# POLITICAL CONTROL OR LEGITIMACY DEFICIT? BUREAUCRACIES' SYMBOLIC RESPONSE TO BOTTOM-UP PUBLIC PRESSURES

Saar Alon-Barkat and Sharon Gilad

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

## ONLINE METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX

The original database of IFAT Business Information, from which we derived our sample, contains information on the advertising expenditure of 16,000 organizations. From this dataset, we sampled 40 state level and municipal level public bureaucracies (hereafter: "public"), which formed the basis for this paper, and 60 businesses and other non-governmental organizations (hereafter "private"). We restricted our overall sample to 100 organizations in order to make the coding and collection of additional information (e.g. on organizations' incomes, the targeting of organizations by protesters etc.) manageable and reliable. These organizations were selected, employing a stratified-random sampling strategy, from within the two groups of organizations – i.e. public and private, provided that they use advertising as a regular means of communication (at least 12 months between January 2010 and December 2012).

Our stratified sampling strategy involved two stages. At the outset, we asked a research assistant to randomly select articles that mentioned the phrase "The social protest" from the on-line searchable archive of 'TheMarker' – the daily economics section of Haaretz newspaper - between June 2011 (the outset of the protests) and May 2012 (a year into the social protest). TheMarker was chosen because it is associated, more than any other Israeli newspaper, with the protests and both reflected and amplified the voice of the activists. This initial search yielded 129 articles, which were found to be relevant to the social protest. The first author coded the names of organizations and/or sectors that were criticized either by the protest leaders or by TheMarker's journalists in relation to the protests. This coding yielded a list of 49 organizations, which were criticized by the protesters or journalists at least once (hereafter also: "targeted organizations"), and an initial analysis of more/less criticized business and service sectors. Table 1A documents the distribution of protest-related criticism across sectors. Following this initial survey of the media, we decided to focus

on organizations that operate (as producers, distributors, regulators/overseers) in six sectors: four sectors that received relatively high attention (foods, education, housing, finance) and two that received less attention (transportation, tourism). Of the 49 targeted organizations that were identified in our initial media analysis, 19 organizations (of which 10 are public and 9 are private) operate in one or more of the six selected sectors and were therefore included in the sample.[1]

The second stage involved supplementing this initial list of 19 targeted organizations by using IFAT's dataset to randomly sample 30 public bureaucracies and 51 private organizations, which operate within the six relevant sectors. For each of the above sampled organizations, whether public or private, we checked whether information on annual income is available from public sources. If information about an organization's annual income could not be made available, we removed the relevant organization and continued our random sampling until we reached our quota of 30 public bureaucracies and 51 private organizations.

To create a matching sample of "public organizations" we had to create a sampling population of all public organizations that operate in one of the six sectors on IFAT's database. Public organizations appear in the IFAT database as "governmental, "municipal" or simply as "organizations". Hence, we first allocated all "governmental' and "municipal" organizations to a sampling population of "public organizations." Next, we had to sift IFAT's category of "organizations" into public-sector organizations versus others (mostly NGOs). This we did based on existing lists of government-owned companies (available from the Governmental Companies Authority), statutory corporations (from the Accountant General 2010 financial report), and municipal companies (based on an index published by the Union of Municipal Corporations). This sifting process was conducted only for "organizations" that advertised over 12 months or more between January 2010 and December 2012. Out of the 152 organizations, which advertised over 12 months or more, we classified 28 as "public organizations," and added them to our sampling population. Thereafter, based on the description of mandates/aims in the websites of 150 relevant public organizations, we classified their operations as related/unrelated to one or more of the six sectors. For this purpose, both authors independently classified each public organization, and discussed any

---

[1] An additional "targeted" organization had to be excluded from the dataset due to missing data regarding its annual income.

disagreements. Overall, out of the 150 public organizations, the operations of 109 (73%) were found to be related to one or more of the six sectors. We then randomly sampled 30 from within this population of 109 public organizations to supplement the initial list of 10 that attracted specific criticism in relation to the social protests. Thus, we now had a sample of 40 bureaucracies, of which 36 are included in this paper and 4 were dropped due to insufficient information.

**Table 1A: Initial Analysis of Protest-Related Coverage of Sectors**

| Sector | Number of articles in which sector was mentioned | % |
|---|---|---|
| Housing | 67 | 51.9% |
| Education | 48 | 37.2% |
| labor market | 35 | 27.1% |
| Welfare services | 33 | 25.6% |
| Foods | 33 | 25.6% |
| Health | 28 | 21.7% |
| Finance | 21 | 16.3% |
| Energy and water | 21 | 16.3% |
| Defense and security | 17 | 13.2% |
| Media and Communications | 11 | 8.5% |
| Transportation | 10 | 7.8% |
| Tourism | 1 | 0.8% |
| Total | 129 | 100% |