Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
ScienceDirect
International Journal of Project Management 26 (2008) 749–757
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT
www.elsevier.com/locate/ijproman

# Investigating the use of the stakeholder notion in project management literature, a meta-analysis

Marjolein C. Achterkamp *, Janita F.J. Vos

*Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands*

Received 13 February 2007; received in revised form 19 September 2007; accepted 2 October 2007

**Abstract**

In project management it is commonly accepted that the interests of stakeholders need to be dealt with to support the success of a project. By doing a meta-analysis of project management literature it is investigated how the stakeholder notion is used in this literature. Forty two publications are assessed against the purpose of this notion, the stakeholder definition and how the identification of stakeholders is addressed. The analysis shows that only a minority of the publications provides a clear definition and addresses the identification of stakeholders. We argue that a role perspective on the stakeholders issue fits the project context and therefore could fill this gap in the project management literature. After comparing the stakeholder approach with project role classifications from the literature, we conclude that a role-based stakeholder identification method is a promising approach for identifying stakeholders in projects.


*Keywords:* Stakeholders, Managing Projects

## 1. Introduction

In the project management literature it is common knowledge that to make a project a success, the interests of the *key* stakeholders or even of *all* stakeholders should be taken into account (e.g. [1–3]). We start with an example that illustrates the importance of identifying the stakeholders, but also the importance of understanding the role a stakeholder may play. This example is the prelude to specifying the goal of this article.

A few years ago, a middle-sized city in the north of the Netherlands intended to modernise its city harbour. A large project was started and numerous stakeholders were heard. The core of the project was the construction of a bicycle bridge. This bridge should connect the old city centre with a new quarter in the vicinity of the city harbour. However, this part of the project was unexpectedly delayed by a protest action of the occupants of some houseboats which possessed a mooring place in the harbour (they blocked the entrance of the city harbour by moving their boats). The project management (coming from the firm the project was commissioned to) was completely taken by surprise. The protesters claimed that they were not heard, although the city council assumed they were represented according to the procedures of public involvement and that the matter was discussed with a number of neighbouring people. Furthermore, the city council assumed that these stakeholders were just powerless bystanders, whereas it turned out that they had the means to influence at least the process, but in the end also the outcome of the project.

This example shows at least two things. First of all, the city council did not recognize this particular stakeholder of the project. They considered the houseboat occupants as an integral part of the neighbouring people. Second, even if the city council would have identified these specific neighbours as a separate group with its own wishes and demands, they presumably still would have misjudged the role these stakeholders could play. Of course, it will remain a question whether the delay could have been prevented. However, it is likely that if the city council (and acting

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +31 50 363 7311.
*E-mail addresses:* m.c.achterkamp@rug.nl (M.C. Achterkamp), j.f.j.vos@rug.nl (J.F.J. Vos).

0263-7863/$30.00 
doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2007.10.001

project manager) had acknowledged this group as a party affected by the project, or as a party able to constrain the project, at least they would not have been taken aback by the blockade.

The example indeed shows what is common knowledge in the literature: the importance of dealing with stakeholder interests for project management. It is therefore no surprise that the authors of several articles published in the *International Journal of Project Management* (IJPM) and in the *Project Management Journal* (PMJ) address the issue of stakeholder participation or in any other way use the stakeholder notion.

This article reports the findings of a meta-analysis of these publications. We show the lack of attention paid to conceptualising the stakeholder notion in the context of projects as well as to make the notion operational for this context. Our main point is that if a clear stakeholder definition is lacking, it is not possible to determine whether the relevant stakeholders have been identified and, consequently, whether a stakeholder analysis (e.g. in preparation to a project) has been accomplished in a satisfactory way. The example shows that this could jeopardise a project.

The article is structured as follows. First we discuss stakeholder notions, stakeholder definitions and stakeholder classifications stemming from stakeholder theory. In the meta-analysis on publications in project literature, we then show that neither these, nor other stakeholder definitions are used much in the project literature. In discussing this outcome, we consider a combination of project roles and an identification method encompassing a role based stakeholder classification model as a promising prospect for stakeholder management in projects.

## 2. Some key insights from stakeholder theory

Before we go into the stakeholder notions used in the project literature, we will first discuss the stakeholder literature. In this literature, several stakeholder definitions and classifications are developed which we expect to be useful too in the context of project management. In the meta-analysis of the publications from the project literature, we use these definitions as a starting point of our analysis. In doing so we hope to be able to place the stakeholder notion as used in the project literature in some perspective.

Freeman's definition stating that "...a stakeholder in an organisation is any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organisation's objectives..." [4, p. 46] takes a "landmark" position in stakeholder theory [5–8]. In the literature, this definition is usually cited as a starting point to give a more narrow view on stakeholders, in which finer-grained categorisations than "can affect" and "affected" are described. Just a few examples of these categorisations are stakeholders who have "potential for collaboration" and stakeholders who have "potential for threatening" [9], "fiduciary and non-fiduciary" stakeholders [10], "primary and secondary" stakeholders [6], "voluntary and involuntary" stakeholders (Clarkson, cited in [11]), or "actively and passively involved" stakeholders [12].

The literature's prevailing stakeholder classification model is the salience model of Mitchell et al. [11]. Salience is described as the degree to which managers give priority to competing stakeholder claims; Mitchell et al. try to answer the question of how managers choose their stakeholders and how they prioritise among competing stakeholder claims. Managers, they argue, perceive the various stakeholder groups differently; managers give a high priority to a stakeholder if they believe that this stakeholder has a *legitimate* claim, which calls for immediate action (i.e. *urgent*), and possesses the *power* to influence the organisation's activities. The stakeholder who is believed to possess these three attributes, (i.e. legitimacy, urgency and power) is called a definitive stakeholder. Likewise, a classification of seven stakeholder groups is developed, depending on the presence of one, two or three attributes in varying combinations. The salience classification is a theoretical framework that explains why (and when) managers pay attention to certain stakeholders. Note that it is in the eyes of the manager who are considered stakeholders, a feature of the salience model often overlooked (e.g. [13]). The framework provides, in terms of Mitchell et al. [11, p. 868], insights for understanding how stakeholders can gain or lose salience to the managers of an organisation and who are, for that reason, able to influence the organisation's activities.

In evaluating various classification models for the purpose of stakeholder identification in the context of innovation projects, Vos and Achterkamp [12] come to two conclusions. First of all, since a classification model is considered a starting point for stakeholder identification, it needs to fit the situation for which it is to be used. They make a case for a role-based stakeholder model that closely depicts the activities within this context. Such a model should structure the different stakeholder groups; only then their identification can start by answering the question of "Which specific stakeholders fit within a specific category?" (i.e., naming the persons and parties that fill a certain stakeholder category). However, the identification of stakeholders is easier said than done, even if one uses a sound stakeholder classification model. Therefore, the second conclusion is that such a model can only be efficacious in practice if it is supported by an additional identification procedure.

Vos and Achterkamp applied this argumentation in developing a stakeholder identification method consisting of a classification model including corresponding identification questions and a procedure for using this model in innovation projects. The classification model, which is adapted from Ulrich [14,15], specifies four roles that stakeholders play in an innovation setting: *client*, *decision maker*, *designer,* and *passively involved* [12,16]. The clients, decision makers and designers together are called the *actively involved*. Of course, this classification echos Freeman's definition, with the actively involved as the "can affect"-stakeholders and the passively involved as the "affected" parties.

However, the way it defines these stakeholders, as based on the innovation project's activities, brings Freeman's generic definition closer to the context of innovation projects.

What can be concluded from the stakeholder theory? First of all, to be able to identify stakeholders, a stakeholder definition, preferably in the form of a stakeholder classification model is needed. The salience classification, based on legitimacy, urgency and power, could be used as a starting point, but also Freeman's distinction between affected stakeholders and stakeholders who can affect the project (outcome) could be useful here, especially if this distinction is clarified further by focusing on the roles the "can affect" stakeholders (or involved stakeholders) can play within the project.

Second, classifying is not the same as identifying; in addition to a stakeholder definition, attention should be paid to how the actual stakeholders fit within these classes and how they are determined accordingly.

Table 1
Summarising analysis of the 42 Publications

| Criteria | Assessment according to the criteria |
|---|---|
| Purpose of stakeholder notion | Defining success/sense making: 29<br>Risk management/risk reduction: 5<br>Stakeholders provide information: 1<br>Stakeholder management instrument: 7 |
| Definition | 'Interest in'-definition: 3<br>Freeman definition: 2<br>Combination of 'interest in'-definition and Freeman definition: 2<br>Classification based on importance: 4<br>Identification of empirical parties without reference to a definition: 22<br>No definition, no classification, no identification: 9 |
| Identification issue | Recognized and explicated: 4<br>Recognized and explicated to some degree: 8<br>Recognized but not explicated: 5<br>Not recognized and not explicated: 25 |

## 3. Analysing the use of the stakeholder concept in project management literature

To find out whether and how the stakeholder notion is used in project management literature, and to see whether stakeholder classifications or stakeholder identifications methods are used, we performed a literature search within the two project management journals: IJPM and PMJ. Investigating the use of the term *stakeholder* in the period 1995–2006, we found 34 articles in IJPM and 8 articles in PMJ in which the stakeholder notion is in some way used. It should be noted that we did not set any restrictions regarding the purpose of using the stakeholder notion or the number of times the notion was being used. On the other hand, we did leave out four one-page articles (mainly editorials from PMJ), because we felt that, in scholarly terms, it is hardly possible to develop a full argumentation on one page.

Appendix A to this article gives an overview of the 42 articles and details the analysis of these articles. The articles were assessed against three criteria: the purpose of the stakeholder notion, the type of definition as used, and the way in which the identification of stakeholders is addressed. Table 1 summarises our analysis of the 42 articles.

Notably, Table 1 shows that the main purpose of using the stakeholder notion is to give meaning to a project's success or to show that the varying views on project success depend on the stakeholders concerned. This confirms once more the relevance of stakeholders in managing projects and consequently the notion's relevance to the theory on project management.

As indicated, the majority of the articles does not provide a definition of what is considered a stakeholder. In only seven out of the 42 articles, the authors specify a definition when referring to the stakeholder notion. On the whole, there are three types of definitions used in these articles. A definition of the first kind resembles "a stakeholder is an individual or organisation with a (vested) interest in the project (i.e. outcome, success)" [17–19]. A definition of the second kind resembles "a stakeholder is an individual or organisation that can affect or is affected by the project" [13,20]. In this definition we recognize Freeman's definition stating that "...a stakeholder in an organisation is any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organisation's objectives..." [4, p. 46]. The third kind is a combination of the 'interest in'-definition and Freeman's definition, which is provided in two articles [21,22].

The large set of articles without a clear stakeholder definition can be divided in three groups. In the first group of four articles, the stakeholders are more or less classified on the basis of their importance; however, their classes are not defined [23–26]. In the second group, which consists of 22 articles, a set of empirical parties is presented as the (undefined) stakeholders. Finally, in nine articles stakeholders are neither defined, nor classified, nor recognized.

With respect to the identification issue, in 17 of the 42 articles, the authors see the problem of stakeholder identification (i.e., actually naming stakeholders) and recognize the difficulty of this task. Furthermore, of these articles only four provide a thorough explication of how the identification of stakeholders has been accomplished, and eight to a lesser extent. This means that in 25 of the articles no attention is paid to the problem of identifying stakeholders.

To gain further insight into the underlying stakeholder theory that contributes to conceptualizing the term stakeholder, we looked at the references regarding the stakeholder notion. Appendix B to this article provides an overview of the publications as cited within the 42 publications, but only when used to give meaning to the stakeholder notion or in relation to the identification issue. Appendix B shows, besides publications which can be classified as students' texts and/or consultants' guides, only four research publications [4,11,27,28]. The first two are cited only by Boonstra [13], and the latter two only by Olander and Landin [19].

In conclusion, Table 1 and Appendix B show that from the 42 articles in IJPM and PMJ, which all address the stakeholder notion, only twelve articles explicate to some extent stakeholder identification, only seven use a stakeholder definition, and only two cite stakeholder research. From this we may conclude that there is a hiatus in the project management literature.

Whether this hiatus indeed leads to any problems in the projects described in these articles, is difficult to say. Unidentified stakeholders are, by definition, not mentioned in the articles. If the importance of a structured stakeholder identification procedure, preferably based on a fitting stakeholder classification is not recognized as an issue, no attention will be paid to the way the stakeholders are then identified.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. A role-based stakeholder classification model

So far we have shown that despite the importance of stakeholder involvement or stakeholder management for projects, the conceptualization of the stakeholder notion hardly takes place, and moreover, the identification of stakeholders is not really recognized as a problematic (or significant) issue.

Of course, it could be the case that the authors use some implicit stakeholder notion to identify the stakeholders. However, stakeholder theory learns us that to allow a structured and exhaustive stakeholder identification, a structured identification procedure, based on an explicit stakeholder model is necessary [11,12]. Moreover, such a classification model needs to fit the situation for which it is to be used. The leading salience classification model [11] might be useful here, but the role-based stakeholder classification model for innovation projects seems more promising, since the project context is similar to the innovation context in several aspects. The question is whether the roles in this model are indeed the roles played in more general projects. Considering stakeholders in terms of *roles of involvement* in the context of projects then raises the question of whether there is anything new. Indeed, thinking in terms of roles is not new in project management. Could project roles perhaps be used for stakeholder identification?

In a series of editorials in the *International Journal of Project Management,* entitled 'Towards a theory of Project Management', Turner discusses the current state of development of the project management theory (see [29–32]; see also [33,34]). He distinguishes seven roles in project management: the *owner*, the *users*, the *sponsors*, the *resources* (i.e., resources may be human material or financial), the *broker*, the *steward*, and the *manager* [29–31].

A different role classification in the project management literature is provided by Callen et al. [35]. Their role classification is based on four types of responsibilities towards activities in projects: *controllers*, *executors*, *constraining advisors*, and *discretionairy advisors*. This classification is,

Table 2
Three sets of role definitions

| |
|---|
| Callan et al. [35, p. 508] |
| The *controller* has direct responsibility for the activity and (if more than one person is involved) delegates the work to other roles |
| The *executor* executes the work as apportioned by the controlling role |
| The *constraining advisor* provides advice that cannot be ignored |
| The *discretionary advisor* provides advice to help the process come along; this advice can be disregarded |
| Turner [31, p. 189] |
| The *owner* provides the resources to buy the asset and derives the benefits from its operation |
| The *users* operate the asset on the owner's behalf |
| The *sponsor* will channel the resources to the project on the owner's behalf |
| The *resources* are assigned to the project and will do the work to deliver the asset |
| The *broker* works with the owner and the sponsor to define the required outcome (benefit) of the project, and the output (change) which will achieve that |
| The *steward* works with the broker to identify the means of obtaining the output, the work and the resources required |
| The *manager* manages the temporary organisation to ensure that the right work is done to deliver the defined output, and to monitor and control progress |
| Vos and Achterkamp [4, p. 167] |
| The client's purposes are being served through the innovation (or project outcome) |
| The decision maker sets requirements for the innovation (or project outcome) and evaluates whether the innovation (or project outcome) meets these requirements |
| The designer contributes expertise to the innovation process (or project) and is responsible for the (interim) deliverables |
| The passively involved is affected by the outcome of the (innovation) project without being able to influence this outcome |

as the stakeholder classification, closely related to the activities in the project.

For the purpose of comparing the role definitions of Turner, Callen et al. and Vos and Achterkamp, Table 2 provides these definitions. The table shows that the project roles of Turner and Callen et al. and Vos and Achterkamp's stakeholder roles partly overlap. The stakeholder role of designer is subdivided into a number of more detailed project roles by both Turner (i.e., sponsor, resources, broker, steward, manager), and Callan et al. (i.e., executor, controller).

The stakeholder role of decision maker differs more. Although Turner (i.e., owner, broker, manager) and Callan et al. (i.e., constraining advisor, discretionary advisor) provide role descriptions covering at least part of the decision makers, those outside the project team and even outside the organisation (e.g., local government setting restrictions on project activities) do not fall under these definitions.

The stakeholder role of client has counterparts in Turner's role definitions (user, owner), but is left out in the role definitions of Callan et al.

Finally, the recognition of passively involved stakeholders should be considered the most crucial difference of the Vos and Achterkamp stakeholder classification. Passively involved cannot be found in Turner's roles. The discretionary advisors of Callan et al. could in some cases be considered as passively involved, but they only cover a small subsection of these stakeholders.

Turner and Callan et al. mainly focus on roles which are played in the actual realisation of the project outcome. The stakeholders who stand on the outside of the activities within the project (i.e. the client, the outside decision makers and especially the passively involved) receive less attention. The stakeholder role classification focusses on especially these types of actors. Of course, project team members indeed play a major part in a project's performance. However, also other stakeholders are important for the success of a project. The input of the client is necessary to give meaning to the project by defining the preferred project outcome. Furthermore, the preferences of the passively involved should be made visible and be dealt with in some way, if not for reasons of corporate social responsibility [36–38], then at least to reduce risks [19,39,40]. The case description in the introduction demonstrated how relevant this can be. So if, in identifying a project's stakeholders, not only the stakeholders actually functioning in the project, but also the outside decision makers, clients, and passively involved should be identified, the classification model of Vos and Achterkamp [12,16] could be considered an enrichment to the classification of project roles.

### 4.2. A role-based stakeholder identification method

As indicated, the classification of stakeholders is only a first step in the identification of stakeholders in a project. Identification means filling these classes, i.e., naming actual parties who should, could, or do play these stakeholder roles.

Vos and Achterkamp have specifically developed their classification model (i.e. as part of a method) for the identification of stakeholders. The complete method consists of the role-based classification model, corresponding identifying questions, and an identification procedure. The procedure consists of four steps, which, together, facilitate a brainstorm session aimed at identifying the parties involved in a specific innovation project. In such a brainstorm session, the participants are asked, as a group, to come up with all the parties who can, will, or ought to fulfil the various stakeholder roles. The chairing persons will then try to obtain an overview that is as complete as possible by posing specifically selected identifying questions. These questions have been designed for opening up new directions in the discussion (see [12,16] for a complete description and underpinning of the role-based stakeholder identification method, including the identifying questions).

The identification method was developed for the purpose of identifying stakeholders in an innovation context. Since the analysis in the previous section indicates that the role-based stakeholder classification also fits the project context, this model, used in the identification method, is suitable for identifying a project's stakeholders.

Arguably, the underlying basis of stakeholder identification could also include a different project role classification model. It is particularly a question of whether the roles of Turner or Callan et al. would be a useful supplementary to the four roles as presented (see Table 2). For reasons of manageability, we believe that the underlying classification model of an identification method using group brainstorm sessions should have a limited number of classes. Therefore, adding extra roles to the classification model is undesirable.

This is not to say that the method could not be more tailor-made to the project context. In that respect, the additional subclasses of Turner and/or Callan et al. could be very useful for identifying stakeholders, particularly as a basis for the identifying questions used within the method. These questions guide the participants in the discussion into new directions. Examples of questions for the identification of the designer are: 'What is the relevant knowledge or expertise of the designers mentioned so far?', and 'Are there any other designers with similar knowledge or expertise?' In the project context, the subclasses of Turner and/or Callan et al. can be used to formulate extra identifying questions. If the chairpersons notice that, for example, the participants mention only resources and brokers when identifying the designers, they can point them towards the stewards, by asking for designers who deal with obtaining the means for the required work. In addition, this could not only be useful in the process of identification but also for pinpointing that particular roles are missing.

## 5. Conclusion and implications

We started this paper by recognizing the common idea in project management that the interests of stakeholders

need to be dealt with to support the success of a project. Our analysis that the majority of the publications investigated relate the stakeholder notion to project success, confirms this idea. So, also within the context of projects, it is crucial to acknowledge the stakeholders or parties involved. It is therefore by no means a far-reaching stance to consider stakeholder involvement as a critical success factor in managing projects.

Stakeholder theory shows the importance of an explicit stakeholder classification model plus an identification method as the first steps in stakeholder involvement. However, in the project literature, such an explicit stakeholder approach seems to be lacking. The combination of a role-based stakeholder classification model from the stakeholder literature and the project roles in the project management literature used in the role-based stakeholder identification method can fill this gap.

Both researchers and practitioners could make use of such a method. Researchers might want to structurally identify the stakeholders of a project before studying the project aspects they are interested in. Project managers should benefit from identifying the stakeholders at the very outset of a project. Good stakeholder management can then lead to higher project performance. Furthermore, the managers might identify the stakeholders again in other phases of the project, for example when the project outcomes are implemented, since different stakeholders can play prominent roles in different phases of a project.

## Appendix A. Publications from IJPM and PMJ in which stakeholder notion is used

*Type of definition*
1: 'interest in'-definition; 2: Freeman definition; 3: combination of definitions 1 and 2; 4: classification based on importance; 5: empirical parties without any reference to a definition; 6: no definition.
*Identification issue*
1: recognized and explicated; 2: recognized and explicated to some degree; 3: recognized but not explicated; 4: not recognized and not explicated.
*Purpose of stakeholder notion*
1: defining success/sense making; 2: risk management/risk reduction; 3: stakeholders provide information; 4: stakeholder management instrument.

| Publication | Type of definition | Identification issue | Purpose of stakeholder notion |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Publications that address the definition and identification issue appropriately* | | | |
| 1997 Wright, J.N. IJPM 15, 3: 181–186. | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 2004 Boddy, D., Paton, R. IJPM 22, 3: 225–233. | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2005 Olander, S., Landin, A. IJPM 23, 4: 321–328. | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2006 Boonstra, A. IJPM 24, 1: 38–52. | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2006 El-Gohary, N.M., Osman, H., El-Diraby, T.E. IJPM 24, 7: 595–604. | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| *Publications that only address the definition issue, but not the identification issue* | | | |
| 2004 Kolltveit, B.J., Grønhaug, K. IJPM 22, 7: 545–551. | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| 2005 Bryde, D.J., Robinson, L. IJPM 23, 8: 622–629. | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| *Publications in which stakeholders are classified based on importance. Besides the fourth, these publications do address the identification issue* | | | |
| 1998 Remenyi, D., Sherwood-Smith, M. IJPM 16, 2: 81–98. | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 2000 Yeo, K.T., Tiong, R.L.K. IJPM 18, 4: 257–265. | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 2003 Crawford, P., Bryce, P. IJPM 21, 5: 363–373. | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| 2006 Winter, M., Andersen, E.S., Elvin, R., Levene, R. IJPM 24, 8: 699–709. | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| *Publications that not address the definition issue, however they do address the identification issue* | | | |
| 1996 Hsu, J.P., Yeo, K.T. IJPM 14, 6: 387–393. | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2001 Mead, S.P. PMJ 32, 4: 32–38. | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| 2004 Bryde, D.J., Brown, D. PMJ, 35, 4: 57–65. | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2004 Christensen, D., Walker, D.H.T. PMJ, 35, 3: 39–52. | 5 | 2 | 1 |

**Appendix A** (*continued*)

| Publication | Type of definition | Identification issue | Purpose of stakeholder notion |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Publications that neither address the definition issue, nor the identification issue* | | | |
| 1997 Baldry, D. IJPM 16, 1: 35–41. | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 1998 Wateridge, J. IJPM 16, 1: 59–63. | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| 1999 Atkinson, R. IJPM 17, 6: 337–342. | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 1991 Fowler, A., Walsh, M. IJPM 17, 1: 1–10. | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 2001 Thiry, M. IJPM 19, 2: 71–77. | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| 2002 Blackburn, S. IJPM 20, 3: 199–204. | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| 2002 Sohail, M., Miles, D.W.J., Cotton, A.P. IJPM 20, 8: 583–591. | 6 | 3 | 4 |
| 2003 Farrell, L.M. IJPM 21, 8: 547–561. | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| 2003 Piney, C. PMJ, 34, 3: 26–31. | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| 2004 Diallo, A., Thuillier, D. IJPM 22, 1: 19–31. | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 2004 Gosh, P.P., Varghese, J.C. IJPM, 22, 8: 669–678. | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 2004 Heung-Fu, D.M. Sankaran, S. PMJ, 35, 4: 15–34. | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 2004 Lycett, M., Rassau, A., Danson, J. IJPM 22, 4: 289–299. | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 2004 Pavlak, A. PMJ, 35, 4: 5–14. | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| 2004 Thiry, M. IJPM 22, 3: 245–252. | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 2005 Alderman, N.,Ivory, C., McLoughlin, I., Vaughan, R. IJPM 23, 5: 380–385. | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 2005 Diallo, A., Thuillier, D. IJPM 23, 3: 237–252. | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| 2005 Kutsch, E. and Hall, M. IJPM, 23, 8: 591–599. | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| 2005 Yu, A.G., Flett, P.D., Bowers, J. A. IJPM 23, 6: 428–436. | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 2006 Agarwal, N., Rathod, U. IJPM 24, 4: 358–370. | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 2006 Callan, K., Sieimieniuch, C., Sinclair, M. IJPM 24, 6: 506–515. | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| 2006 Consoli, G.G.S. (2006) IJPM 24, 1: 75–82. | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 2006 Kloppenborg, T, Tesch, D, Manolis, C, Heitkamp, M., MJ, 37, 3: 16–25. | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| 2006 Nogueira, J.C., Raz, T. PMJ, 37, 2: 5–10. | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| 2006 Olsson, N.O.E. IJPM 24, 1: 66–74. | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 2006 Shen, L-Y, Platten, A., Deng, X.P. IJPM 24, 7: 587–594. | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| 2006 Wang, X., Huang, J. IJPM 24, 3: 253–260. | 5 | 4 | 1 |

## Appendix B. Additional publications on stakeholder notion cited in the 42 publications

*Note:* the publication in italic (i.e. in 'cited in' column) means that the citation is used with respect to the identification issue, otherwise it is used for defining purposes. Furthermore, proceedings for citation purposes are not included (see in [41,42]).

| Types of publications | Cited in |
|---|---|
| Monography | |
| Freeman, R.E. (1984) *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, Pitman/ Ballinger, Boston. | Boonstra (2006) *Baldry (1997)*; Olander and Landin (2005) |
| Johnson G. and Scholes, K. (1999) *Exploring corporate strategy.* London: Prentice Hall Europe. | |
| *Research article* | |
| Gibson K. (2000) The moral basis of stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 26, 3: 245-257. | Olander and Landin (2005) |
| Mitchell, R.K., Agle, B.R. and Wood, D.J. (1997) Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 4: 853-886. | Boonstra (2006) |

(continued on next page)

**Appendix B** (*continued*)

| Types of publications | Cited in |
|---|---|
| *Student text and/or consultant guide* | |
| APM (2000)*Glossary of Project Management Terms*. London: Association of Project Management. | Bryde and Robinson (2005) |
| Boddy, D. (2002) *Managing Projects. Building and Leading the Team*, Financial Times Prentice Hall: Edinburgh. | *Boddy and Patton (2004)* |
| McElroy, B. and Mills, C. (2000) Managing stakeholders. In: Turner RJ., Simister, SJ. (Eds.). Gower handbook of project management. 3rd ed. Gower publishing limited. | Olander and Landin (2005) |
| Obeng, E, (1994) *All Change! The Project Leaders Secret Handbook*. Pitman, London. | *Wright (1997)* |
| PMI. (1996) *A guide to the project management body of knowledge*. Upper Darby: Project management Institute. | Kolltveit and Grønhaug (2004) |
| Tuman, J. (1993) Models for Achieving Success through team building and Stakeholder Management. In: Dinsmore PC (ed.) *The AMA Handbook of Project Management*. AMACOM | *Wateridge (1998)* |

## References


[1] Wateridge J. How can IS/IT projects be measured for success? Int J Project Manage 1998;16(1):59–63.

[2] Fowler A, Walsh M. Conflicting perceptions of success in an information systems project. Int J Project Manage 1999;17(1):1–10.

[3] Boddy D. Managing projects. Building and leading the team. Edinburgh: Financial Times Prentice Hall; 2002.

[4] Freeman RE. Strategic management: a stakeholder approach. Boston: Pitman/Ballinger; 1984.

[5] Wood DJ. Corporate social performance revisited. Acad Manage Rev 1991;16(4):691–719.

[6] Clarkson MBE. Stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. Acad Manage Rev 1995;20(1):92–117.

[7] Rowley TJ. Moving beyond dyadic ties: a network theory of stakeholder influences. Acad Manage Rev 1997;22(4):887–910.

[8] Andriof J, Waddock S. Unfolding stakeholder engagement. In: Andriof J, Waddock S, Husted S, Sutherland Rahman S, editors. Unfolding stakeholder thinking. Theory, responsibility and engagement. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing; 2002. p. 19–42.

[9] Blair DL, Whitehead CJ. Too many on the seesaw. Stakeholder diagnosis and management for hospitals. Hospital Health Administration 1988;33(2):153–66.

[10] Goodpaster KE. Business ethics and stakeholder analysis. Bus Ethics Quart 1991;1(1):53–73.

[11] Mitchell RK, Agle BR, Wood DJ. Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts. Acad Manage Rev 1997;22(4):853–86.

[12] Vos JFJ, Achterkamp MC. Stakeholder identification in innovation projects: going beyond classification. Eur J Innov Manage 2006;9(2):161–78.

[13] Boonstra A. Interpreting an ERP-implementation project from a stakeholder next term perspective. Int J Project Manage 2006;24(1):38–52.

[14] Ulrich W. Critical heuristics of social systems design. Eur J Operat Res 1987;31(3):276–83.

[15] Ulrich W. Some difficulties of ecological thinking, considered from a critical systems perspective: a plea for critical holism. Systems Practice 1993;6(6):583–611.

[16] Vos JFJ, Achterkamp MC. A method for the identification of stakeholders. In: Jorna RJ, editor. Sustainable innovation. The organisational, human and knowledge dimension. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing; 2006. p. 98–110.

[17] Wright JN. Time and budget: the twin imperatives of a project sponsor. Int J Project Manage 1997;15(3):181–6.

[18] Bryde DJ, Robinson L. Client versus contractor perspectives on project success criteria. Int J Project Manage 2005;23(8):622–9.

[19] Olander S, Landin A. Evaluation of stakeholder influence in the implementation of construction projects. Int J Project Manage 2005;23(4):321–8.

[20] Kolltveit BJ, Grønhaug K. The importance of the early phase: the case of construction and building projects. Int J Project Manage 2004;22(7):545–51.

[21] Boddy D, Paton R. Responding to competing narratives: lessons for project managers. Int J Project Manage 2004;22(3):225–33.

[22] El-Gohary NM, Osman H, El-Diraby TE. Stakeholder management for public private partnerships. Int J Project Manage 2006;24(7):595–604.

[23] Remenyi D, Sherwood-Smith M. Business benefits from information systems through an active benefit realisation programme. Int J Project Manage 1998;16(2):81–98.

[24] Yeo KT, Tiong RLK. Positive management of differences for risk reduction in BOT projects. Int J Project Manage 2000;18:257–65.

[25] Crawford P, Bryce P. Project monitoring and evaluation: a method for enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of aid project implementation. Int J Project Manage 2003;21:363–73.

[26] Winter M, Andersen ES, Elvin R, Levene R. Focusing on business projects as an area for future research: an exploratory discussion of four different perspectives. Int J Project Manage 2006;24(8):699–709.

[27] Johnson G, Scholes K. Exploring corporate strategy. London: Prentice Hall Europe; 1999.

[28] Gibson K. The moral basis of stakeholder theory. J Bus Ethics 2000;26(3):245–57.

[29] Turner JR. Editorial. Towards a theory of project management: the nature of the project. Int J Project Manage 2006a; 24(1):1–3.

[30] Turner JR. Editorial. Towards a theory of project management: the nature of the project governance and project management. Int J Project Manage 2006b; 24(2):93–95.

[31] Turner JR. Editorial. Towards a theory of project management: the functions of project management international. J Project Manage 2006c; 24(3):187–189.

[32] Turner JR. Editiorial. Towards a theory of project management: the nature of the functions of project management. Int J Project Manage 2006d;24(4):277–279.

[33] Turner JR, Keegan A. Mechanisms of governance in the project-based organization: roles of the broker and steward. Eur Manage J 2001;19(3):254–67.

[34] Turner JR, Müller R. On the nature of the project as a temporary organization. Int J Project Manage 2003;21(1):1–8.

[35] Callan K, Sieimieniuch C, Sinclair M. A case study example of the role matrix technique. Int J Project Manage 2006;24:506–15.

[36] Heung-Fu DM, Sankaran S. An effective project management-based application model for sustainable urban renewal in Hong Kong. Project Manage J 2004;35(4):15–34.

[37] Achterkamp MC, Vos JFJ. A framework for making sense of sustainable innovation through stakeholder involvement. Int J Environ Tech Manage 2006;6(6):525–38.
[38] Miles MP, Munilla LS, Darroch J. The role of strategic conversations with stakeholders in the formation of corporate social responsibility strategy. J Business Ethics 2006;69(2):195–205.
[39] Farrell LM. Principal-agency risk in project finance. Int J Project Manage 2003;21(8):547–61.
[40] Kutsch E, Hall M. Intervening conditions on the management of project risk: dealing with uncertainty in information technology projects. Int J Project Manage 2005;23(8):591–9.
[41] Atkinson R. Project management: cost, time and quality, two best guesses and a phenomenon, its time to accept other success criteria. Int J Project Manage 1999;17(6):337–42.
[42] Blackburn S. The project manager and the project-network. Int J Project Manage 2002;20(3):199–204.