

BEYOND THE REGISTER

Stakeholder Management Is Not Stakeholder Leadership — Why Influence Cannot Be Administered

The quiet leadership failure inside complex change programmes—and the structural habits that keep it alive



Stakeholder Management Is Not Stakeholder Leadership — Why Influence Cannot Be Administered

Leadership · No. 35

Originally written October 2006 | Re-edited and re-rendered for the WhereBeyond Edition, 2025

“A map can tell us where power sits; it cannot make power move.”

1. The Green Stakeholder Register

At eight o'clock on the morning of a steering meeting, a programme director studies a stakeholder register that is almost entirely green. Every executive has been briefed. Every business unit has a nominated representative. Communications have gone out on schedule. Yet one regional director has quietly instructed his managers not to release their best people for testing, the finance function is still disputing the benefits baseline, and the operations lead intends to keep the old process running after the new one is introduced.

Nothing in the register is false. That is precisely the problem. It records contact while concealing commitment.

Across large change programmes, stakeholder management has become one of the most diligently administered and least honestly practised disciplines. We identify, classify, communicate and report. The language is orderly because order reassures a steering committee. But the work that determines whether change survives is disorderly: interests collide, authority is ambiguous, favours are exchanged, reputations are placed at risk and people wait to see who truly means what they say.

Stakeholder management treats these conditions as information to be organised. Stakeholder leadership treats them as choices to be changed. The distinction explains why programmes can be exemplary in their engagement activity and still discover, late and expensively, that the organisation has never actually consented to change.

2. The Administrative Comfort of the Map

The modern programme office has good reasons to favour the stakeholder map. Complex organisations are increasingly matrixed. Major programmes now cross functions, suppliers and geographies. Shared-service designs, outsourcing arrangements, regulatory demands and large systems implementations bring together parties who do not share a reporting line or even a common definition of success. A disciplined record of who matters, what they know and when they were contacted is not bureaucracy for its own sake. It prevents omission.

The strongest defence of stakeholder management is therefore serious: without a register, communication plan, responsibility chart and regular reporting, influence becomes personality-dependent. Decisions disappear into private conversations. Important groups are overlooked. Senior attention is squandered on whoever speaks loudest. At scale, some

administration is the price of consistency.

That argument is right about the need for management and wrong about its sufficiency. A map can tell us where power sits; it cannot make power move. A communication can tell a person what will happen; it cannot make the consequences acceptable. A meeting can secure attendance; it cannot secure a decision. The error is not using the apparatus. The error is allowing evidence of activity to stand in for evidence of movement.

The test of stakeholder work is not whether a person has been reached. It is whether a consequential choice has changed.

This substitution is attractive because activity is visible and influence is not. A programme office can count briefings, workshops and newsletters. It can colour a matrix. It cannot so easily report that a powerful executive remains politely unconvinced, that two sponsors are protecting incompatible outcomes, or that the agreed benefit requires one function to surrender budget and status to another. The administrative artefact makes the political fact easier to avoid.

3. Influence Begins Where Courtesy Ends

Management asks: Who needs to know? Leadership asks: Who must choose differently, and what presently prevents that choice?

That second question is more exacting because resistance is rarely a simple lack of information. People resist for reasons that are often rational from where they sit. A sales director may support a common customer process in principle while fearing that standardisation will slow the quarter's orders. An operations manager may accept the new system but distrust the staffing assumptions behind it. A finance director may doubt benefits that depend on head-count reductions no line executive has agreed to make. Calling these people "resistant" turns a conflict of obligations into a defect of attitude.

The pattern repeats because programmes speak in the language of the enterprise while stakeholders are judged by the performance of their own part of it. The programme promises a future benefit. The executive carries a present target. The programme asks for scarce staff. The executive bears the immediate service risk. Unless that exchange is made explicit, support remains ceremonial.

A useful influence conversation therefore has four parts:

- The required choice: the specific decision, resource or behaviour needed.
- The stakeholder's exposure: what the person risks by agreeing, including operational, financial and reputational consequences.
- The credible exchange: what protection, authority, evidence or reciprocal commitment makes agreement reasonable.
- The proof of commitment: an action with a date and consequence, not a favourable remark in a meeting.

This is not manipulation. It is the opposite. Manipulation disguises interests; leadership puts them on the table. It accepts that an executive can agree with the destination and still reject the route.

4. A Programme That Was “Fully Supported”

Consider a composite situation familiar to many organisations in 2006. A national service business is replacing separate regional administration with a common process and a central transaction centre. The business case promises annual savings of £18 million, largely through removing 310 local posts and standardising work across twelve regions. A new information system is part of the change, but the benefit depends less on the software than on whether regional directors actually release work and people to the centre.

The stakeholder plan is comprehensive. Each director receives a monthly briefing. Regional representatives attend design workshops. A steering pack shows all twelve regions as supportive. The programme reports that 94 per cent of planned communications have been delivered.

Three months before the first transfer, the delivery team discovers that only four regions have named staff for knowledge transfer. Five intend to retain “temporary” local teams for at least a year. Two have inserted additional approval steps into the common process. One has agreed to everything in meetings but has not changed a single local objective. If all those positions hold, the first-year saving falls from £18 million to roughly £6 million, while the organisation carries both the centre and much of the old structure.

The programme had managed twelve relationships and led none of the decisive choices.

The turning point is not another roadshow. The sponsor changes the unit of discussion. Each regional director receives a one-page commitment record showing the posts to be released, the transfer date, the service risk during transition, the support requested and the consequence for the business case. These records are reviewed together, not privately, because the value depends on common action. Exceptions require a named owner, an expiry date and an explicit adjustment to benefits.

Within six weeks, nine regions commit to the original timetable. Two negotiate staged transfers in return for temporary service cover. One refuses and accepts that its £1.4 million share of the saving will be removed from the regional plan rather than left ambiguously inside the programme total.

No rhetoric creates this movement. The mechanism is clarity joined to consequence:

1. General support is converted into a specific, visible commitment.
2. The stakeholder's legitimate exposure is recognised and, where possible, reduced.
3. Incompatible promises are brought into the same room.
4. The cost of non-agreement is assigned rather than hidden in an optimistic total.

The lesson is not that every disagreement should be escalated. It is that agreement becomes real only when the organisation can see what has been promised, what it costs and who is accountable for the choice.

5. Why the Pattern Persists

The confusion between management and leadership is not merely a weakness in individual programme managers. Several structural forces sustain it.

5.1 Governance rewards presentable certainty

Steering committees often ask for assurance in a form that can be absorbed quickly: red, amber or green; complete or incomplete; contacted or not contacted. Nuance appears evasive. A programme director soon learns that “the chief operating officer supports the direction but will not release people until the service-risk assumptions are revised” creates more discomfort than a green engagement rating. The reporting convention does not cause the conflict, but it teaches the programme to conceal it.

5.2 Sponsorship is treated as endorsement

A sponsor's name at the top of a chart can be mistaken for active authority. Yet sponsorship is not a statement of approval. It is repeated intervention where line incentives and programme outcomes diverge. The sponsor must broker exchanges, settle competing claims and sometimes make one executive's loss explicit for the sake of the whole. When sponsorship is ceremonial, programme staff are asked to influence decisions whose consequences they do not have the authority to allocate.

5.3 Communication is mistaken for conversation

The growing reach of e-mail and corporate intranets makes it easier to distribute a consistent message. It also creates a seductive measure of progress: the message was sent, the presentation was delivered, the questions were posted. But communication designed for reach tends to remove the very friction that leadership must examine. It explains the case for change without discovering whose case against it remains stronger.

5.4 The method separates people from decisions

Stakeholders are often plotted by power and interest, then assigned a communication treatment. Decisions are tracked elsewhere, usually in a log. This separates the person from the choice. The result is a set of well-managed relationships and a set of ownerless decisions, even though the two are inseparable.

Administrative view	Leadership view
Stakeholder has attended	Stakeholder has made the required choice
Message has been delivered	Consequence has been understood
Support is recorded	Resources or authority have moved
Resistance is a communication issue	Resistance may be a rational conflict of obligations
Escalation is a last resort	Timely escalation protects value when authority is required

6. The Moral Weight of the Middle

The hardest stakeholder work sits in the middle of the hierarchy. Senior executives can declare an intention; front-line staff can describe what will and will not work. Between them, functional heads and regional managers translate broad ambition into budgets, people, measures and exceptions. They are often labelled blockers because they make the transformation encounter operating reality.

We should be slower to dismiss them. The middle manager who asks how a new process will cope at month-end may understand the risk better than the design team. The regional director who resists releasing experienced staff may be protecting a service obligation the business case has underpriced. Leadership listens for the information inside the resistance.

But respect for resistance cannot become indefinite accommodation. That is the other failure. Programmes sometimes confuse empathy with surrender and allow every local concern to become a permanent exception. Stakeholder leadership must distinguish three things:

- Evidence that improves the design should change the programme.
- Exposure created by the change should be acknowledged, mitigated or explicitly accepted.
- Preference dressed as necessity should be challenged by the accountable sponsor.

This judgement cannot be automated by a matrix. It requires someone to understand both the enterprise case and the local consequence, then bring the two into a decision that can withstand scrutiny.

7. From Sentiment to Commitment

The practical shift is small in language and large in effect. Replace the question “Are they supportive?” with “What have they committed to do, by when, and what would cause them not to do it?”

A stakeholder record can still be used, but its centre of gravity changes. For every stakeholder whose action materially affects the outcome, it should show:

- the decision or behaviour required;
- the present position and the evidence for it;
- the interest, obligation or fear shaping that position;
- the person with enough authority to negotiate the exchange;
- the next observable commitment and its date;
- the programme consequence if commitment is withheld.

This makes reporting less comfortable and more useful. A stakeholder may be highly engaged and still red because no resource has moved. Another may dislike the programme and still be green because the necessary decision has been taken and honoured. Sentiment matters, but behaviour carries the benefit.

There is also a discipline for meetings. Do not use senior time to repeat information already distributed. Use it to expose a choice, hear the objection in its strongest form, agree the exchange and record the consequence. If no decision, commitment or discovery is possible, the meeting may be communication, but it is not leadership.

8. The Gap Between Intention and Reality

Transformation intent is usually expressed at the level of the whole organisation: lower cost, better service, common standards, stronger control. Transformation reality is lived

through particular losses and obligations: a budget moves, a role disappears, a manager gives up discretion, a region accepts dependence on a central function. The gap between the two is not closed by a more persuasive description of the destination. It is closed by leading the exchanges that make the destination possible.

This is why stakeholder leadership cannot be delegated wholly to the programme office or communications team. They can prepare the analysis, maintain the record, test the argument and make avoidance visible. But only accountable leaders can settle conflicts that redistribute authority, risk and reward. When they fail to do so, the programme does not become apolitical. Its politics merely become informal, late and expensive.

The enduring temptation is to prefer evidence that people have been managed over evidence that the organisation has been led. Managed stakeholders appear orderly. Led stakeholders may disagree openly, demand conditions and force difficult choices. Yet the second condition is healthier because it converts hidden resistance into governable decisions.

The green register at the steering meeting is therefore not reassurance. It is a question. Does it describe a set of people who have heard the programme, or a set of commitments on which the programme can safely depend?

Until that distinction is visible, stakeholder management will continue to prosper as a discipline of contact while transformations fail for want of leadership.