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Introduction

- A stakeholder is someone who "can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives" (Freeman, 1984, p. 46).
- Mitchell, Agle, and Wood (1997) add, ". . . who (or what) are the stakeholders of the firm? And to whom (or what) do managers pay attention?“ (p. 853)
- Stakeholders exist at the center of any problem solving effort and holistic consideration of them is absolutely necessary for successful problem resolution
Stakeholder Analysis and Management

We have developed a six step, structured process to deal with stakeholders:

1. Brainstorm stakeholders
2. Classify stakeholders
3. Evaluate stakeholder attitudes
4. Determine stakeholder engagement priority
5. Develop a stakeholder management plan
6. Manage stakeholders

This presentation will discuss the basics of each step and demonstrate the steps on an example.
1) Brainstorm Stakeholders

- We must consider the "the principle of who or what really counts" (R. E. Freeman, 1994, p. 413).
- Given Freeman’s (1984) seminal stakeholder definition and Mitchell, Agle, and Wood (1997) emphasis on managerial attention, we must consider how to identify stakeholder and how to engage these stakeholder in support of our organizational objectives.
1) Brainstorm Stakeholders

Exercise must answer two questions:

- **Who can affect or is affected by the problem solution?**
  - This list may include users, customers (users who spend money), a project financier, regulatory agencies, those responsible for maintenance, competitors, and others.

- **What does the stakeholder want as a result of the problem solution?**
  - Written as a simple narrative of stakeholder desire.
  - Note *want* and not *need* due to the suboptimization principle (Hitch, 1953)

- Expect the list to be quite large
2) Classify stakeholders

- Mitchell, Agle, and Wood (1997) developed a typology to classify stakeholders
- Helps organizations to determine which stakeholder require organizational attention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>&quot;A relationship among social actors in which one social actor, A, can get another social actor, B, to do something that B would not&quot; (Mitchell, et al., 1997, p. 869)</td>
<td>(Dahl, 1957; Pfeffer, 1981; Weber, 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>&quot;A generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, definitions&quot; (Mitchell, et al., 1997, p. 869)</td>
<td>(Suchman, 1995; Weber, 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgency</td>
<td>&quot;The degree to which stakeholder claims call for immediate attention&quot; (Mitchell, et al., 1997, p. 869)</td>
<td>(Mitchell, et al., 1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Answer these questions in a binary (Y/N) fashion
2) Classify stakeholders

Stakeholder Typology, adapted from (Mitchell, et al., 1997)

1. Dormant (Power, no legitimacy, and no urgency)
2. Discretionary (Legitimacy, no power, and no urgency)
3. Demanding (Urgency, no power, and no legitimacy)
4. Dominant (Power and legitimacy, no urgency)
5. Dangerous (Power and urgency, no legitimacy)
6. Dependent (Legitimacy and urgency, no power)
7. Definitive (Power, legitimacy, and urgency)
8. Non-stakeholder (No power, no legitimacy, no urgency)
2) Classify stakeholders

Stakeholder categories demand varying levels of attention:

- Individuals who exhibit zero characteristics are Non-stakeholders
- Stakeholders exhibiting any one characteristic are Latent
  - Little expectation for influence
  - "managers may not even go so far as to recognize those stakeholders' existence" (Mitchell, et al., 1997, p. 874)
- Stakeholder exhibiting two characteristics are Expectant
  - "seen as 'expecting something,' because the combination of two attributes leads the stakeholder to an active versus a passive stance, with a corresponding increase in firm responsiveness to the stakeholder's interests" (Mitchell, et al., 1997, p. 876)
- Definitive stakeholders exhibit all three attributes
  - "managers have a clear and immediate mandate to attend to and give priority to that stakeholder's claim" (Mitchell, et al., 1997, p. 878)
3) Evaluate Stakeholder Attitudes

- Strategy for stakeholder engagement based solely on classification is insufficient
- Doesn’t account for support or opposition to a particular endeavor
  - If a stakeholder is supportive of a project, while they may not be classified as definitive, it still may be advantageous for us to engage them
3) Evaluate Stakeholder Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder’s Potential for Cooperation with Organization</th>
<th>Stakeholder’s Potential for Threat to Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Low} )</td>
<td>( \text{High} ) and ( \text{Low} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supportive</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

adapted from (Savage, et al., 1991)
3) Evaluate Stakeholder Attitudes

- Four strategies from Savage, et al. (1991):
  - Involve supportive stakeholders
  - Collaborate with mixed stakeholders
  - Defend against non-supportive stakeholders
  - Monitor marginal stakeholders

- We add the strategy of No action
3) Evaluate Stakeholder Attitudes--Continuum of Stakeholder Action

Stakeholder strategies

No action | Monitor | Defend | Collaborate | Involve

Direction of increased stakeholder involvement

adapted from Hester, et al. (2012)

- As we move from left to right, strategies require more effort
- Must balance concern for involvement with classification (i.e., importance) of stakeholders
3) Evaluate Stakeholder Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Classification</th>
<th>Undefined</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Expectant</th>
<th>Definitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive</strong></td>
<td>No action</td>
<td>Involve</td>
<td>Involve</td>
<td>Involve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed</strong></td>
<td>No action</td>
<td>Defend</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td>Involve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-supportive</strong></td>
<td>No action</td>
<td>Defend</td>
<td>Defend</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marginal</strong></td>
<td>No action</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>Defend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Evaluate Stakeholder Attitudes--Transformation of Stakeholders

Work from right to left, moving stakeholders toward a more supportive role

adapted from Hester, et al. (2012)
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority

- We lack the ability to prioritize our efforts regarding stakeholder engagement.
- This is crucial as we must focus our efforts on the stakeholders who can affect the largest amount of change for our effort (i.e., give us the most bang for the buck).
- This requires us to think about our stakeholders in relation to one another.
- Can use network theory to do so.
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority

- Can construct a directed graph
  - Nodes represent stakeholders
  - Arcs represent influence (direction and magnitude)

- Can use degree, the number of nodes a given node is adjacent to, to evaluate the network
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority—Degree

Opsahl, Agneessens, and Skvoretz (2010) show *degree* to be appropriate for directed graphs:

\[ k_i = C_D (i) = \sum_{j}^{N} x_{ij} \]

where \( C_D \) is the degree centrality, \( i \) is the node of interest, \( j \) represents all other nodes, \( N \) is the total number of nodes, and \( x_{ij} \) is the adjacency matrix, defined as 1 if an arc exists between \( i \) and \( j \), and 0 otherwise.
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority—Strength

Degree has generally been redefined (e.g., Barrat, et al., 2004; Opsahl, et al., 2010; Opsahl, Colizza, Panzarasa, & Ramasco, 2008) for weighted networks and redefined as strength as follows:

\[
s_i = C_{D}^W(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{ij}
\]

where \( C_{D}^W \) is the weighted degree centrality, and \( w_{ij} \) is the weighted adjacency matrix, defined as the weight of the connection between \( i \) and \( j \) (>0) if \( i \) is connected to \( j \), and 0 otherwise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence ( i ) exerts on ( j )</th>
<th>( w_{ij} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (no arc between ( i ) and ( j ))</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority—Influence

Two notes on determining influence:

- Relationships will likely not be symmetric
- Many stakeholders will not be connected (i.e., have a $w_{ij}$ of 0)
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority—Combining Degree and Strength

Opsahl, et al. (2010) develop a combined metric of degree and strength since both are important:

\[ C_D^{W\alpha}(i) = k_i \left( \frac{S_i}{k_i} \right)^\alpha = k_i^{(1-\alpha)} S_i^\alpha \]

where \( \alpha \) is a positive tuning parameter used to adjust the relative importance of degree and strength.

- If \( \alpha = 0 \), the measure reduces to \textit{degree}
- If \( \alpha = 1 \), the measure reduces to \textit{strength}
- Suggest adopting an \( \alpha \) of 0.5, insuring that the effect of both strength and degree are accounted for
- Final complication is that stakeholder network is directed
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority—Activity and Popularity

Opsahl, et al. (2010) go on to define *activity* and *popularity*, for directed graphs as:

\[
\text{Activity}(i) = \mathcal{C}_D^{W \alpha}(i) = k_i^{\text{out}} \left( \frac{s_i^{\text{out}}}{k_i^{\text{out}}} \right)^\alpha \\
\text{Popularity}(i) = \mathcal{C}_D^{W \alpha}(i) = k_i^{\text{in}} \left( \frac{s_i^{\text{in}}}{k_i^{\text{in}}} \right)^\alpha
\]

- *Activity* is a measure of the amount of reach that a stakeholder has in a network; high activity individuals are highly connected.

- *Popularity* can be conceptualized of as the inverse of the ease with which someone is able to be influenced; high popularity individuals are difficult to influence.
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority—Intersection of Activity and Popularity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Popularity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Important and easy to influence</td>
<td>Important but hard to influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Important but hard to influence</td>
<td>Not important and hard to influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority—Illustration of Activity and Popularity

Influence Key
High → Medium → Low

Diagram:
- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F

Connections:
A → B
B → C
B → E
E → D
E → F
B ← D
C ← D
B ← E
C ← E
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority—Illustration of Activity and Popularity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>$k_i^{in}$</th>
<th>$k_i^{out}$</th>
<th>$s_i^{in}$</th>
<th>$s_i^{out}$</th>
<th>Popularity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority

- Recall our goal is to move all stakeholders toward a supportive role.
- In order to do this, all stakeholders should be sorted first by activity (in descending order), and then, if necessary, by popularity (in descending order).
- This order reflects the engagement order of stakeholders.
4) Determine Stakeholder Engagement Priority—Illustration of Activity and Popularity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Popularity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Engagement Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) Stakeholder Management Plan

Should include:

- Stakeholder name/identifier (per Step 1)
- Stakeholder wants (per Step 1)
- Stakeholder classification (per Step 2)
- Stakeholder attitude (per Step 3)
- Stakeholder engagement priority (per Step 4)
- Strategy (defend, collaborate, etc.) for dealing with stakeholder
- Method for engagement (e-mails, in-person, etc.)
- Proximity of engagement (e.g., monthly, weekly)
- Responsible party who pursues the identified strategy
- Notes that are necessary for housekeeping purposes
### 5) Stakeholder Management Plan—Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Name</th>
<th>Wants</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Priority of engagement</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Manage stakeholders

- We must *follow through* on the strategies determined by the stakeholder management plan.
- Remember that stakeholder analysis and management is a cycle, and you must *revisit* and *update* your plan regularly for it to be effective.
Framework for Managing and Analyzing Stakeholders

Undertaking a stakeholder analysis requires an individual to complete the six-step process we outlined earlier as it pertains to an identified problem, namely:

1. Brainstorm stakeholders
2. Classify stakeholders
3. Evaluate stakeholder attitudes
4. Determine stakeholder engagement priority
5. Develop a stakeholder management plan
6. Manage stakeholders
Example Problem

- Derived from the example discussed briefly in Hester, Bradley, and Adams (2012)
- A local developer sought to rezone portions of an upscale, single family home residential neighborhood to a condominium complex.
- This rezoning must take into account the values of important stakeholders in order to ensure project success.
- Example is analyzed from the point of the real estate developer.
1) Brainstorm Stakeholders -- Example

1. The real estate developer
2. Nine local communities
3. Local media
4. City Staff
5. City Planning Commission
6. City Council
1) Brainstorm Stakeholders -- Example

1. The real estate developer wants financial gain from the project.
2. Nine local communities want to maintain their property values and quality of life.
3. Local media want news stories that sell.
4. City Staff wants minimal disruption.
5. City Planning Commission wants compliance with regulations.
6. City Council wants to be reelected.
## 2) Stakeholder Classification -- Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Stakeholder Attribute</th>
<th>Stakeholder Class</th>
<th>Stakeholder Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The real estate developer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine local communities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planning Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two stakeholders who hold the most power are the real estate developer and the local community affected by the developers’ efforts.
### 3) Stakeholder Attitude -- Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Potential for threat</th>
<th>Potential for cooperation</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The real estate developer</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planning Commission</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine local communities</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Non-supportive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Stakeholder Engagement Priority--Example

- City Staff
- Local media
- Planning commission
- City council
- Local communities

**Classification Key**
- Latent
- Expectant
- Definitive

**Attitude Key**
- Supportive
- Mixed
- Non-supportive
- Marginal

**Influence Key**
- High
- Medium
- Low
# 4) Stakeholder Engagement Priority--Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>$k_i^{in}$</th>
<th>$k_i^{out}$</th>
<th>$s_i^{in}$</th>
<th>$s_i^{out}$</th>
<th>Popularity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The real estate developer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planning Commission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine local communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4) Stakeholder Engagement Priority--Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Popularity</th>
<th>Engagement Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine local communities</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planning Commission</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The real estate developer</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5) Stakeholder Management Plan -- Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Name</th>
<th>Wants</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Priority of Engagement</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine local communities</td>
<td>Property values and quality of life</td>
<td>Definitive</td>
<td>Non-supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Reelection</td>
<td>Expectant</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planning Commission</td>
<td>Regulation compliance</td>
<td>Expectant</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media</td>
<td>Stories that sell</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Defend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>Minimal disruption</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The real estate developer</td>
<td>Financial gain</td>
<td>Definitive</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Involve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Manage stakeholders -- Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Name</th>
<th>Wants</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Priority of Engagement</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine local communities</td>
<td>Property values and quality of life</td>
<td>Definitive</td>
<td>Non-supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Reelection</td>
<td>Expectant</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planning Commission</td>
<td>Regulation compliance</td>
<td>Expectant</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media</td>
<td>Stories that sell</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Defend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>Minimal disruption</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The real estate developer</td>
<td>Financial gain</td>
<td>Definitive</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Involve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top priority is to collaborate with the local communities, using their wants as motivating factors in the discussion.
Summary

- Presented a straightforward manner to identify and evaluate stakeholders, and to develop a plan for dealing with them.
- This approach can be used to deal with stakeholders in complex systems problems, allowing for practitioners to prioritize scarce organizational resources.
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