able to distinguish between the different categories within agencies’ communication approaches; *agency advocacy by promoting issue, agency advocacy by legitimating agency* and *information* we have stated some subjects, see figure 2, that the debate articles could be about and how our categories should respond to them. We have found the subjects in previous research but since agency advocacy has not been fully defined, not all categories have been represented in each subject. In the subjects where no examples from previous research have been available we have developed standpoints according to how agencies *should* react in a certain category. To do this is one of our contributions when it comes to investigating agency advocacy.

The first subject is about how agencies can respond to “adopted laws”. Kjellgren and Johansson, SOU 2007:107 and Rothstein all agree that impartial communication about adopted laws and regulations is to be defined as information.\(^{88}\) If an agency informs about a new law one should expect that it only informs about it impartially and when it comes into effect. Agencies could also inform about laws that have existed for some time, but this will only be seen as information when it is not used to promote an issue or legitimate the agency. Advocating agencies would respond differently; they would either take a stance on why the new law is good or bad according to either thematic issues or agencies’ activities (legitimating). This subject is important since agencies traditionally are supposed to implement laws; therefore they should not have an opinion about them.\(^{89}\)

Next subject is about “legislative proposals”. This subject is in many ways related to the first subject; agencies can inform about legislate proposals as part of their impartial communication.\(^{90}\) When agencies advocate it is either to raise support for or against the proposal and the incentive could either be related to thematic issue or agency itself. Legislative proposals only refer to legislative proposals from the politicians. If agencies propose new laws it will be seen as promoting issue in topic under debate. As mentioned above, the traditional task for agencies is to implement laws and not take part in decision-making.
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The subject “topic under debate” refers to how agencies deal with questions of societal relevance. For this subject, we recognize that impartial information hardly could take place since this subject is heavily related to having an opinion. When agencies take a stance on a topic and argue why it is good or bad for society or that something should be done it will be seen as promoting issue and when they discuss how topic under debate is related to the agency it will be seen as legitimating agency. This subject is important since Rothstein has acknowledged that debate traditionally is a task for politicians and not agencies. The subject recognises that agencies can advocate on their own initiative and do not only respond to external actors or events.

“Internal activities” refers to when agencies describe what they do. They legitimate themselves by showing society the activities they perform and how they contribute. This could e.g. take the form of self-criticism as an agency admits problems but promises to improve. Kjellgren and Johansson write in their work that agencies can use descriptions of their activities to legitimate their existence, and that agencies today are supposed to do this to a higher extent. This subject is important since agencies often are required to communicate about their activities; it is, however, debated whether or not it should be seen as information or advocacy. Our view is that this is advocacy since it works as a tool for agencies to show the use they provide. Since the agency always is in focus legitimacy is the only category this subject applies to.

The last subject “other actors” will help us to see how the different communication approaches deal with other actors. When it comes to advocacy the agencies can either legitimate themselves by showing the inadequate or well performed work of others or promote issues by showing how other actors affect thematic issue. Rothstein brings up the example of when JämO reacted against Folkhälsoinstitutet’s campaign about relationships for youths since it undermined JämO’s activities for sexual tolerance. This example shows both that JämO pointed to how Folkhälsoinstitutet handled the issue poorly and that JämO performed better. This subject only includes comments about what other actors are doing. If agencies recommend other actors to do something it will be seen as promoting issue in topic under debate. When it comes to information there is no example from the previous literature. We do, however, recognise that it could be situations where an agency informs about other actors impartially, e.g. Länsstyrelserna. Länsstyrelserna act as co-ordinators and are therefore likely to inform about other actors’ work in the county. This subject is important to include because agencies work independently of each other and could collide.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication approaches</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-stated subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Promote issues</strong></td>
<td><strong>Legitimate agency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New laws/decisions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Abolish or strengthen law/decision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adopted laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What the legislative proposal is about</strong></td>
<td><strong>Raise support for or against proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legislative proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>Take stance to either promote or fight</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Topic under debate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internal activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other actors e.g. agencies</td>
<td><strong>Information about other actors not in relation to agency or promoted issue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments for or against others activities</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specified Aim and Research Questions

The aim of this thesis is to assess whether agency advocacy in newspapers debate articles has increased since the 1970’s, as research about bureaucratic reform and mediatisation implies. We also aim to clarify the different forms agency advocacy can take. This will be done through answering the following research questions:

1. Have the number or share of debate articles written by agencies increased from the 1970’s to 2000’s?
2. What types of communication approaches, and subjects within the approaches, are used in debate articles over the years; information, agency advocacy by promoting issue or agency advocacy by legitimating agency?

Research Design and Methods

Research Design

This thesis will be a descriptive one investigating first how common it is for agencies to write debate articles and secondly how common agency advocacy is and what it looks like. A descriptive study stands in comparison to an explanatory study. The difference is that descriptive studies describe reality answering how, when, who etc. while explanatory studies answers why.\(^{95}\) Our study has elements of theory testing, since we investigate which theory, NPM or mediatisation, that matches best with the result. Theory testing is part of explanatory studies where theory is the main focus.\(^{96}\) The kind of descriptive study we will perform is categorising and in these kinds of studies theory works as points of comparison and as active building blocks.\(^{97}\) Therefore, it is natural that theory receives a central position in our analysis. However, agency advocacy is the main focus and not NPM and mediatisation. Since this is a descriptive study an experimental design or cross-sectional design are not suitable as they are used to investigate causal relationships.\(^{98}\) A single case-study design is not adequate either since it is difficult to generalize the results from one agency.\(^{99}\) We could have used a longitudinal design if we had chosen which agencies to look at and compared their communication approaches in different years.\(^{100}\) However, we do not know in advance which agencies to investigate.

\(^{95}\) Esaiasson et al. (2007); 37
\(^{96}\) Esaiasson et al. (2007); 42
\(^{97}\) Esaiasson et al. (2007); 155
\(^{98}\) Bryman (2008); 44
\(^{99}\) Bryman (2008); 54 and 55
\(^{100}\) Bryman (2008); 49
Since we want to see how agency advocacy looks; in relation to both time and content, the study will mainly be of a comparative character. We will for our first research question perform a comparison over time. Question two will be a comparison over time as well, with an ideal type analysis to categorize the debate articles and clarify agency advocacy as a concept. Our ideal types are the communication approaches presented in the analytical framework; information, agency advocacy by promoting issue and agency advocacy by legitimating agency. Ideal types are extreme cases; they do not exist in the real world. Therefore, we do not expect articles to always contain only one ideal type. This is a deductive approach since we have developed ideal types from previous research. The limitation of using a deductive approach instead of an inductive, where one develops categories from observations, is that we may miss other types of communication approaches. However, since we already know what ideal types to look for this creates a bias which means that the risk of missing other types of communication approaches would still be present even if we used an inductive approach.

**Data: where to find agency advocacy?**

Media is a wide concept but in this thesis we focus on newspapers. We will look at agency communication in newspapers’ debate articles and see if it has an advocating character. In order to know whether or not agencies increasingly have been authors of debate articles we must put it in perspective over time.

**Years to investigate**

Based on NPM and previous research we expect an increase in agency advocacy between the 1970’s and 1990’s. Mediatisation research, on the other hand, suggests a gradual change from somewhere around the 1980’s and forward, since the concept of mediatisation was first mentioned in 1986 and the mediatisation process has accelerated in the last decades of the twentieth century. Therefore it is interesting to investigate the time period 1970’s to 2000’s. By looking at debate articles for one entire year in each of our four decades we should be able to detect a pattern. The years we will use when collecting our data will be: 1978, 1989, 1999 and 2007. The last three years are “post-election years” i.e. the year after national elections. At first we aimed to use 1977 since this is also a post-election year, but our chosen newspaper did not organise the use of debate articles until late 1976 and we found that the debate articles did not have clear labels until
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1978. We have chosen “post-election years” since we assume that the newspaper will provide more space for politicians during election years. We also assume that “post-election years” or “pre-election years” could be important for the civil servants within the agencies since new politicians and election promises could create uncertainty for the agency. An implication of choosing these years is that there might be specific events that have affected the content of the debate pages and which agencies that are concerned. But every year has specific events that call for attention and debate and it is impossible for us to look at every year in this thesis. The change of using 1978 instead of 1977 should not have any major implications on our study; it is a pre-election year instead of a post-election year so this year should, too, have some uncertainty. The importance is that it is not an election year.

Why debate articles?

We have chosen to look at newspapers’ debate articles for several reasons; one is that we want to investigate primary data. Another is that if we had chosen to look at all articles about agencies we would not have known if the article really pictures the agencies’ views or just the journalists’ angles. Now we will know that most of what is written in the article is written by the agencies itself (we will not analyse the “introduction” or title of the debate article since that often is written by the newspaper). To look mainly at newspapers debate articles is a narrow selection which could lead to that we miss advocacy performed on other platforms; like press-releases or campaigns. Rothstein writes that debate traditionally is a task for politicians and not agencies. Therefore, debate articles put things on the edge. We argue that this is the place where agency advocacy is most likely to exist, which makes it a strategic selection of a most likely case. The selection of most likely cases is usually used to disprove theories. The focus of this thesis is however to find as much agency advocacy as possible and therefore we have chosen to look at the most obvious place to find it. One important implication of looking at newspapers’ debate articles is that we do not know how many articles that have been written by agencies without being published. There could be agencies that have produced extensive amounts of debate articles but have failed to get them published; they are invisible advocators in this thesis. This is why we have brought forward and included the discussion of mediatisation and, to a smaller extent, the use of media logics since it explains that agencies must compete for media space.

106 Beckérus, G. DN (1976-12-01)
107 Andersson, B. G. E-mail (appendix 2)
108 Rothstein (2005); 213
109 Esaiasson et al. (2007); 184
The authors of the debate articles

When it comes to the debate articles, we will look at debate articles that are signed by civil servants and clearly linked to an agency. We are aware of that there can be many levels of civil servants that can be the authors, which could affect the result. Previous research has focused on debate articles written by general directors.\textsuperscript{110} In another c-level thesis, “Ideologiproducerande myndigheter”, this distinction has not been made which has led to that some agencies, especially universities, are highly represented as authors of debate articles without saying how many of the articles that concern the agency.\textsuperscript{111} Therefore we have chosen to divide the articles in two main categories; board of directors and employees with internal division within them, see figure 3. The board of directors will be the main focus in the analysis.

Figure 3 Authors of Debate Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of directors</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• General directors</td>
<td>• &quot;Regular&quot; employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board members</td>
<td>• University researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With “board of directors” we mean the general director, vice general director, chairman and board members. The chairman and board members are often assigned their positions by the government but they are regulated to be impartial from political views and “exclusively represent the agency” in their assignments.\textsuperscript{112} Most researchers that have investigated agency advocacy only looks at the general directors; but it could also be valuable to include the board, as long as they do write as a representative of the agency.\textsuperscript{113} Therefore, we will include the board in our analysis. Rothstein and Kjellgren and Johansson focus on agencies at national level (central agencies), but do not motivate why regional agencies are excluded.\textsuperscript{114} These regional agencies are, however, also subordinated to
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the government as are the central ones. SOU 2007:107 choose to include regional agencies in their study.\textsuperscript{115} It can also be noted that the Swedish government has given SCB the task of keep a record of all Swedish agencies and here regional and national agencies are mixed.\textsuperscript{116} We will include regional agencies but we recognize that they are of a different character as several parallel agencies work with the same tasks according to geographical regions. We will therefore check if a difference occurs when they are excluded.

With employees we mean everyone that works within an agency but is not general director, vice general director or board member. As mentioned earlier, employees are often excluded from research concerning agency advocacy. It is questionable if they should be included or not since they are not the formal representatives of the agencies but they are presented as if they were in debate articles. We have decided to include them in the first research question because it is interesting to see if it will affect the result. However, by reading a sample of debate articles we have noticed that agency employees often write debate articles about the section they work within or criticise the agency or parts of the agency. Therefore, they are difficult to include in the second research question since they fall outside the analytical framework. Our analytical framework is designed to look at communication approaches used by an agency as a unit and not the approaches used by individual actors to promote or legitimate their own opinions.

A specific group of employees that frequently is seen as authors of debate articles is the “university researchers”. Their articles are often about performed research on an individual level and not about the university. We do, however, recognize that even if these debate articles are not specifically about the university it can be argued that they are valuable to the university since they show that the university is active when it comes to the task of producing new research.\textsuperscript{117} Therefore, these articles will be included in the first research question as a specific group. “University researchers” also include researchers at university hospitals since these hospital are closely linked to universities and often share staff, students and projects.\textsuperscript{118} Administration staff and regular doctors at university hospitals are, however, not included since there is no clear connection between them and the universities. We have also noticed that many researchers sign debate articles without specifying workplace. They cannot be included in the analysis at all since there is a risk that they work for private actors. It is important to note that researchers at other agencies than universities will be
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regarded as “regular employees” in the analysis since their research is part of the work of their agency and therefore directly connected to the agency.

Another group that is problematic is the church. The church was until 2000 a part of the Swedish state and has handled different societal services during the decades.\textsuperscript{119} This means that the church has dual roles: one societal where it handles societal services and one religious where it handles religious questions. Therefore, we have chosen to include only the articles that are related to the societal role since that is what relates to this study.

The last thing to note is that articles can be written by several authors. We have decided to include the articles that have relevant agency representatives among them, even if the other authors are not relevant. Debate articles written by general director together with e.g. an employee will be counted as “board of directors” and articles written by an employee and e.g. a university professor will be counted as “employees”.

\textbf{Where to collect data?}

The choice of newspaper has fallen on “Dagens Nyheter” (DN) because we want to look at a morning paper. Morning papers differ from evening papers since morning papers are distributed through subscription while evening papers are based on single copy sales.\textsuperscript{120} Due to this, evening papers must focus more on selling papers which is usually done by writing about dramatic events.\textsuperscript{121} Morning papers are not as exposed to this since they have a fixed number of subscribers. Therefore, we believe that agencies are more likely to use morning papers as medium when advocating; they know that a relatively fixed number of readers will receive the morning paper. The morning paper in Sweden with highest circulation is DN.\textsuperscript{122} An implication of choosing a national right-wing newspaper is that we could perhaps miss agencies that choose to send debate articles to local papers that are directed to another target group. Nevertheless, DN is the largest morning paper in Sweden and if there is a general trend in agency advocacy it should be visible in this paper.

\textbf{Analysis of collected data}

For the first research question, the analysis will be based on frequencies. We will count the number of articles written by agencies as well as the total number of debate articles. It will enable us to provide both changes in number and changes in shares (in percent). For question two we will, as mentioned above, perform an ideal type analysis based on the analytical framework in the theory
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chapter. The ideal type analysis will be a content analysis, since we will categorise the text in the debate articles according to what the text “does”: informs, advocates by promoting issue or advocates by legitimating agency.\textsuperscript{123} There could be several ideal types in one article. We will then present the shares of debate articles that contain the different ideal types.

When it comes to interpretations of the texts, Esaiasson et al. bring up four factors one must be aware of.\textsuperscript{124} The first is the character of the question; we will look at manifest content since we want to look at what is written in the text, not what is implied. To use manifest content makes the reliability higher since it is clearer what the text means. Next factor to consider is “clarity of thought”. It is not always that the producers of the texts mean or think what you ask them. In our study this could be exemplified by an agency manager writing a debate article that we consider to be legitimating, something that was not in the manager’s mind but still became present. The third factor is “choice of interpretative perspective” and the fourth is about how distant one is from the text. For us this is not that problematic since our texts were produced relatively recently by Swedish bureaucrats. To interpret texts can be risky in the sense that other can interpret it differently. We will control inter-coder reliability by analysing the texts separately and then comparing our coding to each other’s. To achieve high reliability we have tried to clearly define our subjects so there should not be any doubt which ideal type and subject the text should be coded as. The stated ideal types should be considered to be valid since they are based on what is said about agency communication approaches and advocacy in earlier research.\textsuperscript{125}

\textbf{Criteria for conclusion}

Both NPM and mediatisation writers mention that there have been changes the last decades; new directives for agencies and the development of an independent and powerful media. If these two changes have led to increased advocacy, this should be visible. New institutionalism notes that “institutions are not ‘things’ [...] but processes” that evolve slowly.\textsuperscript{126} In this spirit we expect that change of agency advocacy in debate articles, if present or changed at all, should be \textit{developed over time}.
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Research question 1

So both NPM and mediatisation supports our hypothesis that there should be an increase in debate articles written by agencies between 1970’s – 2000’s, but how do they respond to increases in shares or numbers? Figure 4 presents the different responses.

Figure 4 Research Question 1: Analytical Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of articles written by board of directors</th>
<th>Number of articles written by board of directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>NPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No increase</td>
<td>Mediatisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Against both NPM and Mediatisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there is an increase in share only or both share and number we argue that NPM is the perspective that is supported, as seen in figure 4, since the agencies have not only produced more debate articles but also published more in relation to other authors of debate article, as discussed in the theory chapter. As Premfors et al point out, the NPM reform started in the late 1980’s with extra stress during the first half of the 1990’s. Therefore, there should be an increase between 1978 and 1989, but the major increase should according to this thesis take place between 1989 and 1999. Mediatisation supports an increase in the number of debate articles, but not in share. There is nothing in mediatisation that says that articles written by agencies should be published to a higher extent than debate articles written by other actors. It is true that one talks of an increased mediatisation of today’s society, but then many actors are affected beside agencies. This is why figure 4 shows that an increase in number of articles but not in share supports the mediatisation thesis. Mediatisation theory describes mediatisation as a process and it should therefore be a gradual increase in the number of debate articles. If there is no increase visible in either number or shares neither NPM nor mediatisation are supported.

Research question 2

In research question two we will see to what extent our communication approaches are present. Both NPM and mediatisisation support the existence of communication approaches; but different aspects of them. From this we will draw conclusions about which of the theses that are supported. Figure 5 visualizes how the communication approaches should support the different theses.

---
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As mentioned in the literature review and in the theory chapter, the introduction of NPM changed the way agencies work. Information was a traditional task for agencies to perform but with the shift from a more legalistic management by detailed rules to management by goals and results they increasingly became producers of ideology. An increased presence of information would, therefore, disconfirm the NPM thesis. Vice versa, an increased use of agency advocacy by promoting issue and legitimating agency would support NPM.

Agency advocacy by legitimating agency is not only connected to NPM but also to mediatisation. Mediatisation has, as seen in figure 5, weak connections to the first two communication approaches, since it supports a general increase in the use of media through standard operating procedure; but not specifically to inform or to promote issues. For legitimating activities, mediatisation encourages agencies to legitimate themselves by external communication as already discussed in the theory. As mentioned, processes evolve slowly so there should, according to the mediatisation thesis, be a slow increase in agency advocacy by legitimating agency.

If there is no increase in agency advocacy both NPM and mediatisation are disconfirmed. If there is almost no agency advocacy it could indicate that agency advocacy is not that widespread. But it could also be that debate articles are the wrong place to look for agency advocacy. If there is agency advocacy, but not in the expected pattern of an increase over the years, something else or another perspective of the theses may be behind the present agency advocacy.
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Results of our findings and Analysis of data

In the analysis we will look at how the results respond to our research questions; Have the number or share of debate articles written by agencies increased from the 1970’s to 2000’s? What types of communication approaches, and subjects within the approaches, are used in debate articles over the years; information, promoting issue or legitimating agency? Our general hypotheses promote that the number and share of debate articles increase, that information decreases and that agency advocacy increases over the years.

Research question 1: Has there been a change over time?

We will now look at the number and share of debate articles written by agencies over the years and if NPM or mediatisation is supported or none of them, as discussed in criterions for conclusion. We will also look at if the result varies depending on which groups and sub-groups that are included.

Table 1 shows the total number of debate articles for our chosen years. As we can see the number has varied over the years; there was an increase from 1978 to 1999 but from 1999 to 2007 a decrease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All debate articles written by agencies %</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>17,5</td>
<td>18,3</td>
<td>28,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of directors %</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>10,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees without university researchers %</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>3,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University researchers %</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>14,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other authors than agencies %</td>
<td>84,9</td>
<td>82,5</td>
<td>81,7</td>
<td>71,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in %</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99,9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of debate articles in DN</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of all debate articles approximately 20 percent were written by agencies. As can be seen in table 1 there has been an increase in both number and share of debate articles written by agencies for each year. So far our general hypothesis is supported; there is an increase in debate articles written by agencies. It is interesting to see that there is a major increase in shares between 1999 and 2007.
The mystery is, however, easily solved. As we have already mentioned university researchers are frequently seen as debaters but are often excluded. If we exclude them we can see that the difference between 1999 and 2007 becomes more moderate from 13.3 percent to 13.9 percent.

The pattern we are most interested in is the one with the board of directors. Table 1 shows the following result: there is a constant increase in share of articles but when it comes to numbers there is a decrease between 1999 and 2007. The main difference when one looks at the shares here is that the largest increase occurred between 1989 and 1999 instead of between 1999 and 2007. And this is very interesting! We have already mentioned that an increase in share but not numbers is best supported by the NPM thesis and here the major increase support NPM further.

General directors and board is seen as one group in this thesis, something previous research most often have not done. We found that the difference between board of directors and only general directors was very small. There were, of course, small differences in percentage but the pattern was the same. Thus, our result was not affected by including all board of directors. We have discussed that we will look at state agencies on national level as well as regional. Now we will see if a difference occurs when they are excluded. The pattern is similar to the one seen for all board of directors, the only real difference is that the share between 1978 and 1989 is unchanged instead of a small increase. NPM is still the thesis that best explains the results. It is interesting to be aware of the difference that occurs; when debate articles written by regional agencies are included the pattern for increased use of debate articles is slightly stronger.

**What does the data tell us?**

As we now have seen; the result can differ depending on how one handles the data. The general answer with our sample is, however, that the debate articles written by agencies have increased from 1978 to 2007. On the overall level an increase has occurred in both shares and numbers of debate articles written by agencies. This is best supported by the NPM thesis since NPM best explains the increased share and numbers of debate articles, see figure 7. But also if one only looks at the debate articles written by the board of directors NPM is the best explanation since, once again, the share of debate articles have increased. The difference between share and number is that an increase in numbers not always says so much unless it is put in perspective. The number of debate articles written by agencies has doubled from 1978 to 1989, but at the same time the total number of debate articles has almost doubled in these years; leading to a more moderate increase in share. And it is here share becomes important, an increase in shares mean that one has gained space on behalf of somebody else. That NPM is the best explanation for our results strengthens Rothstein’s claims that a shift has occurred in how agencies work and that many agencies increasingly have come
to regard debate as a proper tool in their activities. As already mentioned, our results also correlate well with what research covering the Swedish adaptation to NPM have explained; that the introduction of management by goals and results should lead to a major increase between 1989 and 1999.

Figure 6 Research Question 1: Analytical Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of articles written by board of directors</th>
<th>Number of articles written by board of directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Increase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No increase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mediatisation thesis did not receive as much support as NPM in our thesis, but when collecting our data we discovered that the design of the debate articles changed over the years; in 1999 there were once a week several shorter comments while in 2007 the articles became fewer but longer. This shows that even if the number of debate articles decreased between 1999 and 2007, the space of the debate articles increased. This is an implication to our study since we did not take this into consideration when arguing for that mediatisation should lead to an increase in number of debate articles. Even if our study supports mediatisation, the support could gain more strength if design (pictures, word count, occupied size etc.) was taken into account.

To conclude research question one, if one only looks at debate articles written by the board of directors the share of debate articles has increased for each year in our sample. The same pattern occurs when looking at all agency articles. Our hypothesis that there should have been an increase in debate articles written by agencies is supported; and also further related to NPM. Mediatisation could perhaps be further connected in future studies if design in general was taken into consideration.

Research question 2: Are the communication approaches present?

Now we know that the share of debate articles written by agencies has increased from 1978 to 2007. The next thing to establish is if the communication approaches; information, agency advocacy by promoting issue and agency advocacy by legitimating agency, are present in the debate articles written by the board of directors and if the use of communication approaches has changed between 1978 and 2007.

Table 2 visualises how many percent of the articles that contain a certain communication approach and subject each year. We have reached our results through the content analysis discussed in the
methods chapter. All the debate articles that we have analysed contained at least one advocating ideal type. This means that 100 percent of the debate articles written by the board of directors contained agency advocacy. The inter-coder reliability was high as most of our coding correlated.

Section one; communication approaches

By looking at how our ideal types are represented in the debate articles written by board of directors we find that among the communication approaches the categories with agency advocacy are frequently seen in the debate articles; 89,6 percent of the debate articles contains agency advocacy by promoting issue and 72,4 percent contains agency advocacy by legitimating agency. Table 2 shows that information is the communication approach that is used the least; summoned up only 3,0 percent of the debate articles contain information.
# Table 2 Share of Debate Articles containing certain Communication Approaches and Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted laws</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative proposal</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic under debate</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal activities</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other actor</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agency advocacy by promoting issue* % | 77.8 | 94.7 | 89.7 | 89.6 |
*Adopted laws* % | 22.2 | 0    | 8.6  | 14.6 |
*Legislative proposal* % | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
*Topic under debate* % | 55.6 | 84.2 | 69   | 83.3 |
*Internal activities* % | -    | -    | -    | -    |
*Other actors* % | 44.4 | 47.4 | 56.9 | 39.6 |

*Agency advocacy by legitimating agency* % | 100  | 47.4 | 79.3 | 68.8 |
*Adopted laws* % | 11.1 | 0    | 6.9  | 10.4 |
*Legislative proposal* % | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
*Topic under debate* % | 66.7 | 10.5 | 36.2 | 50   |
*Internal activities* % | 55.6 | 42.1 | 62.1 | 54.2 |
*Other actors* % | 44.4 | 15.8 | 39.7 | 39.6 |

*Total count of articles* | 9    | 19   | 58   | 48   |

Since an article can contain many communication approaches the percentages add up to more than 100 percent.

When one looks at how common each communication approach is in each year one can see that information is only present in 1999, see table 2. This is a bit remarkable since NPM and management by goals and results were introduced in the second half of the 1980’s and not “stressed” until the first half of the 1990’s. Therefore, one could expect more information in 1978 and 1989 than in 1999 and 2007. But one can, on the other hand, not say that there is an increase of information either, the 6.9 percent in 1999 is more of an anomaly. If we had data covering more years we could perhaps been able to draw more conclusions, as it is now it is hard to say anything; besides that information is highly absent.

As seen in table 2, agency advocacy by promoting issue is the most common of all ideal types for all years except for 1978. The high level of agency advocacy by promoting issue in all of our years is again interesting since NPM was not introduced in 1978. But as mentioned, Swedish agencies have a
long history of being independent, so perhaps they have always been promoting. The levels do increase after 1978 but the peak is in 1989, as seen in table 2. After that the level decreases slightly but remains stable around 90 percent in 1999 and 2007.

Agency advocacy by legitimating agency is also rather common. It is interesting that all debate articles in 1978 contain this ideal type and table 2 shows that it has never been as strong as then. Agency advocacy by legitimating agency has not been as stable as agency advocacy by promoting issue. Table 2 shows that high levels have been followed by a decrease only to gain strength again. The fluctuation makes it difficult to draw safe conclusions about the pattern. If one wants to be sure that the pattern shows a general trend and not an anomaly in one year more years would need to be added in each decade.

We will also in this research question see what happens if regional agencies are excluded. When they are the general pattern is still the same with highest amount of agency advocacy by promoting issue, closely followed by agency advocacy by legitimating agency and information highly absent. The important difference lies in how the levels of agency advocacy by promoting issue is lower each year except for 1989 and agency advocacy by legitimating agency is higher each year except for 1978 where it already is 100 percent. A result of this shift is that agency advocacy by legitimating agency actually exceeds agency advocacy by promoting issue in 1999. An explanation to this could be found in replies; in 1999 32,8 percent of the national directors’ debate articles were replies. And in 91,2 percent of the debate articles written by the board of directors as replies is agency advocacy by legitimating agency present. Replies therefore, seem to be connected to agency advocacy by legitimating agency and regional directors do not reply to others as often as the directors of the national agencies (8,6 percent vs. 31,3 percent). So directors of regional agencies seems to be less legitimating in their debate articles, something that affects the result when they are excluded. Nevertheless, both on national and regional level agency advocacy is common while information is highly absent in all years which means that regardless of which group one looks at the implications for our study are the same.

What does the data tell us?
The data shows that agency advocacy by promoting issue and by legitimating agency is highly present in the debate articles and that information is highly absent. Therefore, previous research is supported empirically in their claims that agency advocacy is common, but it is problematic that the levels are so high already in 1978. But then again, Swedish agencies have a history of independence. The constant high levels prohibit us from drawing conclusions of that NPM or mediatisation is what explains the presence of agency advocacy, as seen in figure 8.
In next section we will investigate the communication approaches’ subjects to see if something hides there. But as it is now, no support is gained for our hypothesis that either NPM or mediatisation could explain the presence of agency advocacy. What we can conclude is, however, that agency advocacy has two aspects; promoting issue and legitimating agency. 61.9 percent of all debate articles written by the board of directors contain both types of agency advocacy while only 10.4 percent were purely legitimating and 27.6 percent purely promoting.

**Section two; a pattern among the subjects?**

So now we know that all communication approaches are present, but to different extent. On the communication approach level, there are no patterns of increased agency advocacy. But what do we find if we investigate the subjects? Table 2 shows how the subjects have been present for each year. We will go through the subjects according to communication approach. But we can first mention one strong pattern that goes for all communication approaches; no article has touched “legislative proposal”. Since articles have discussed the related subject “adopted laws” it suggests that the directors either do not advocate about “legislative proposals” or that they chose to use another medium than debate articles for this subject.

Let us start with the first communication approach; information. As we now know, information is highly absent. As seen in table 2, “adopted laws” is the only subject that contains it; but only in 1999. That agencies do not impartially inform about other actors can suggest that they always take a stance when others are mentioned. We discussed “other actors” in the theory were we pointed out that only a few agencies would be likely to inform about others and those were especially Länsstyrelserna as they partly work with coordinating others’ work. This kind of information did, however, not occur. To conclude information; the presence of information about “adopted laws” is more of an anomaly than a pattern and it is, therefore, hard to draw any conclusion from it.

Next communication approach is agency advocacy by promoting issue and it is the most frequently used approach. We can see in table 2 that the most common subject is always “topic under debate”,
followed by “other actors”, leaving “adopted laws” the third most common. The percentages between the subjects differ but there is actually a vertical pattern. This is interesting but the pattern we want to look at is the horizontal pattern. Table 2 shows that there is no pattern of increased levels for any of our subjects that stretch over all of our chosen years. This is problematic but one of the reasons why it looks like this is because there were very few articles in 1978. This leads to that when one approach is found that finding skyrockets the percentages. If this year is excluded we find that there still are no overwhelming results; but one pattern, as seen in table 2, is present in “adopted laws” where the share increases from 1989 to 2007.

The last communication approach is agency advocacy by legitimating agency. As established, this ideal type is also highly present, if not as present as agency advocacy by promoting issue. Agency advocacy by promoting issue had an interesting vertical pattern within it; this pattern is not found here to the same extent. There is, however, one subject that almost always is the most frequent one, this is “internal activities”, and one subject that is the least frequent of the present, once again “adopted laws”. When it comes to the pattern we are interested in, now between 1989 and 2007, we get two findings; both “adopted laws” and “topic under debate” are increasing in shares over the years.

**What does the data tell us?**
The findings we have for the content of the debate articles do not give much support to our theses. Even if agencies have become more active as authors of debate articles over the years the subjects of the articles have not changed much over time. And among the changes we do see, the support for an increase in shares is weak. Only three subjects correspond to this, but only between 1989 and 2007. In agency advocacy by promoting issue only one out of four subjects support that NPM is the thesis that best explains agency advocacy by promoting issue. As seen in figure 9, this consists of “adopted laws”. For the legitimating subjects, “adopted laws” is once again present but together with “topic under debate” this time. Thus, two out of five subjects support that NPM together with mediatisation best explain agency advocacy by legitimating agency. These results do not change when the directors of the regional agencies are excluded.
Conclusions

In the first research question we investigated if there had been an increase in share or number of debate articles written by agencies between 1970’s and 2000’s. On a general level there had been an increase in both number and shares. Our main focus was, however, the debate articles written by the board of directors and here we found that even if the share constantly increased the number had actually decreased between 1999 and 2007. This makes NPM the most proper explanation. 

In the second research question we wanted to know which types of communication approaches, and subjects within the approaches, that were used in debate articles over the years; information, agency advocacy by promoting issue or agency advocacy by legitimating agency. We found that agency advocacy by promoting issue was the most common, followed by agency advocacy by legitimating agency in all years except for 1978 when agency advocacy by legitimating agency was the most common. Information was completely absent in all years except for a few percent in 1999. This means that neither NPM nor mediatisation was supported. Nevertheless, we found weak support for both NPM and mediatisation in the subjects; three of the subjects supported NPM and out of these three two also supported mediatisation.

To conclude, agencies have increasingly been seen as authors of debate articles. We can see that agency advocacy is present to a high extent already in 1978, before the NPM reform, but then it can be argued that Sweden introduced something it already had. Even if research question two showed no clear pattern for that the use of agency advocacy in debate articles has increased, the increase in share and number of debate articles show that agency advocacy in debate articles has become more widespread. So, we have gained some new knowledge regarding the use of agency advocacy and what it looks like; it can either be promoting issue or legitimating agency. These two types of agency advocacy are often combined in debate articles. We have also learned that not only is agency
advocacy highly present over the years but information is highly absent. Finally, we know how different groups within the agencies have increasingly and decreasingly been seen as authors of debate articles, see table 1. Previous studies have often looked at one group only or clustered groups together. Another implication of our findings for previous research is that researchers should be aware of the two types of agency advocacy. As seen in the literature review previous research has not always made this distinction, only Kjellgren and Johansson show that they think of it in this way. SOU 2007:107 and Rothstein only seem to be concerned with agency advocacy by promoting issue, while Yeung only deals with agency advocacy by legitimating agency. But generally the researchers are supported in their claims that agency advocacy has increased, at least in debate articles.

The study we have performed is mainly of a quantitative character, it could be further developed by doing a more extensive qualitative content analysis to gain an even clearer picture of agency advocacy. As discussed in the analysis, mediatisation could possible gain more support if other aspects than number was included in the analysis. Other interesting research questions that arise from our study are how agency advocacy appears in other sources or countries. Debate articles were a good place to look for agency advocacy, but agency advocacy may also appear in press-releases, campaigns, information material etc. These sources or countries could perhaps contain other types of agency advocacy.

Our study is important since it indicates that agency advocacy has existed at least since the 1970's and has become more widespread. It has also helped clarify the concept of agency advocacy which is important since it shows what agencies actually advocate for. Its findings have important implications for society and politics when it comes to the role of agencies. Agencies’ advocacy can affect politics directly since they often have an expertise that politicians may lack and they have, therefore, an advantage over the politicians. Agencies are in charge of running the nation and can, by engaging in agency advocacy, affect which societal tasks that are prioritised and how tasks should be performed. Therefore, agency advocacy raises important questions regarding democracy and the chain of decision-making.
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## Appendix 1 – Analytical framework with examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication approaches</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>Legitimate agency (agency always in focus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-stated subject</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Adopted laws</strong></td>
<td>Adopted laws/decisions</td>
<td>Abolish or strengthen law/decision</td>
<td>Agency in relation to law/decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX informs about that there is a new law</td>
<td>XX writes about how and why the new law will affect society in a good/bad way (without necessarily being affected)</td>
<td>XX writes about how and why the new law will affect agency and agency’s work in a good/bad way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Legislative proposal</strong></td>
<td>What the legislative proposal is about</td>
<td>Raise support for or against proposal</td>
<td>Agency in relation to proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX informs about that there is a new law upcoming</td>
<td>XX writes about why the new proposal is good/bad for society (without necessarily being affected)</td>
<td>XX writes about why the new proposal is good/bad for the agency and agency’s activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Other actors e.g. agencies</strong></td>
<td>Information about other actors not related to agency or promoted issue</td>
<td>Comments about other actors activities</td>
<td>Blaming/explaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX informs about implementations made by other actors without putting oneself in perspective</td>
<td>XX writes about what others have done good/bad. Takes stance in thematic issue</td>
<td>XX writes about how other actors influence the work of them. Could be “not our task but theirs…” or pointing out why they perform well in comparison to others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Topic under debate</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Take stance to either promote or fight</td>
<td>How the agency is related to the question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX takes stance for e.g. why smoking should be forbidden/allowed</td>
<td>XX writes about how agency is affected by that there e.g. is no law against smoking</td>
<td>XX writes about how agency is affected by that there e.g. is no law against smoking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-Internal activities</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>When the agency describes what they do/daily activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX writes about activities they perform and show society the use they provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When the agency is self-critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XX writes about that they know that there are problems inside/with agency and that one works with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 3 – Original quotation

Author: Valfrid Paulsson, Generaldirektör Naturvårdsverket

Date: 25 February 1989

"Vad vi upplever just nu är hur miljöfrågan i nordiskt sammanhang politiseras.

Politiskt samarbete och politiska program syftar ju ytterst till att så snabbt som möjligt komma fram till gemensamma framgångslinjer och praktiskt samarbete. När det gäller nordisk miljövård verkar utvecklingen gå åt motsatt håll. Ett effektivt och nära praktiskt samarbete ser ut att återföras till diskussioner mellan politiker." [...] 

"Nordiska miljövårdsmyndigheter, experter och forskare känner varandra. Vi kan samarbeta och vet var samarbetet behövs och gör störst nytta.

Det är det arbetet som är det viktigaste, inte den politiska överbyggnaden, även om den behövs."