

# An Evaluation of Stakeholder Management Role in GETFund Polytechnics Projects Delivery in Ghana

Emmanuel Eyiah-Botwe

Department of Building Technology, Kumasi Polytechnic, P. O. Box 854 Kumasi Ghana

Email of corresponding author: ebotwe123@yahoo.com

## Abstract

Construction projects are undertaken to achieve specific goals and the success of it is measured by the realization of the set goals including stakeholder satisfaction. Several stakeholders are involved in construction projects and depending on the nature, complexity, procurement method adopted; stakeholders are involved at different stages of the project undertaking different roles and responsibilities. These stakeholders with varying stake influence and power, plays major roles in the success or failure of the project. Stakeholder Management is therefore essential if project goals are to be achieved. The Ghana Education Trust Fund (GETFund) is a key stakeholder established to provide and maintain educational infrastructure but has failed to achieve its objectives. Several projects have failed and stakeholders are dissatisfied. This study explores the role of Stakeholder Management in GETFund projects delivery. A mixed method approach of qualitative and quantitative surveys using semi-structured interviews and questionnaire was adopted. Research findings were analyzed using triangulation and descriptive analysis methods to evaluate the role of SM in project delivery. SM plays major role in project time, cost overruns, scope variation, non-completion, abandonment and poor payment schedules through poor SM process consideration and records keeping. Respondents agree that SM role should be considered during project planning, development and execution stages using SM framework.

**Keywords:** Evaluation, GETFund, Project Delivery, Role, Stakeholder Management

## 1.0 Introduction

The quest for increased access to higher education coupled with the inability of the public universities in Ghana to enrol all qualified applicants has led to increased students population in the polytechnics in Ghana and the high demand for education infrastructure projects. According PMI (2010), projects are temporary endeavours undertaken to create unique product, service or result with definite beginnings, end times, cost and performance parameters. This is however not the case with GETFund funded polytechnic projects in Ghana which is characterised by non-completion inevitably affecting academic work. Several projects funded by GETFund do not meet these set targets of time, cost and quality.

Eskerod and Jepsen (2013), suggest that carrying out a project as planned is not a guarantee for success and that project may fail because project managers do not take the requirements, wishes and concern of stakeholders sufficiently into account. This seems to confirm the concerns of major key stakeholders expressed during the 3<sup>rd</sup> consultative forum held in Sogakope in 2010. Construction project is delivered only when completed and project objectives are achieved (Maylor, 2003) hence many polytechnic projects remain undelivered with set targets unachieved.

Construction projects by their nature have diverse stakeholders who plays various roles and responsibilities in the project outcome (Newcombe, 2003). These stakeholders are from different disciplines, backgrounds, have different goals, interest, stake and influence which can affect or be affected by the project outcome. The ability to meet delivery targets of cost, time and performance and stakeholder needs may constitute stakeholder value and a measure of project success (PMI, 2013). These stakeholders' interest, influence, power and perception about the project among others need to be managed systematically for a successful project delivery. Wang and Huang (2005), states that there is a positive relationship between stakeholder role and project success hence Stakeholder Management SM and impact must essentially be considered.

Polytechnic project stakeholders are diverse in nature and are involved at different stages depending on positions occupied by stakeholders in the polytechnic administration, responsibilities assigned or procurement method used. These stakeholders can be beneficial or antagonistic towards achieving the project goal because of the stake, interest, influence and power to impact, may benefit or be affected by project outcomes (Chinyio and Olomolaiye, 2010). *Projects are led mostly by architects as team leaders or project managers depending on the project implementation approach. The level of knowledge, understanding and consideration of these project team leaders and others in SM will determine SM consideration or ignoring the importance of managing project stakeholders and their expectation* (Maylor, 2003). This together with the lack of integration and coordination of stakeholders have been identified as contributory factors to poor project performance (Olusegun *et al.*, 2003).

Stakeholder Management becomes an essential part of project delivery if project goals are to be achieved especially for Polytechnic projects where stakeholders may not be permanent on the project because

stakeholder are part of the project team as a result of one's position ( Head of Departments and Management positions). Stakeholder Management requires systematic identification, analysis, planning actions, communication, and negotiation aimed at influencing these stakeholders (Lock, 2007), therefore justifying this research.

## 2.0 Problem Statement

At the third GETFund consultative forum held in February 2010, a review of the operations of the GETFund in a report titled "GETFund review and outlook (2000-2009)" raised concerns about the poor management of resources due to lack of project due diligence and the absence of monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes. A performance audit report confirmed stakeholders concerns about the management of the fund, infrastructural projects and the inability of GETFund to successfully deliver projects (Performance Audit Report of the Auditor General, Ghana, 2012)..

These challenges were attributed to GETFund's:

- Non-involvement in contract awarding arrangements (though a sponsor), therefore remaining largely ignorant of developments in the project cycle and
- Acting only as an agency for processing and effecting payments merely on the presentation of certificates in whose favour cheques are written out (GETFund review and outlook (2000-2009)).

This is compounded by increased demand for educational infrastructure from the polytechnics even as the government considers upgrading the polytechnics to universities, challenges associated with GETFund support and the growing number of abandoned and uncompleted project suggest the need to consider the Stakeholders role for enhanced polytechnic projects delivery.

## 3.0 Aim

The purpose of this paper is to evaluate Stakeholder Management role in Polytechnics building projects delivery by exploring the role and impact of project stakeholders and SM in the successful project delivery.

## 4.0 Research Questions and Objectives

To achieve this, the main question this paper seeks to answer is "what role does stakeholder management play in successful project delivery regarding project cost, time and performance? The specific questions are:

1. Who are the project stakeholders?
2. What is their level of understanding and knowledge in SM process?
3. How is SM process considered?
4. What role does SM plays in project delivery with regard to project time, cost and quality?

Following this the following specific objectives were set:

- To identify project stakeholders
- To explore project team members understanding and consideration of project stakeholders
- To explore SM consideration, process and consideration stages
- To determine and evaluate stakeholder management role in project delivery regarding project cost, time, performance and delivery

## 5.0 Literature Review

### 5.1 project delivery

PMI, (2010) defines project as a unique and transient endeavour undertaken to achieve a desired outcome and a unique set of coordinated activities with definite starting and finishing points undertaken by individual or organisation to meet specific performance objectives with defined schedule, performance and cost parameters. According to Eskerod and Jepsen (2013), there are pre-project and post-project phases when resources are spent and project generates benefits. Projects must be seen as temporary organisations created to generate benefits for an organisation. Project delivery however entails initiating, planning, coordinating, design, resources procurement, construction, test and handing over of a project to the project owner or users (Lock, 2007).

Newton (2007) states that a project is delivered when completed and the defined terms of specific tangible deliverables are met. Since building project success is associated with the whole-life cycle including operation and maintenance (Fewings 2005, OGC, 2007), delivered projects may not necessarily be considered successful until they meet the initial set criteria for completion. Project stakeholders can be beneficial or antagonistic towards achieving a project goal (Chinyio and Olomolaiye, 2010).

### 5.2 project stakeholders

Project stakeholders are individuals, groups or entities who may possess the power to be a threat or opportunity to a project. Project stakeholders are classified as primary or secondary depending on whether they have formal or contractual agreement with the project owner and are critical or not to the project success (Carroll and

Buchholtz, 2006 mentioned in Chinyio and Olomolaiye, 2010), Maylor (2003), suggest stakeholders can be classified as internal (project team) or external (outside the project team) for whom the project is being provided, insiders or outsiders, contracted or not contracted, supportive, neutral, proponents, opponents, powerful, powerless, influential or non-influential, interested or not, depending on the complexity and stake. Olander (2007) argues that construction projects attract interest from various stakeholders whose expressed needs and expectations are often in conflict with each other. According to Olander and Landin (2005), stakeholders influence project decisions positively or negatively, confirming the need for stakeholders' management.

### **5.3 stakeholder management**

Project Stakeholder Management entails all purposeful activities towards the stakeholders to enhance project success (Eslerod and Jespen, 2013). Lock (2007) defines stakeholder management as the systematic identification, analysis, planning actions, communication, and negotiation aimed at influencing the stakeholders. The stakeholder management process is considered necessary for managing relationships due to the diverse stakeholders involved in a project and their possible conflicting interest which affects or may be affected by the project outcome (Freeman, 2010).

Chinyio and Olomolaiye (2010) states that, Stakeholder Management can be carried out in many ways including evaluating needs and expectations of stakeholders in relation to main project goals. Stakeholder Management involves definition, identification, mapping and analysing which is aimed at stakeholder satisfaction, a key to meeting client's objective, value, concern and success (Mederith and Mantel, 2006). It entails processes and techniques employed to effectively manage relationships between project organisation and stakeholders in action an oriented way so as to enhance the positive and reduce negative impacts of the stakeholder influence on project goals and objectives. Mayor (2009), mentions PRINCE 2 (2009) as referring to the sponsor as the one who ultimately wants results, has the budget for the project execution and is involved throughout the project life cycle.

### **5.4 Ghana Education Trust Fund (GETFund)**

The Ghana Education Trust Fund (GETFund) is the major sponsor of Polytechnics Building Projects with a key stakeholder role in provision and maintenance of infrastructure projects. According to the Performance Audit Report of the Auditor-General 2012 (PARAG, 2012), the demand for expansion of educational facilities to cope with increased student population became a challenge to the Education Ministry in 2000; by an act of Parliament the Ghana Education Trust Fund (GETFund) Act, (Act 581) of 2000 was established. Sources of money for the Fund include payment to the fund by the Value Added Tax (VAT) Service the equivalent of 2.5 % VAT collected and mainly parliamentary allocation and donations.

The aim of GETFund to assist nationwide financing of education, management, development, maintenance of essential academic facilities and infrastructure for public tertiary institutions such as the polytechnics (Ghana Act 581, 2000) cannot be claimed realised. The GETFund depends on government release of budgetary allocation in order to approve and pay expenditure charged on the Fund (Ghana Act 581, 2000), a situation that has not only crippled GETFund project implementation but also suggest the need for improved management.

At the third GETFund consultative forum held in February 2010, a review of the operations of the GETFund in a report titled "GETFund review and outlook (2000-2009)" raised concerns about challenges encountered as follows:

- Acting only as an agency for processing and effecting payments merely on the presentation of certificates in whose favour cheques are written out.
- Not part of the contract awarding arrangements and therefore, remains largely ignorant of developments in the project cycle.
- The persistence of these situations been dysfunctional to the efficient and effective operations of the Fund.

This signifies the discontentment of GETFund as a major stakeholder involved in provision and maintenance of building infrastructure delivery in the educational sector. According to the report, project targets of time, cost and performance were not achieved in many instances necessitating the performance audit report. From the review and report, it is obvious that project management teams should consider the entire stakeholder management process; identification, engagement, assessment/analysing, mapping, monitoring or engagement of stakeholders to ensure that stakeholder' interests are addressed and negative impacts reduced for enhanced project delivery. Impact is about the marked effect or influence hence this research seeks to evaluate the impact of stakeholder management on successful project delivery. Stakeholders are mapped or managed using: Power/interest grid, (PMI, 2008; Newcombe, 1996) Power/influence/ grid, (PMI, 2008), Influence/impact grid (PMI, 2008), Power/Interest/attitude (Chinyio and Olomolaiye, 2010) and Power/importance (Lock, 2006) and

Power/predictability matrix (Newcombe, 1996).

Eskerod and Jepsen (2013) argues that proper stakeholder management improves the ability to anticipate opportunities and threats in a timely manner when room still exist to make wise decisions on how to spend the project resources in effective interaction with the stakeholders. Koster (2009) also states that for the sake of efficiency main project stakeholders need to be identified early in the project life cycle. The object of the relationship is to successfully deliver the project by achieving the project objectives.

## 6.0 Research Methodology

To achieve the research main objective of evaluating the impact of stakeholder management on enhanced project delivery, a mixed method approach was adopted. Using this research design provided for in-depth knowledge and generalization of the findings (Flick, 2009; Leech et al, 2011), Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie's (2003) suggest sequential mixed method analysis (SMMA) in analysing mixed method approach data and Johnson and Turner (2003), typology for primary data collection in conducting mixed research.

### 6.1 methodology and methods

A methodology was adopted to examine the overall approach and the theoretical basis of the researcher, while the method considered data collection and analysis (Hussey & Hussey, 1997). The methodology and methods adopted together was conceived then as a system of philosophical underpinnings and rules underlying the particular techniques used to achieve the preset research objectives (Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Ghauri and Gronhaug, 2005; Hughes and Sharrock, 2007; Saunders *et al.* 2007). The research design was as follows:

To answer the research questions, a two-step approach was used for data collection. A secondary data was obtained through literature review for enhanced knowledge, theoretical base, empirical data and questionnaire development. Purposive sampling of three (3) out of ten (10) Polytechnics in Ghana located in Kumasi, Koforidua and Sunyani were selected based on availability of data, projects scale, and proximity. The results were triangulated (Woodside, 2010). A pilot test using a set of questionnaire was face to face administered to five respondents (architect, quantity surveyor, project manager, client and sponsors' representatives) and followed with hundred (100) questionnaires to industry practitioners' working on polytechnic projects mainly, architects, quantity surveyors, contractors, clients and engineers through the Northern Chapter of the Ghana Institute of Architects, the Polytechnics Estates/Works Department and the researcher. Six themes were developed for the evaluation of the role of stakeholder management for interview and focus group discussion as follows:

1. Respondents understanding of project stakeholders and who are GETFund projects stakeholders?
2. Respondents understanding of SM?
3. Consideration of SM process?
4. At what stage SM process is considered?
5. Role and Impact of SM on project cost, time and performance?
6. Should SM process be adopted and practiced?

100 questionnaires were administered based on similar work done for responses on the six thematic areas. Sixty-Two (62%) percentage response rates were achieved. The respondents were architects (24), quantity surveyors (12), engineers (6), client representatives (8), sponsors (4) and contractors (8). The questionnaire administration was followed with six (6) semi-structured face to face interviews comprising eight questions and same for focus group for in-depth qualitative data from the project team members and industry participants from different disciplines and varying experience for investigator triangulation. Interview surveys were conducted during site meetings and from industry participant's offices by the researcher lasting for an average of one hour and the focus group three hours. The research findings were analysed using the descriptive frequencies and triangulation method of data analysis which considers triangulating data, methods and investigators.

Key findings were drawn in relation to the literature review, research question, aim and design adopted and analysed by triangulation method (Colin, 2011). The six interviewees included Project Manager/Architect, Quantity Surveyor, Contractor, Structural Engineer, Sponsor and Client Representative.

## 7.0 Findings and Discussion

Findings were reduced and displayed using data coding, frequency distribution and graphical display (Colin, 2011) Appendix A.

### 7.1 Respondents understanding of project stakeholders and GETfund projects stakeholder.

The questionnaire Q1– Q3 sought for respondents understanding of Project Stakeholders. Respondents agreed that all GETFund projects have stakeholders and agreed that stakeholders have interest, influence and are affected by the project outcome. Respondents selected the client, project manager/team leader, consultant, sponsor, contractor and supplier as impacting on project outcome with the client and sponsors ranked first and

second highest considered. Industry practitioners thus identified the project team as mainly stakeholders with interest confirming theory and secondary data even though identified other stakeholders (Newcombe, 1996). Investigators have also identified the project team as internal stakeholders who affect project outcome. The six research participants interviewed had a similar understanding of project stakeholders, mentioning individuals or firms with stake, interest or whose interest can be affected by the project's outcome. Focus group participants and interviewees mentioned project stakeholders as clients, consultants, GETfund as sponsor, contractors, subcontractors, suppliers and end users. Clients' and contractor's staff internal staff were also mentioned. The client emerged as the most considered stakeholder. This agrees with literature which states that most project managers consider only the interest of the client.

### **7.2 Respondents understanding of stakeholder management.**

Responding to the questionnaire (Q4&Q5) which sought for respondents' understanding of Stakeholder Management (SM), eleven (11) respondents mainly industry practitioners with project management background understood the SM concept. Respondents agreed that it is about considering the interest of individuals and organisations affected and can affect the project's outcome. Respondents selected engagement, identification, analysing stakeholders as a means of considering stakeholders interest and ranked the client's relationship as the most considered.

Four interviewees understand SM as bringing stakeholders together during project meetings. Three claim to consider SM as a process but cannot identify stages involved. The project manager understands and identifies the stages as identification, engagement, analysing and monitoring and mentions that he is yet to see a consultant with stakeholder plan for a project. Development Committee and site meetings were mentioned several times as aimed at SM. The focus group reiterates these views mentioned except that it agreed that SM is not fully considered. The focus group discussion confirmed literatures view on SM to entail process of identification, engagement, analysing and controlling stakeholders' interest (Mederith, 2006). Members agreed that pre-construction meeting forms the beginning of the SM process if any. Respondents identified the sponsor as distancing itself.

### **7.3 Consideration of stakeholder management process.**

In response to questionnaire (Q6–Q10) on SM process, all respondents agreed that, SM should be a process of identifying stakeholders and engaging them to achieve a common goal, sixty-eight (68) respondents' seem not to have considered the aspect of documentation and monitoring stakeholders' interest, forty-two (42) kept mental records. It was obvious that stakeholders kept only mental records of stakeholders. Some respondents consider assigning roles and responsibilities based on competencies, others on ability to influence. The use of tools and models like stakeholder matrix, register and plans were completely new to majority. Polytechnic Development Committees/Estates Department claims to manage stakeholders through engagements, keeping records of stakeholders and minutes of meeting; this was considered in-complete. This appears different though agrees with Chinyio and Olomolaiye, (2010) stance that different approaches can be used.

Interviewees suggested that SM should entail a process, considering identification, stakeholder meetings, analysing, controlling and ensuring that stakeholders' influences are positive. Clients' representatives believe different approaches can achieve same goal. The focus group discussion reiterated the key words; identification, engagement, analysing, mapping a strategy and monitoring the process. Members concern was the procurement method which considers stakeholders at different stages of the project development. Interviewees suggested that stakeholder's roles, responsibilities, competencies and power to influence should be considered. These agree with literature review and stakeholder theory.

### **7.4 Stakeholder management process and project stage consideration.**

In answering questions (Q11&Q12) on stages of SM consideration, industry practitioners believe that stakeholders are partly considered at the pre-contract stage but fully considered at the post contract stage. This is partly due to the traditional procurement method adopted. Stakeholders are considered only when there is a formal contract with the client, as and when their services are needed. This is in contrast with theory and empirical research which recommends that SM is considered fully at project's early stages (Jespen and Eskerod, 2008).

Again the client representatives suggested that SM is considered at project planning stage. Team leaders believe it is partly considered at the post contract stage. It was evident from one of the focus group discussion members that it is not considered except that individuals consider stakeholders who can influence their interests. Assessing this claim further revealed that efforts were not made to change project opponents to proponents (Winche and Bonke, 2002). Interviewees agreed that a framework will be required to ensure its implementation. The sponsor's representative believes they are side-lined even though they manage the funds. An interviewee suggested that, client representatives can better prepare stakeholder management plan since they

are involved throughout the project life cycle. This suggestion was agreed by the focus group members.

Responding to the question on the use of SM tools, with the exception of two interviewees who mentioned the use of stakeholder mapping and matrix, the rest had no knowledge. This implied that the client representatives' assertion that SM is practiced cannot be accepted. Researchers and theory suggest the use of SM mapping, matrix, plan and register as tools for analysing and monitoring stakeholders' interest during the project execution (Chinyio and Olomolaiye, 2010). Power/predictability, power/impact, influence/interest, and influence/importance matrixes were new to focus group members (Chinyio and Olomolaiye, 2010: Newcombe 1999).

Responding to questions (Q13&Q18) on how stakeholder management role impact on project time, cost and performance delivery, during the interview and focus group discussions, respondents' agreed that stakeholder management impacts on project target objectives mentioned. Respondents mentioned the following repeatedly:

1. Late scope changes impact on project design quality (lighting, ventilation, space utilization) cost, time schedule and can be reduced if interest of all stakeholders are considered and design brief finalised at the project development stage. A multi purpose building was completed after 4 years instead of 18 months duration at double cost.
2. Work method can be impacted upon and adhered to by considering the experience of all stakeholders for value for work through stakeholder conferences and engagement.
3. Project site challenges leading to relocation can be resolved before contract award.
4. Design brief is well considered to avoid late scope changes which affect design, cost and programme of works.
5. Experience can be brought to bear on forecast to ensure realistic project targets.
6. Effective consideration of stakeholders roles, responsibilities, influence and interest can be enhanced and opponents monitored to reduce negative impact.
7. Project cost and time overruns is reduced due to reduced variations, consideration o alternative designs and avoidance of late scope changes and avoidance of price adjustment and interest payment clauses in the contract.
8. Right scale of project can be agreed upon, contract conditions properly reviewed, fluctuations and late payments avoided.
9. Consultancy fee and pre tender cost is reduced.
10. The reduced project cost will lead to increased infrastructure delivery. These impact outlined agrees with literature review and the different methods of data collection.

## 8.0 Conclusion

This paper evaluates who GETFund project stakeholders are, stakeholders and industry practitioners' knowledge in SM process and the role of SM in achieving project set targets of cost, time, performance and delivery. Three (3) Polytechnics, their GETFunds projects and project teams were considered together with six (6) experienced industry practitioners. Respondents agreed that GETFund project stakeholders are; client, client representative, project manager/team leader, architect, structural engineer, services engineer, sponsor, contractor, sub-contractor, suppliers, project internal, end user and the polytechnic community with the client's interest mostly considered. This agrees with literature reviewed however external stakeholders have very little impact on Polytechnic projects.

Eleven (11) stakeholders have required knowledge in SM process six (6) consider Stakeholder Management process. This is attributed to absence of SM guideline, framework, education and SM not a project procurement requirement. Client's representatives exhibited better understanding in SM process than other project team members due to their project management background and the establishment of Works directorate. Thirty-seven (37) of respondents keep mental records of project stakeholders as Stakeholder Management. Thirty-five (35) and Thirty (30) respondents do not practice because it not a project management requirement and are without SM knowledge respectively.

Two sharp opposing views were discovered agree confirming literature and theory which establishes various forms of SM process. No team leader or project manager practices the entire process of identification, engagement, analysing, mapping and monitoring rather keeping mental record than documentation. This is at variance with literature reviewed since SM process requires documentation. Reference materials such as SM form, map and reporting format are carefully prepared.

Finally the paper revealed that fifty-eight (58) stakeholders agree that SM role impacts on project time target by reducing estimated duration, ensuring schedule project completion, avoiding time overrun due to late scope changes and late payments. SM role aids in finalising brief and designs, resolving conflicts or modalities for settlement at the pre contract stage.

Regarding project cost, Stakeholder Management role reduced consultants' fees, consultants' fee, a

percentage of the total project cost, interest rates on payments, fluctuations, cost additions due to late scope changes and unavailability of total funds. Majority of respondents agree that SM leads to achievement of value for money (Eskerod and Jepsen, 2013), avoidance of price adjustment and interest on delayed payment. On project quality, scope variation, delayed completion and increased cost leads to compromise on quality which can be avoided through SM process. The non-consideration of SM process has impacted negatively on projects delivery hence the urgent need for a SM framework which considers the entire process and factors affecting its implementation.

## REFERENCES

- Anvuur, A. and Kumaraswamy, M. (2006) *Taking Forward Public Procurement Reforms in Ghana*, Centre for Infrastructure & Construction Industry Development, *CIB W107 Construction in Developing Economies International Symposium "Construction in Developing Economies: New Issues and Challenges"*
- Carroll, A. (1993) *Business and Society: Ethics and Stakeholder Management* (South-Western Publishing, Cincinnati).
- Chinyio, E. and Olomolaiye, P. (2010) *Construction Stakeholder Management*, Chichester Wiley.
- Colin, R. (2011) *Real world Research*. Wiley, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pgs 113,115
- Eskerod, P. and Jepsen, A. L (2013) *Project Stakeholder Management*, 1<sup>ST</sup> Edition Gower Publishing Ltd.
- Fewings, P. (2005) *Construction Project management: an integrated approach*. Abingdon: Taylor and Francis.
- Flick, U. (2009) *An introduction to qualitative research*. 4<sup>TH</sup> Ed. Sage publications Limited, London EC1Y 1SP.
- Freeman, R.E. (2010) *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Koster, R. (2009) *Declaring the rights of players*, Newyork University Press, New York.
- Lock, D. (2007) *The Essentials of Project Management*, 3<sup>RD</sup> Edition Gower Publishing Ltd.
- Maylor, H. (2003) *Project Management*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Harlow: Pearson Education. (Understandable generic approach, good on management approach to PM).
- Meredith, J. and Mantel, S. (2003) *Project Management: A managerial approach*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Newton, R (2007) Newton, R (2009) *The project manager: mastering the art of delivery*, 2<sup>ND</sup> Edition, Trans-Atlantic Publications, ISBN0273723421, 9780273723424
- Newton, R (2012) *Brilliant Checklists for Project Managers- Business and Economics*, Pearson UK
- Nguyen, N.H, Skitmore, Wai Wong, M.J.K (2009) *Stakeholder impact analysis of infrastructure project management in developing countries: a study of perception of project managers in state-owned engineering firms in Vietnam*.
- Olander, S. (2007) *Stakeholder impact analysis in construction project management*. *Construction Management and Economics*, 25 (3), 277–87.
- Olander, S., Landin, A., (2005) *Evaluation of stakeholder influence in the implementation of construction projects*: *International Journal of Project Management* 23 (4), 321–328.
- P M I, (2010) *A guide to the project management body of knowledge*. (PMBOK Guide). 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Newtown Square (PA): Project Management Institute; 2004.
- Woodside, G. (2010). *Organisational Culture, Business-Business Relationships and Interfirm Networks*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Howard House, Bingley.
- Wang, X, and Huang, J. (2006) *The relationships between key stakeholders' project performance and project success; Perceptions of Chinese construction supervising engineers*, *International Journal of Project Management* 24 (3)
- Power/predictability, power/impact, influence/interest, and influence/importance matrixes

APPENDIX A  
DISPLAY OF FINDINGS - QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

Q No.	Questions/Responses						
1	Whom do you consider as a project stakeholder? A person with						
	Interest (62)	Influence(53)	Stake (62)	Power (42)	Others (10)		
2	Do GETFund projects have stakeholders?						
	Yes (62)		No (0)				
3	Who do you consider as a stakeholder if your answer to Q2 is yes?						
	Client (62)	Architect (62)	Engineers (62)	QS (54)	PM (54)	Contractors (62)	Suppliers (42)
4	Do you understand or have knowledge in Stakeholder Management (SM)?						
	Yes (11)		No (51)				
5	Please, Give reasons?						
	Not a requirement (50)		Has PM background (10)		Others(12)		
6	Do you consider STAKEHOLDER Management as a process or just an activity?						
	Process (62)		Activity (0)				
7	Do you consider the process or activity?						
	Yes (11)		No (51)				
8	If your answer to Q7 is yes, do you consider all these stages; Identification, engagement, assessment/analysing, mapping, monitoring or managing?						
	Yes (6)		No (56)				
9	Do you consider all the following? Roles, competences, responsibilities, interest, position, power, influence among others?						
	Yes (6)		No (56)				
10	Do you consider any of the following mappings or matrixes?						
	Power/predictability (6)	power/impact (6)	influence/interest (6)	Stakeholder Map (6)			
11	At what stage do you think SM process is considered?						
	Project development (11)		Pre contract (9)	Post contract (42)			
12	What do you consider as stakeholder meetings?						
	Conferences (24)	Site meetings (62)	Project meetings (62)	Others (62)			
13	Does SM impact on project time?						
	Yes (62)		No (0)				
14	If your answer to Q13 is yes, how does it impact on project time						
	1 <sup>st</sup> time overrun	2 <sup>nd</sup> late payment	3 <sup>rd</sup> late completion	4 <sup>th</sup> time extension			
15	Does SM impact on project cost?						
	Yes (62)		No (0)				
16	If your answer to Q13 is yes, how does it impact on project cost						
	1 <sup>st</sup> cost overrun	2 <sup>nd</sup> fluctuation	3 <sup>rd</sup> increased fees	4 <sup>th</sup> inadequate funds			
17	Does SM impact on project performance?						
	Yes (62)		No (0)				
18	if your answer to Q13 is yes, how does it impact on project performance						
	1 <sup>st</sup> design quality	2 <sup>nd</sup> workmanship	3 <sup>rd</sup> work method	4 <sup>th</sup> non-completion			
19	Should SM be practiced for enhanced project delivery						
	Yes (62)		No (0)				
20	What do you consider as best practice?						
	1 <sup>st</sup> Implement the entire process		2 <sup>nd</sup> Engage all stakeholders at the project development stage				

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

### CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

**Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

### MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

### IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

