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Exploring the use of critical systems heuristics (CSH)
Stakes, stakeholders and stakeholdings
social learning in water management: development or entrenchment?

• “Stakeholding expresses the idea that individuals **actively construct**, promote and defend their stake” (SLIM 2004 p.1)

• “One of the platform members, in frustration with the official process, has set up an informal multistakeholders’ group. They call themselves ‘**cake bakers**’, developing new recipes together, to distinguish themselves from the ‘**cutting up of the cake**’ deals that seem to characterise the official platform process.” (SLIM 2004 p.2)
Stakes, stakeholders and stakeholdings
three questions of stakeholding analysis

1. What’s at stake?
2. Who are the stakeholders?
3. What possibilities exist for stakeholding *development*?

3. What threats exist for stakeholding *entrenchment*?
Stakes, stakeholders and stakeholdings

Evaluation as social learning: a *conversation* between ideas and reality

1. What’s at stake?

   Situations of interest subject to evaluation

2. Who are the stakeholders?

   Those involved and affected by evaluation

3. What Ideas exist for improving stakeholding?

   Reference system circumscribing evaluation

...Evaluation as conversation

Stakeholding development
Stakes, stakeholders and stakeholdings

using the appropriate reference system for formative evaluation

1. What’s at stake?
   Situations of interest subject to evaluation

2. Who are the stakeholders?
   Those involved and affected by evaluation

3. What ideas exist for improving stakeholding?
   Reference system circumscribing evaluation

   What might be used as an appropriate reference system?
CSH as reference system for evaluating what’s at stake and identifying stakeholders and stakeholdings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Stakes</th>
<th>Stakeholdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Roles</td>
<td>Role-specific concerns</td>
<td>Key Problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources of control</td>
<td>4. Decision-maker</td>
<td>5. Resources</td>
<td>6. Decision environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSH as reference system for evaluating what’s at stake and identifying stakeholders and stakeholdings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Stakes</th>
<th>Stakeholdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Roles</td>
<td>Role-specific concerns</td>
<td>Key Problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of motivation:
- 1. Beneficiary/client
- 2. Purpose
- 3. Measure of success

Sources of control:
- 4. Decision-maker
- 5. Resources
- 6. Decision environment

Sources of knowledge:
- 7. Expert
- 8. Expertise
- 9. Guarantor

Sources of legitimacy:
- 10. Witness
- 11. Emancipation
- 12. Worldviews

3 points of tension in using CSH as a reference system for improving stakeholdings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involved vs affected</th>
<th>Ought vs is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>stakeholders</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stakes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Social Roles</em></td>
<td><em>specific concerns</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of <strong>motivation</strong></td>
<td>1. <strong>Beneficiary</strong> who ought to be/is the client or beneficiary of the system (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of <strong>control</strong></td>
<td>4. <strong>Decision -maker</strong> who ought to be/is in command of resources necessary to enable S?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of <strong>knowledge</strong></td>
<td>7. <strong>Expert</strong> who ought to be/is providing expert support for S?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of <strong>legitimacy</strong></td>
<td>10. <strong>Witness</strong> who ought to be/is representing the interests of those negatively affected by but not involved with S?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evaluation and a 3rd source of tension**

**Stakeholding in CSH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders Social Roles</th>
<th>Stakes Role-specific concerns</th>
<th>Stakeholdings</th>
<th>Sources of motivation</th>
<th>Sources of control</th>
<th>Sources of knowledge</th>
<th>Sources of legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Beneficiary/ client</td>
<td>2. Purpose</td>
<td>3 – (measure of success) enchantment of fixed <em>measurable outcomes</em> vs managing emergence</td>
<td>The involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Check on values (circumscribing the system)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decision-maker</td>
<td>5. Resources</td>
<td>6 – (environment) imperative towards <em>command and control</em> vs allowing autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Check on power (controlling the system)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expert</td>
<td>8. Expertise</td>
<td>9 – (guaranator) dogma and promises of <em>professional expertise</em> vs wider humility of social/ ecological uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Check on complacency (informing the system)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Witness</td>
<td>11. Emancipation</td>
<td>12 – (worldview) righteousness and premises of <em>‘the’ system</em> vs rights of, and consequences on, those affected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Check on fundamental meanings (assumed within the system)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tensions in using CSH for stakeholding development

- CSH reference system of interest about the real world being evaluated
- principle stakeholders (e.g., evaluators, producers, beneficiaries, decision makers...)
- emphasising the ‘involved’
- Stakeholding questions
- 3, 6, 9, 12
- real world situation of interest subject to evaluation including values, power, knowledge and ethics
- emphasising the ‘affected’
## Case Study (Midgley and Reynolds, 2004)
Evaluating expert support for environmental planning

| Components to a system of operational research (OR)/ systems support for environmental planning (EP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **stakeholders** | **Stakes** | **stakeholdings** | **Sources of** |
| **Social Roles** | **specific concerns** | **Key Problems** | **motivation** |
| 1. Public/government sector agencies as proxy to the interests of intended beneficiaries | 2. Improving natural resource use without harm to the natural environment in the context of complexity and uncertainty | 3. Complexity and uncertainty – measuring success given the unpredictability of natural and social phenomena | **The ‘involved’** |
| 4. Private/ business sector users of natural resources | 5. Access to and control over limited natural resources using monetary value in the midst of other values | 6. Multiple and often conflicting values, outside conventional market control | **control** |
| 7. OR/ systems practitioners | 8. Existing expertise in OR and systems research and practise supporting concerns of those in other stakeholder groups | 9. Inadequate and sometimes pretentious (false) guarantor support for environmental planning | **knowledge** |
| 10. NGO/ environmental- activist sector groups | 11. Making representation of natural world and marginalised users of natural resources amidst political power to alienate such representation | 12. Political effects on those not involved in planning processes (including non-human nature) | **legitimacy** |
|  |  |  | **The ‘affected’** |
Case Study (Midgley and Reynolds, 2004)

Evaluating expert support for environmental planning

1. 3 Points of tension as drivers to a summative evaluation (boundary reflection)

(involved vs affected): which groups best represent sources of influence on expert support? – (i) public sector, (ii) business sector, (iii) academia and consultants vs (iv) NGOs

(ought vs ‘is’): what questions might be asked of each stakeholder group to get a picture of the situation? – (i) indices of sustainability used, (ii) values on environment commonly appreciated, (iii) expert deficiencies, and (iv) restrictions on alternative viewpoints

Stakeholding issues: - what might be the ideal system of expert support from different stakeholder perspectives? – (i) provision of more robust indices of sustainability, (ii) incorporating citizen values on environment, (iii) generating support for dealing with all stakeholder group concerns, and (iv) providing space for alternative viewpoints
Situations of interest constituting what’s at stake during an evaluation

Evaluators and other Stakeholders involved with and affected by evaluation

(i) Boundary reflection (summative evaluation)

(ii) Boundary discourse (formative evaluation)

(iii) CSH as a reference system for

i. Boundary reflection: understanding stakeholdings
ii. Boundary discourse: practice in transforming stakeholdings

Through delineating 4 sources of influence:

1. Motivation (values)
2. Control (power)
3. Expertise (knowledge)
4. Legitimacy (ethics)

Systems as conceptual tools for the purpose of stakeholding development during an evaluation
Evaluation as meaningful conversation amongst stakeholders
using appropriate reference systems and stakeholding development

**CSH as a reference system for framing**

i. **understanding** of what’s at stake (boundary reflection) ; and

ii. **practice** in transforming stakeholdings (boundary discourse),

Through delineating 4 sources of influence:

1. Motivation (values)
2. Control (power)
3. Expertise (knowledge)
4. Legitimacy (ethics)

**CSH for stakeholding development?**

Good on **boundary reflection**: revealing what’s at stake (ethics), who stakeholders are and what possibilities for stakeholding development exist (relations of power)

Not so explicit on **boundary discourse**: how can our tools be better used for actually ‘talking’ ie. conversing with different stakeholder concerns?
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