Pre-Published Version

To cite this article, use:

James Hathaway & Steinar Askvik (2020) A Typology of Institutional Logics for Public Accountability Organizations in Zambia, International Journal of Public Administration, DOI: 10.1080/01900692.2019.1709078

(Word total 7501, including references)

Abstract

This article presents a new typology of institutional logics that is useful for studying public accountability organizations in Zambia. The typology was developed by following the adaptive theory approach introduced by Derek Layder and is based on extant literature as well as on new empirical data from three public accountability organizations in Zambia, the Office of Auditor General, the Anti-Corruption Commission, and the national ombudsman office. The model consists of four types of logics: a kinship logic, which is informal and based on gift-giving and mutual obligation; a bureaucratic logic, which is based on hierarchical division of labour in a stable environment; a development management logic, based on private sector approaches to development; and a professionalism logic based on membership in a professional field. The new typology broadens the scope of the institutional logics perspective to include the Global South as well as to include informal aspects of public accountability organizations and the political power struggles that tend to surround them.

A TYPOLOGY OF INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS FOR PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY ORGANIZATIONS IN ZAMBIA

Introduction

This article presents and discusses ideas about how public accountability organizations in Zambia are organized: for example, the appropriate roles and forms of such organizations, how the civil servants should behave and be evaluated, and the basic values and norms organizational actors should follow while carrying out their work. These ideas are linked to an institutional logics perspective which provides a way of understanding the different organizing principles, practices, and structures that guide public administration in developing countries.

The institutional logics perspective was first introduced by Friedland and Alford (1991), and more recently it has become an important inspiration for research on organizations in various contexts. A study by Andrews (2013) examines these issues further in relation to good governance in poor countries. His study contributes to the field of development research by considering how dominant institutional logics that guide behavior in the governments of the Global South have a significant influence on the outcomes of reforms and development initiatives. He argues that reform and development initiatives in the Global South often fail because they do not take local contexts into account and that these reforms are often only implemented in symbolic ways as “signals” to donors. As a result, governments in the Global South usually only change on the surface – not in the ways they function.

This article contributes to the work of Andrews and others in development research by proposing a typology for understanding the institutional context of public accountability organizations in Zambia. It asks: What types of institutional logics provide sets of organizing principles, practices, and social structures that constitute the contexts of accountability organizations in a poor country like Zambia?

The presentation is based on three case studies of public accountability organizations in Zambia: the Office of Auditor General, the Anti-Corruption Commission, and the Ombudsman Office. In generating the typology, the authors have followed the adaptive theory approach by Derek Layder (1998) where empirical data are used inductively as well as deductively. The main source of data comes from semi-structured interviews, conducted during three visits to Zambia, with a total of 60 members of the three organizations and other stakeholders. Also, when available, various documents were consulted, and meetings and other organizational processes were observed. After the three trips, a fourth and final trip was made where the purpose was primarily to present preliminary research findings to stakeholders from the three organizations for them to review and to give their feedback. This article presents the way in which the new typology of institutional logics was developed, not the full story of the empirical observations from the three case studies.

The Institutional Logics Perspective

The institutional logics perspective refers to a stream of research located within a broader theory addressing organizational behavior and institutional theory (Greenwood, Oliver, Sahlin, & Suddaby, 2008). The central quest of institutional theory, according to Johansen and Waldorff (2017), "has always been to understand organizational action as a social construct, bound by more than economic reasoning and rational strategic goals" (p. 52). As Farazmand (2002) noted, "institutional theory can be traced to ancient and medieval times", within Greek and Persian philosophy and governance (p. 68). Farazmand calls these early developments, the early institutionalism. The modern era of institutional theory, which Farazmand calls, classical intuitionalism, came to prominence with the studies of organizations by Philip Selznick (1949; 1957), which noted that organizations had lives of their own apart from the intentions of rational actors within them. Institutionalism continued through the 1970s and 1980s with studies that focused on organizational action through a macro-level perspective, examining how institutionalized myths and rules lead to isomorphism among the formal structures of organizations on a global scale, even if they did not implement them in their day-to-day operations (Dimaggio & Powell, 1983; J. W. Meyer & Rowan, 1977). This stream of institutional theory eventually became known as "the new institutionalism" after DiMaggio and Powell (1991) coined the phrase to capture it as a "reaction to the behavioral revolution" (p. 2) and "a rejection of rationality as an explanation for organizational structure" (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, p. 100).

The new institutionalism became increasingly criticized for being ignorant about issues of change, dissimilarity among organizations, and the effects of human agency. Amid those criticisms, researchers began developing a new stream of institutional research that would later be called the institutional logics perspective (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). It began with a 1991 essay by Friedland and Alford (1991) who introduced their work as a path toward "understand[ing] individual and organizational behavior" by "locating in a societal context", which could accommodate both the "utilitarian individual" and the "power-oriented organization" (Ibid, p. 232). According to this perspective, each institution in a society has a central logic: "a set of material practices and symbolic constructions – which constitutes its organizational principles and which is available to organizations and individuals to elaborate" (Ibid, p. 248). This perspective shifted the focus of analysis away from isomorphism and towards the ways in which actors can draw on different institutional logics that provide meaning, motive, and identity and also how those actors can manipulate and elaborate on

those different logics for their own advantage and to change social relations in society (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, p. 101).

Friedland and Alford (1991) listed several institutions and their corresponding logics. Their essay mentions, for example, the "central institutions of Western societies – capitalism, family, bureaucratic state, democracy, and Christianity" (Ibid, p. 249), and it also mentions other logics such as "the institutional logic of kinship" (p. 259) and of love (pp. 249-250). Central to the institutional logics perspective is the notion of "embedded agency", which assumes "that the interests, identities, values, and assumptions of individuals and organizations are embedded within prevailing institutional logics. Decisions and outcomes are a result of the interplay between individual agency and institutional structure" (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, p. 103). This was a core aspect of the theory: to understand individual and organizational behavior by locating it within its societal and institutional context, and to understand how the inter-institutional system guides behavior and shapes action, while it also provides opportunities for change through individual and collective agency. Thornton and Ocasio (2008) contend that institutional logics shape action via "collective identities and identification", "contests for status and power", "classification and categorization", and the "allocation of attention" (pp. 111-114). Change in the context occurs through the embedded agentive actions of institutional entrepreneurs as actors encounter different logics across organizational boundaries and as disruptive events shift cultural schemas, power sources, and resources (Ibid, pp. 115-117).

Typologies of Institutional Logics

Research on institutional logics often uses typologies of logics as a systematic way of viewing the inter-institutional system. This helps order data collection and theorizing since the ideal types serve as stable points that "facilitate systematic comparison of empirical variation" (Goodrick & Reay, 2011, p. 378). Typologies are classifications based on ideal types with exaggerated features that may be found in empirical reality. Typologies of institutional logics are comprised of what could be considered the typical features that are internally consistent within those logics, which Johansen and Waldorff (2017) "call the 'vertical relationships' internal to the institutional logics and their more detailed compositions" (p. 60). According to Layder (1998), developing and using typologies in social research "is a very useful means by which the theoretical imagination is fired" and "has the advantage of ordering one's observations and analysis" by asking how phenomena are similar or different from others (p. 73).

Studies on institutional logics can derive their ideal types of logics in different ways depending on their focus, their research questions, and their methodological approach for answering them. Reay and Jones (2016) elaborated on some of the different approaches that have been used in extant research. They noted that some studies use inductive approaches to develop their ideal types, and that these studies are grounded in empirical data that are then categorized and developed into a set of different institutional logics that exist in relationship to one another in a particular social context. Other studies, according to Reay and Jones (2016), begin with "the established literature" to develop a typology of logics (p. 447). Thus, "they privilege theory and prior research" and use a set of ideal types to interpret meaning within the organizational or social contexts they are studying (Ibid, p. 447). Finally, Reay and Jones also noted that studies of institutional logics likely involve a combination of different techniques and "cycle between inductive and deductive approaches" (Ibid, p. 442). Thus, it is important not to limit oneself strictly to inductive or deductive approaches when conducting institutional logics research, as this would limit theoretical development (Layder, 1998).

After reviewing the literature in search of relevant models or typologies of logics to be used in the Zambian cases, three studies stood out as useful. The first one was a study by Battilana and Dorado (2010) which focused on two microfinance organizations in Bolivia and the different strategies those organizations employed to manage the tensions between their fiduciary responsibilities as banks and their social responsibility to help the poor. It showed how different institutional logics offered competing goals, management principles, and ways of viewing loan recipients. The authors identified two competing logics through an inductive approach, which were a development logic that focused the attention of organization members on helping the poor and vulnerable, and a banking logic that focused organization members on making enough profits to support the organization and meet obligations to investors and depositors. Battilana and Dorado (2010) found that for these new types of organizations to work, they would need to develop a hybrid logic combining the development and banking logics in a sustainable way.

Another useful study was from the Global North, by R. E. Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006a, 2006b). It focused on the Austrian civil service and used a typology of two competing logics – a legalistic-bureaucratic logic and a managerial logic, which they consider "globally available constructs" (Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006a, p. 1002). The legalistic-bureaucratic logic is part of a tradition of European-style professional bureaucracy "characterized by a strong emphasis on processes, rules, and… impartiality toward sovereign and citizen… drawing on distinctive bodies of knowledge… but especially tied to the legal profession itself" (Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006a, pp. 1002-1003). The managerial logic is based on market principles, which are seen by some as a way to make government organizations more responsive and to serve their citizens more efficiently and effectively. This form of managerialism has often been promoted under a program of New Public Management (NPM) and can even be seen as part of "a global wave of administrative reforms" within the public sector (Christensen & Lægreid, 2011, p. 1). Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006a) looked at "identity work" among civil servants and executives and contended that their identities "change with the logics that shape them" (p. 1001). Under this view, identity is flexible and contingent, and as such it is socially constructed "from the productive power of discourse" (Maguire, Phillips, & Hardy, 2001, p. 304).

A third model that inspired the search for a useful typology of institutional logics, comes from work by Goran Hydén (2012, 2013a, 2013b), who has spent much of his life's work theorizing about and studying the contexts of government administrations in Sub-Saharan Africa. Although Hyden's studies do not approach these phenomena from an institutional logics perspective, they do look at the competing interests and competing "models of administration" within African contexts (Hydén, 2012). Hydén (2013b) noted the importance of considering the historical development of administrative legacies and "the conflicts that exist between norms that are indigenous to African societies, those that were introduced by the colonial powers, and the contemporary reform agenda with its inspiration from New Public Management" (p. 922). Therefore, most states in Sub-Saharan Africa have relied on transplanted administrative systems, which have been shaped by colonial regimes, and, more recently, by development and restructuring programs of Northern donors.

Hydén (2012) contends that the problems with reform and development programs in the Global South come from tensions between these three models, in which civil servants are pulled in three competing directions based on their relationships with different actors. The first model, patrimonialism, is based on a system of social interaction that flows from a personal form of rule or leadership, through which powerful leaders grant favors to people in exchange for their loyalty and fealty. The second model, the colonial model, is based on the rule of law and a hierarchical division of labor, which was based roughly on administrative systems in Europe. It arose in Europe to replace traditional patronage systems, and it was later transplanted to Africa in the 20th Century when most

African administrations were directed by foreign powers to control and extract from their colonies (Hydén, 2012, 2013a, 2013b). The third model, New Public Management, can be considered a more recent phenomenon in Sub-Saharan Africa. It too is a transplant, but instead of coming from Colonial powers, it comes from donor organizations and initiatives and through consulting firms. It is based on principles of the market and business trends, and it emphasizes measurable results, which lend themselves to donor goals and objectives and the more short-term nature of donor-driven projects. Therefore, donor organizations and consultancies often push African client governments to adopt elements of the New Public Management model through reform and development programs and with the enticements of donor funding (Ibid).

Hydén (2013b) noted that these three models of administration are combined in public organizations in Sub-Saharan Africa, and he used a metaphor of the "triangular hold" to describe the tensions and the effects that the three models have on African civil servants (Hydén, 2012, p. 606). The tensions between the models produce "a hybrid administrative reality where norms shift, and it is difficult to know which one is decisive where and when" (p. 930). There are similarities between Hyden's typology of three models and Meyer and Hammerschmid's typology based on the Austrian civil service. Hyden's typology compliments the legalistic-bureaucratic logic and managerial logic from the Austrian study by providing additional concepts that account for local organizing principles, practices, and structures that have been institutionalized over time in African contexts.

The concepts from Hydén (2012, 2013a, 2013b) offer a valuable, alternative perspective from development research to the typology of logics from R. E. Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006b) and other concepts from the Global North. They offer elements of an institutional logic that can reflect the long-standing norms, values, and social structures of the local society in the Sub-Saharan region and within Zambia. These informal norms and social structures may stand in conflict or be subversive of the more formalized norms and structures of a state bureaucracy (Friedland & Alford, 1991, pp. 258-259).

Developing A New Typology

The following section describes the development of a new typology for understanding the context of public organizations in Sub-Saharan Africa. It considers the contributions from Hydén and other studies on administrations in Sub-Saharan Africa as well as literature on institutional logics, public organizations, and the professions. The development of the typology began with extant literature, but is has also been iterative, moving between the previous conceptualizations and observational, documentary, and interview data that were collected from the field in the three public accountability organizations in Zambia. This process of iteration comes from a view of theory as "adaptive", following the adaptive theory approach by Derek Layder (1998). Layder's approach views theory metaphorically as a "scaffold" that pre-exists data collection and is a durable construction (Ibid, p. 150). Yet, just as a construction scaffold can adapt and be reconfigured to fit different locations, so can theoretical constructs be reflexively adapted to understand new empirical data. The "raw materials" (Ibid, pp. 163-166) of adaptive theory come from four types of sources (see following table): general theory (e.g., institutional logics as societal level structures guiding action), substantive theory (e.g., more focused research on development, professions, public organizations, typologies of logics), extant data (previous findings from research on Zambian public organizations), and emergent research data (i.e., data collected in this study of public accountability organizations in Zambia).

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

To Layder, the dual approach of using theory and data in "dialectical interplay" is that "prior concepts and theory both shape and inform the analysis of data which emanates from the ongoing research at the same time that the emergent data itself shapes and moulds the existing theoretical materials" (Ibid, p. 166). Using theory and data dialectally, Layder attempts to find a middle ground between inductive studies that are grounded in empirical observations that lead to new theory and deductive studies that begin with theory, which is in turn tested through empirical observations. To Layder, the adaptive approach can include elements of both deductive and inductive procedures, echoing the position by Reay and Jones (2016, p. 442) mentioned previously, about how researchers often cycle between inductive and deductive procedures to develop models of institutional logics.

Therefore, when field work for this research project in Zambia began in 2014, there were already some preliminary concepts and types that could be used for organizing and understanding the data. These were derived, generally, from the two types of civil service logics from Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006b) and the models of administration in Sub-Saharan Africa from Hydén (2012, 2013b) and his concept of the economy of affection (Hydén, 2013a). This provided an initial scaffolding of theory, presenting three preliminary types of logics that might be found in the three organizations: a kinship or patrimonial logic, a bureaucratic logic, and a managerial logic.

While collecting data through interviews, observations, and extant documentary and academic literature sources, it was possible to re-evaluate the preliminary typology. It became evident that some of the practices or values espoused within the public accountability organizations went beyond typical norms and practices of efficiency and public service found in the new public management or managerialism logic (Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006b). As noted previously, the main source of data was from 60 interviews, which are illustrated in table 2. For example, interview respondents discussed outreach and service to members of the public, particularly those who were poor and marginalized and who would normally have no access to systems of governance or democratic accountability, which went beyond the patterns of practices and principles of the managerialism logic and the other types from the preliminary typology. A return to the literature then led to the theoretical concept of "development management", which is a well-established discourse within international development and reform in the Global South (Cooke, 2001). Within the development management discourse are normative notions about how public organizations in the South empower the poor and the disadvantaged and how modern managerial practices and techniques can help move developing societies towards modernization (D. W. Brinkerhoff & Coston, 1999; J. M. Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2010). These notions seemed to be a better representation of the typical features likely to be found within public organizations in Sub-Saharan Africa and Zambia than managerialism alone. Therefore, instead of the more general types of managerialism or new public management, a more contextually relevant and specific type, the development management logic, was developed further and used in the three case studies.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Another issue that became evident was that professionalism would need to somehow be addressed and analyzed. Interview respondents spoke in terms of professionalization processes and practices and the organizational effects those processes were having in their organization. For example, in the Office of Auditor General, interview respondents talked about how new audit standards and

practices were implemented locally in the organization because they were propagated from within the international professional community. Furthermore, extant data and literature on public organizations in Zambia also mentioned the effects of the "erosion of professionalism" in the early days of the Zambian civil service (Mulikita, 2002, p. 2) and the compounding effects of that erosion of professional values and skills that are still being felt in the civil service today (Mpaisha, 2004). In that way, professionalism can be seen as having been divorced from the bureaucracy in the Zambian context. In addition, there was also a basis in the development literature on the analytical value of considering professionalism when studying development in the Global South (Hildebrand & Grindle, 1997) and public accountability organizations in Sub-Saharan Africa (Gustavson, 2014). Therefore, it seemed reasonable that a fourth logic should be developed based on "professionalism" as its core organizing principle. This was a departure from the typology from Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006b), which implied that professionalism is an innate characteristic of the bureaucracy. That may have been the case in Austria, but in Zambia where bureaucracy had existed for many years devoid of professionalism, this did not seem to be the case. Furthermore, literature on the professions (Freidson, 2001) and organizations (Mintzberg, 1979, 1989) have also made an analytical distinction between bureaucracy and professionalism as a way of understanding professional organizations and their members, texts which would come to inform the development of the fourth logic in this typology, the professionalism logic.

The iterative processes between substantive and general theories as well as emergent and extant data resulted in a new typology of four institutional logics, which can be used for analyzing public organizations in Zambia and across the region. In that way, this process follows Layder's (1998) approach to developing a typology:

> The development of this typology subsequently becomes the centrepoint of the adaptive theory, which then feeds into the data collection… So that while the typology itself is shaped and modified by the extant theoretical materials and the incoming research data, the unfolding adaptive theory (the typology and related concepts) simultaneously shapes, modifies and orders the data and the extant materials…The typology that begins to shape up in this way becomes an addition and partly autonomous theoretical product (new theory) as well as providing new theoretical insights into the substantive area of [research] (Ibid, p. 171, parentheses in original).

After the typology had been substantially revised and developed during early fieldwork in Zambia it was used to compare to the data being collected in the three cases, which was also a useful means of assessing its validity since the types needed to fit the incoming data and have a capacity to explain social reality (Layder, 1998, pp. 85-97, in particular pp. 85-86, 91-92). The typology and the four ideal types are presented below, and descriptions of the specific dimensions and elements that make up the "'vertical relationships' internal to the institutional logics" (Johansen & Waldorff, 2017, p. 60) are presented briefly in the subsequent section.

Presentation of Four Ideal Type Logics

The Kinship Logic

The first ideal type, kinship logic, is inspired by the original conception from Friedland and Alford (1991) as an informal type of logic based on gift-giving and mutual obligations between individuals. The formulation of the kinship logic in this study also draws extensively from Goran Hyden's work on the economy of affection, and as such, it is based on a communitarian and relational approach to life in Sub-Saharan Africa. This way of life is "primordial", according to Hydén (2013a) and (Masunungure, 2004), in that it predates colonialism and is often divided along ancient kinship lines, and through which, actors "share expectations about what is appropriate behavior: that is,

reciprocity in all exchanges" (Hydén, 2013a, p. 87). Roberts's (1976) history of Zambia discussed these types of reciprocal exchanges in ancient tribal relations in Zambia, that it "was one of the most important means of circulating scarce commodities such as salt, iron-work, or foreign cloth" at that time (p. 81). These types of informal exchanges also ensured the loyalty of tribe members to their chiefs by rewarding loyal members with the material and cultural resources necessary for their existence.

Masunungure (2004) contended that one of the central problems facing African public administration today is the tension that exists between this informal and primordial way of getting things done and the more abstract civic professionalism within government administrations. This is because within the kinship logic there is no distinction between private and state resources. Thus, state resources may be distributed as favors in exchange for fealty, and patrimonialism is practiced and tolerated under a kinship logic. Patrimonialism is a system of social interaction in which powerful leaders grant favors to people in exchange for their loyalty, and it flows from a personal form of rule or leadership. Weber (1978, as cited in Hydén, 2013a) noted, "the patrimonial office lacks above all the bureaucratic separation of the 'private' and the 'official' sphere" and is there to serve the ruler and the official – not civil society (p. 98).

The kinship logic has its own basis of rationality in the sense that it "presupposes personal interdependence" between members across all levels of society (Hydén, 2013a, p. 86). As Friedland and Alford (1991) described this interdependence, "Through gifts, the lower status persons take possession of powerful persons whose substance they have penetrated with their own… Individuals make use of the institutional logic of kinship to penetrate the state definitions of needs and social categories" (p. 259). In this way it can subvert the professional and bureaucratic logics and their ways of determining what is appropriate and the ways in which they serve the public, and it can be used to get things done outside of those logics. This can be commonly seen in practices such as payouts or bribes, the hiring or promoting of civil servants based on tribal affiliation, or the granting other types of benefits based on interpersonal relationships or exchanges of favors as opposed to being based on formal operating procedures.

The Bureaucratic Logic

The second ideal type, bureaucratic logic, is based on the hierarchical division of labor in a standardized and stable work environment. If a public organization is run according to a bureaucratic logic, the career system would be fixed and closed with promotions based on seniority, and public services would be delivered in a regulated fashion, without the requirements of bribes or payouts. Bureaucratic organizing principles arose over time in Europe as a response to patrimonial rule with its fiefdoms, patronage, and fealty (Hydén, 2013a) and as a means of standardizing industrial labor (Freidson, 2001). An organization guided by a bureaucratic logic would be "characterized by a strong emphasis on processes, rules, and… impartiality" (Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006a, pp. 1002-1003). This can be seen as "traditional bureaucracy" with "rigid rule orientation and a programming of all activities" rather than a more "modern" and professional bureaucracy (Askvik, 1993, p. 158) as was reflected in the typology for Austrian public organizations by Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006b).

As Hydén (2012, 2013a, 2013b) noted in his typology of administrative models, bureaucracy is a product of transplantation from Europe in the 20th century, when much of Africa was colonized by European powers who set up administrative systems for collecting taxes, organizing industry, and controlling the native populations. Many Africans have understandably looked upon this set of ideas with skepticism. However, bureaucratic ideas, practices, and structures still can be seen on the continent, at least on the surface, in public organizations today (Ibid).

The Development Management Logic

The third ideal type, development management logic, is based on private sector approaches to development processes. Development management is a value-laden term and is contested in research literature (Bawole, Hossain, Ghalib, Rees, & Mamman, 2016). In its logically pure form, development management assumes the claim that governments in the Global South "have yet to achieve modernity, which is why they are deemed to need 'development'" (Cooke, 2004, p. 604) and that management is a neutral technocratic instrument rather than an instrument of political power. Much as Thomas (1996) argued in his pioneering work on development management, this study takes the concept of development management at "face value" (Cooke, 2001, p. 13) for the purpose of developing an ideal type that can be used for making comparisons with the empirical data. As such, the statement by Thomas (1999) holds true: "Development management will often remain the ideal rather than a description of what actually takes place" since what takes place in reality is "more ambiguous, with value-based conflicts, contestation over the definition of development itself, and power struggles" (p. 17).

In a development management logic, the mission of the organization is centered around the empowerment of society and its marginalized groups. According to Brinkerhoff and Coston (1999), "development management takes a normative stance on empowerment and supporting groups, particularly the poor and marginalized, to take an active role in determining and fulfilling their own needs" (p. 350). This makes the development management logic distinct from managerialism more generally because of its normative emphasis on promoting societal empowerment and good governance for the citizenry, particularly for the disempowered and vulnerable. This normative distinction is kept intact for this typology even as recent research from a critical management perspective has debated whether development management is "simply another colonizing discourse… governed by an institutionalized managerial logic" and used as a form of oppression (Gulrajani, 2010, p. 140). The development management logic's values and practices are centered on "results" – bringing measurable results for all members of society with efficiency and effectiveness, and in particular, those who are poor and disenfranchised. It approaches organizing with flatter and more team-based approaches, and it has a flexible and open career system. The principles and practices found in the development management are more recent arrivals to Africa, according to Hydén (2013b, p. 923). These types of ideas lend themselves to donor goals and objectives and the more short-term nature of donor-driven projects.

The Professionalism Logic

Finally, it is useful to consider a fourth ideal type, the professionalism logic, in order to gain a better understanding of public organizations in Zambia and Sub-Saharan Africa. Some development researchers (Grindle & Hildebrand, 1995; Gustavson, 2014) have been calling for greater attention to the role of professionals and professionalism in development processes. They contend that professional identity, ethics, and skill sets can have a positive impact on reform and development efforts in the region. Within the professionalism logic, special emphasis is placed on education and training within an occupational specialty, and a professional ethic is assumed to eclipse other motivations when it comes to doing one's specialized job or delivering a professional service. For example, a professional accountant is assumed to not cheat when producing financial data, even when there is an opportunity for financial gain by doing so. Thus, it is thought to add an additional layer of accountability to members of public organizations in the Global South, which would help ensure more effective delivery of public service.

According to Freidson (2001), a professionalism logic would be characterized by control and coordination from within the profession by fellow professionals, as opposed to by organizational

executives and management. Within this logic, occupational roles are to be stable and fixed, offering freedom to professionals to assume those same roles across different organizations within the same professional field. Formal and abstract knowledge are hallmarks of the professionalism logic, and this specialized knowledge is a key source for a sense of occupational identification and pride common among professionals (Freidson, 2001). The profession sets standards for labor market entry with particular training and credentials being required to enter the labor market. A typical career line within a professionalism logic would be horizontal, with the ability to easily move across firms – thus a professional's allegiance lies more with the profession than with the employer.

Specifying Dimensions of Institutional Logics

When studying logics, it is useful to specify the sets of dimensions that comprise them. This enables researchers to analyze how "actors handle different logics across identified characteristics" (Johansen & Waldorff, 2017, p. 61) as well as to determine patterns of change by examining how much each dimension changes over time (Campbell, 2004). According to Campbell (2004), there are three considerations for specifying these types of institutional dimensions: theoretical perspective, local salience, and the levels to be studied (pp. 37-38). The first consideration is the analyst's theoretical perspective, which broadly organizes a range of dimensions to be examined based on theoretical relevance and categories. The second consideration for specifying institutional dimensions is local salience, ensuring that the dimensions to be covered "are salient for the people who live with them" (Ibid, p. 38). The third consideration for specifying institutional dimensions relates to levels of analysis. Since the relevance of insights and analyses may differ based on global, societal, field, organizational, or individual levels, it is important to clearly articulate the levels on which the dimensions in the typology are based.

Regarding the first consideration of the analyst's theoretical perspective, the dimensions in the typology (table 3) are based mainly on the institutional logics perspective. The nine dimensions of the typology correlate with the models mentioned previously by Hydén (2013b) and Meyer and Hammerschmid (2006) and other well-established conceptualizations (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton, et al, 2012). For example, the first dimension in the table, "collective identity", is considered to play central role in the way organization members experience different institutional logics. As organizational actors identify with different institutionalized groups, they experience a common shared status and connection with other group members and are thus "more likely to… abide by its norms and prescriptions" (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, p. 111, citing March and Olsen, 1989). Rao, Monin, and Durand (2003) argued that the link between the institutional logic and the behavior of individuals is bound up in their social identity, "the self-image derived by actors when they categorize themselves as members of a collectivity or occupants of a role" (p. 797). In that way, decisions and behaviors of organizational actors link to the institutional logics and their respective categories and criteria of boundaries between who is in-group and who is out-group. Likewise, the second dimension of "staff orientation" is believed to define the issues and realms that are important to organization members and have an impact on where they focus their attention (Hyden, 2012, 2013b, Meyer and Hammerschmid, 2006a/b, Thornton et al, 2012).

Regarding Campbell's (2004) second consideration of "salience", the dimensions of the typology were developed in dialogue with interview data from organization members and other stakeholders in Zambia (illustrated in table 2). This helped to ensure the dimensions reflected the perspectives of the people who live within the context being studied by making room for input from the respondents about what is important within their own social world. Beyond ensuring that the research can be useful to practitioners, it also ensures that the research can adequately reflect reality. For example, the interview respondents were eager to discuss to how employment practices affected their work,

noting how it seemed unfair for some employees to be hired or promoted based on tribal affiliation or length of service instead of on performance of academic qualifications. Whereas dimensions from other models such as "models of governance", "sources of legitimacy", or "economic systems" found in other typologies were not as salient to them (R. E. Meyer & Hammerschmid, 2006b). The process of developing the dimensions of the logics with interview data helped to increase its "ability to render accurately and adequately the lived experiences of those studied" and to help ensure the theory fits the context and is relevant to local actors (Layder, 1998).

The third consideration for specifying dimensions of a study relates to levels of analysis – be they global, societal, field, organizational, or individual levels (Campbell, 2004). This study is focused on the organizational level, looking at the dynamics of institutional logics in three public accountability organizations in Zambia. Therefore, the dimensions in the typology are more focused on practices, principles, and structures that would be experienced within organizations than within broader societal groups. For example, employment processes, preferred organizational structure, and the sources of authority within the organizations are important dimensions to consider when conducting analysis at the organizational level, and they are represented in the proposed typology.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Concluding remarks

The purpose of this article has been to propose a typology of the differing institutional logics that affect public accountability organizations in Zambia. This was achieved by reviewing relevant literatures on institutional logics and by following the adaptive theory approach introduced by Derek Layder (1998). On the basis of the literature, the authors constructed a preliminary typology including three ideal types: a kinship/patrimonial logic, a bureaucratic logic, and a managerial logic. Subsequently, after carrying out fieldwork during a first visit to Zambia, the preliminary typology was revised and expanded to include a fourth ideal type, professionalism as well as a number of vertical dimensions for each logic.

This new typology contributes to the literature on institutional logics, as it fills a gap, since institutional researchers have not focused their research in the Sub-Saharan region or throughout the Global South more broadly (Andrews, 2013, p. 3; Johansen & Waldorff, 2017). Therefore, this typology helps move institutional logics research beyond its narrow focus on organizations in the Global North. It directly answers the recent call by Johansen and Waldorff (2017) "for a broader engagement with the world" and "to move beyond a rather rationalistic view of organizations and organizational actors by tending also to the informal organization… and power struggles" (pp. 70-71). It does this by calling attention to the kinship logic, which goes beyond the formal organizational roles, rules, and procedures and emphasizes the informal identity of civil servants resulting from ethnicity or tribe. This also reflects what Friedland and Alford (1991) considered within their original conception, that the kinship logic is subversive of the more formal logics. It reintroduces the kinship logic into the literature, which had previously been absent in research on institutional logics until now.

The new typology contributes to development research, as it broadens our understanding of how multiple sets of organizing principles, practices, and ideas co-exist and guide action in public organizations in Sub-Saharan Africa, which is a vibrant focus of inquiry in the development literature (Andrews, 2013; Evans, 2004; Hydén, 2012, 2013b; Jamil, Askvik, & Hossain, 2013). This is especially

relevant in research on public accountability organizations, which play an increasingly central role in development processes in the Global South (Hydén, 2013b; Reichborn-Kjennerud et al., 2019) and in which there are often political power struggles related to the different values, systems of control, and modes of operation consistent with the different institutional logics. The typology provides a lens for examining how a public accountability organization and its members manage these conflicts. For example, practices consistent with different institutional logics can be segmented from one another, through which the activities of one organizational unit can be consistent with one institutional logic while the activities in another unit are consistent with another logic, which can alleviate tensions and competition that can exist between the logics. There can also be instances in which the different logics may enable organizational action when they are complimentary to one another and can exist within facilitative relationships. These theoretical developments lie outside of the scope of this paper, however, and will be developed further in future papers based on the data from public accountability organizations in Zambia.

References

Andrews, M. (2013). *The limits of institutional reform in development: Changing rules for realistic solutions*: Cambridge University Press.

Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management journal, 53*(6), 1419-1440.

Bawole, J. N., Hossain, F., Ghalib, A. K., Rees, C. J., & Mamman, A. (2016). Development Management: A Conceptual and Theoretical Overview. In J. N. Bawole, F. Hossain, A. K. Ghalib, C. J. Rees, & A. Mamman (Eds.), *Development Management: Theory and practice*: Routledge.

Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Coston, J. M. (1999). International development management in a globalized world. *Public Administration Review*, 346-361.

Brinkerhoff, J. M., & Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2010). International development management: A Northern perspective. *Public Administration and Development, 30*(2), 102-115. doi:10.1002/pad.557

Campbell, J. L. (2004). *Institutional change and globalization*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2011). Introduction. In T. Christensen & P. Lægreid (Eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to New Public Management* (pp. 1-13): Routledge.

Cooke, B. (2001). *From colonial administration to development management*. University of Manchester. Institute for development policy and management (IDPM).

Cooke, B. (2004). The managing of the (third) world. *Organization, 11*(5), 603-629.

Dimaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160.

DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1991). Introduction In P. DiMaggio & W. Powell (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 1-38). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Evans, P. (2004). Development as institutional change: the pitfalls of monocropping and the potentials of deliberation. *Studies in comparative international development, 38*(4), 30-52.

Farazmand, A. (2002). Emergent theories of organization: An overview and analysis. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Modern Organizations: Theory and Practice* (2nd ed., pp. 63-96). Westport, CT, USA: Praeger.

Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism : the third logic*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions.

Goodrick, E., & Reay, T. (2011). Constellations of institutional logics changes in the professional work of pharmacists. *Work and Occupations, 38*(3), 372-416.

Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K., & Suddaby, R. (2008). Introduction. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 1-46).

Gulrajani, N. (2010). New vistas for development management: Examining radical–reformist possibilities and potential. *Public Administration and Development, 30*(2), 136-148. doi:10.1002/pad.569

Gustavson, M. (2014). *Auditing Good Government in Africa : Public Sector Reform, Professional Norms and the Development Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hildebrand, M. E., & Grindle, M. S. (1997). Building Sustainable Capacity in the Public Sector. What Can Be Done? In M. S. Grindle (Ed.), *Getting Good Government* (pp. 31-59). Boston: Harvard Institute for International Development.

Hydén, G. (2012). Public administration in developing and transitional societies. . In B. G. Peters & J. Pierre (Eds.), *Sage handbook of public administration* (pp. 603-608).

Hydén, G. (2013a). *African politics in comparative perspective* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hydén, G. (2013b). Culture, Administration, and Reform in Africa. *International Journal of Public Administration, 36*(13), 922-931. doi:10.1080/01900692.2013.773034

Jamil, I., Askvik, S., & Hossain, F. (2013). Understanding Administrative Culture: Some Theoretical and Methodological Remarks. *International Journal of Public Administration, 36*(13), 900-909. doi:10.1080/01900692.2013.837728

Johansen, C. B., & Waldorff, S. B. (2017). What are Institutional Logics-and Where is the Perspective Taking Us? In G. Krucken, C. Mazza, R. Meyer, & P. Walgenbach (Eds.), *New Themes in Institutional Analysis: Topics and Issues from European Research* (pp. 51-76): Edward Elgar Publishing, Incorporated.

Layder, D. (1998). *Sociological practice: Linking theory and social research*: Sage.

Maguire, S., Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2001). When 'silence = death', keep talking: trust, control and the discursive construction of identity in the Canadian HIV/AIDS treatment domain. *Organization Studies, 22*(2), 285-310.

Masunungure, E. (2004). Towards understanding some obstacles to professionalism in Africa: A view through contextual lenses. In E. Masunungure, F. Appiah, D. Chimanikire, & T. Gran (Eds.), *Professionalism and good governance in Africa* (pp. 63-83): Copenhagen Business School Press.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340. doi:10.1086/226550

Meyer, R. E., & Hammerschmid, G. (2006a). Changing institutional logics and executive identities: a managerial challenge to public administration in Austria.(Author Abstract). *American Behavioral Scientist, 49*(7), 1000-1014.

Meyer, R. E., & Hammerschmid, G. (2006b). Public management reform: An identity project. *Public Policy and Administration, 21*(1), 99-115.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations : a synthesis of the research*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on management: Inside our strange world of organizations*: Simon and Schuster.

Mpaisha, C. (2004). Professionalisation of the Foreign Service in Zambia In E. Masunungure, F. Appiah, D. Chimanikire, & T. Gran (Eds.), *Professionalism and good governance in Africa* (pp. 189-211): Copenhagen Business School Press.

Mulikita, N. (2002). *Reform and the Crisis in Zambia's Public Administration: A Critical Appraisal.* Paper presented at the Development Policy Management Forum, Ethiopia.

Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional Change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle Cuisine as an Identity Movement in French Gastronomy 1. *American Journal of Sociology, 108*(4), 795-843.

Reay, T., & Jones, C. (2016). Qualitatively capturing institutional logics. *Strategic Organization, 14*(4), 441-454.

Reichborn-Kjennerud, K., González-Díaz, B., Bracci, E., Carrington, T., Hathaway, J., Jeppesen, K. K., & Steccolini, I. (2019). Sais work against corruption in Scandinavian, South-European and African countries: An institutional analysis. *The British Accounting Review*, 100842. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2019.100842

Roberts, A. (1976). *A history of Zambia*. London: Heinemann.

Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the grass roots : a study in the sociology of formal organization.* University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration : a sociological interpretation*. New York: Harper & Row.

Thomas, A. (1996). What is development management? *Journal of International Development, 8*(1), 95-110.

Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism, 840*, 99-128.

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective*: Wiley Online Library.

Table 1

Sources of adaptive theory

Theoretical	General Theory
	Substantive Theory
Empirical	Extant Data
	Emergent Research Data

(Layder, 1998, p. 163)

Table 2

Interview Respondents: Office of Auditor General Zambia	
Auditor General	1
Deputies Auditor General	2
Department Directors	6
Managers/principal auditors/auditors/other officers	10
Former Vice President/Current Leader of Opposition Party	1
Members of Parliament sitting on the Public Accounts Committee	3
Executive Director of Transparency International Zambia	1
Local expert on programs at Auditor's Office from Norwegian Embassy	1
Norwegian Ambassador to Zambia	1
Total respondents related to OAGZ	26
Interview Respondents: Zambia Anti-Corruption Commission	
Commissioner Steven Moyo (1 of the 5 commissioners in 2016)	1
Department Directors	3
Chief, Senior, and other Officers	22
Total respondents related to Anti-Corruption Commission	26
Interview Respondents: Zambian ombudsman office	
The Zambian Ombudsman: Public Protector Caroline Sokoni	1
Executive Administrator	1
Investigators	2
Administrative officers and other officers	3
Executive Officer from Danish Ombudsman Office	1
Total respondents related the Zambian ombudsman organization	8
Total Interview Respondents	**60**

Table 3

Dimensions	*Kinship Logic*	*Bureaucratic Logic*	*Development Management Logic*	*Professionalism Logic*
Collective Identity	Affiliation with tribal and ethnic groups	Affiliation with the bureaucracy	Affiliation with shared mission of the organization to serve society	Affiliation with the professional community
Staff Orientation	Orientated toward kin, community, and patriarch	Internal orientation within bureaucratic organization	External orientation toward public	Oriented toward professional field
Core Values	Relationships: reciprocity, serving one's own needs and those of family and tribe with loyalty	Rules: Following rules and correct procedures in a stable environment	Results: Achieving measurable results, efficiency, effectiveness for society, especially the disempowered	Reliability: Being skilled in and following professional norms, standards, and methods; maintaining professional work ethic, autonomy
Preferred Org. Structure	Patriarchal structure	Centralized hierarchical structure	Fragmented structure, team & project based	Decentralized hierarchical structure
Operational Mode	"Personal fiefdoms" with no separation between private and public resources	Mechanistic and geared to rules and routines	Organic, strategic, and flexible to meet the needs of the public	Pigeonholing processes: diagnosis and application of program; discretionary judgement
System of control	Informal control based on expectations of reciprocity and/or fear	Rule-based, with strict formal control by centralized authority structure	Managerial control based on performance measurement	Professional autonomy, guided by norms and standards
Source of Authority	Informal authority	Rational-Legal authority	Managerial authority	Professional authority
Evaluation criteria	Elevating status with community; showing and sharing personal wealth	Following proper procedures; providing stable, consistent service	Achieving performance goals and targets	Delivering professionally sound and reliable work by following professional standards and methods
Employment Practices	Entry to employment and promotions based on personal favor and connections	Entry to employment through centralized system. Promotions based on seniority	Entry to employment and promotions based on ability to bring results and performance	Entry to employment and promotions based on professional certifications and knowledge acquisition