Assess Your Stakeholders’ Attitudes

By Dr. Lynda Bourne

Some stakeholders will love your project and be happy to provide the support you need, others will hate it and many will simply ignore it. Successful project delivery requires three key steps; for all of the ‘important stakeholders’ you need to:

1. Assess their current attitude towards the work.
2. Determine a realistically desirable attitude to expect of the stakeholder that will optimise the chance of success.
3. Work out what needs to be done to shift stakeholders from their current state to the desired state.

Attitudes can range from actively supportive of the work through to active opposition to the work, and the stakeholder may be willing to engage in communication with you (even if they hate the work) or refuse to communicate (even if they support the work).

Both measures are important; to change a stakeholder’s attitude, you first need to be able to communicate with them! In fact, the only ethical tool you have to support or change stakeholder’s attitude towards the work is various forms of communication. Even if you only want to maintain a stakeholder’s current level of support communication is essential to monitor the situation and avoid nasty surprises.

The Stakeholder Circle methodology separates this critical assessment of ‘attitude’ from the prioritisation of stakeholders based on power, urgency and proximity to deal with the full spectrum of attitudes a typical project is confronted with.

The first step in the ESEI approach to assessing attitudes involves identifying the level of receptiveness and support of each stakeholder. The ranges are:

- Receptiveness:
  1 = Completely Uninterested - Refuses to accept reports
  2 = Not Interested - On mail list but unlikely to read reports
  3 = Neutral - Receives Reports
  4 = Medium - Indirect personal access

---

1 This series of articles on effective stakeholder engagement is by Lynda Bourne, PhD, Managing Director of Stakeholder Pty Ltd (Australia) and author of the books Stakeholder Relationship Management and Advising Upwards, both published by Gower (UK). Dr. Bourne is one of the world’s leading authorities on program/project stakeholder relations. Her author profile can be found at the end of this article.

2 Based on your stakeholder prioritisation discussed in: http://pmworldlibrary.net/article/stakeholder-identification-and-prioritization/
5 = High - Direct personal contacts

- Support:
  1 = Active Opposition
  2 = Passive opposition
  3 = Neutral
  4 = Passive support
  5 = Active support

One way to make the assessment process relatively objective is to identify a person who is 'just within' each of the categories (e.g., someone who is just in the 'Passive support' category) then by comparing the level of support of another stakeholder to the 'minimum benchmark' stakeholder it is easier to determine if the level of support is about the same or better in which case the stakeholder will score a 4 (or a 5 if they are deemed equal or more supportive than the next categories benchmark). If the level of support is lower, the stakeholder would score a 3 or lower. The critical outcome from this process is not to rank stakeholders against some abstract benchmark, rather to build a comparative order so that an optimum communications plan can be developed.

The current levels of support and receptiveness for the stakeholder are shown in a 5 x 5 matrix, the S/H Profile.

The next assessment is to determine a 'realistic target' for each stakeholder; this may be equal to, or lower than the current assessment, slightly better or significantly better than the current situation.

Having assessed the stakeholder's current level of engagement, the target level of engagement and the difference between the two, a communication plan needs to be developed to enhance or maintain each key stakeholder's levels of receptiveness and supportiveness. This planning process is needed for each of the important stakeholders 'one-size does not fit all'! For example, if an important stakeholder is both actively opposed and not interested in information about the project, he or she will need a different engagement approach compared to a stakeholder who is highly supportive and encourages the personal delivery of messages.

The figure below illustrates three stakeholder engagement levels indicating the baseline engagement level 'X', and the target level planned at a future time 'O'. 
From this information you can start to plan your communication strategy:

- Stakeholder 1 needs a maintenance strategy to keep the current status in place, possibly just forwarding routine reports.

- Stakeholder 2 may need a ‘heroic’ communication effort to build the level of support needed, particularly if the person is important.

- Stakeholder 3 is a different challenge - do you scale back the communication effort and risk alienating the person or do you ‘play safe’ and keep communicating at the level wanted by the stakeholder?

Important stakeholders whose attitude is less supportive than needed require carefully directed communication. Others may simply require routine engagement through more general ‘PR’, or simple reporting (the process of stakeholder engagement will be discussed later in this series).

If this all sounds like hard work it is! But it’s far less work then struggling to revive a failed project. This theme is central to my new book: *Making Projects Work, Effective stakeholder and communication management*. The underlying theme of both the book and the ESEI approach to stakeholder engagement is the proposition that the cheapest and easiest way to achieve a successful outcome is to invest the effort needed to obtain the support you require from your stakeholder community. If you do not, the same stakeholders will help you fail.

---
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