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ABSTRACT

Cross sector social partnerships have been increasingly used as vehicles to address societal issues. However, the practices are poorly understood and lacking transferability. One of the challenges relates to evaluating the success of cross sector social partnership projects through a stakeholder perspective. This thesis aims to examine how the different stakeholders perceive and assess project success by examining a case in a tripartite cross sector social partnership project named Umeå Interactive Recycling Room. Seven interviews with representatives from five participating organisations and project archival documents were analysed for the purpose of this thesis. The study reveals that stakeholders assessed success in multiple dimensions using short and long-term perspectives. The success criteria tend to be related to the value creation concept of the project which can be categorised into outcome, organisational benefits, product, and learning perspectives. The study also reveals that the stakeholders did not assess success using the traditional project management measures of time, cost, and scope. Furthermore, project success was assessed multiple times, both during the project life and post the project life with the evaluation means that can differ from informal ways to more formal ways. Overall, the findings suggest that connections exist between the success criteria, the timing of the project being assessed, and the role of the stakeholders in the partnership.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of Cross Sector Social Partnerships

There has been an increasing commitment for organisations to invest resources in cross sector social partnerships aiming to address broader societal issues such as issues relating to the environment, economic development, and public health (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 127; McDonald & Young, 2012, p. 55; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 413; Seitanidi et al, 2010, p. 239; Seitanidi & Lindgreen, 2010, p. 1; Waddock, 1991, p. 481, 1989, p. 79). Among the main drivers behind this phenomenon are the increased demand for government and public agencies to deliver impactful results and the globalisation that has created the increasing need to collaborate with other organisations in order to achieve organisational goals (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 129; Waddock, 1991, p. 484). In view of this trend, cross sector social partnerships are poorly understood (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 231; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009; p. 413; Waddock, 1991, p. 79). Often times the term is even confused with other types of organisational networks, as Googins and Rochlin (2000) highlight, it is like “putting a new label on old clothes” (p. 131) such as mis-referencing sponsorship with partnership (p. 132). This implies a need to first clarify the definition and main characteristics of cross sector social partnerships before proceeding to the discussion.

Many authors such as Googins and Rochlin (2000), Seitanidi and Crane (2009), and Selsky and Parker (2005) refer to Waddock’s (1989, 1991) definition of cross sector social partnership:

“A commitment by a corporation or a group of corporations to work with an organisation from a different economic sector (public or non-profit). It involves a commitment of resources - time and effort - by individuals from all partner organisations. These individuals work cooperatively to solve problems that affect them all. The problem can be defined at least in part as a social issue; its solutions will benefit all partners. Social partnership addresses issues that extend beyond organisational boundaries and traditional goals and lie within the traditional realm of public policy - that is in the social arena. It requires active rather than passive involvement from all parties. Participants must make a resource commitment that is more than merely monetary” (Waddock, 1988, cited in Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 413).

The above definition summarises the main characteristics of a cross sector social partnership. It is because of this definition that it is wrong to refer to sponsorship as a type of cross sector social partnership because it is a passive relationship which is based on one way resources transfer, merely monetary, from the sponsor organisation to the recipient organisation (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 132; Waddock, 1991, p. 483). Another important characteristic is the requirement that the partner organisations should come from two or more different economic sectors (Waddock 1989, p. 481). In this context, sector refers to the ways the society is organised which can be classified in three ways: through profit seeking organisations or private sector, government, and non-profit seeking organisations dedicated to solve societal issues such as NPO and educational institutions (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 130). It is also important to note that the partnership should aim to solve societal issues while providing benefits to all partner organisations (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 127; McDonald & Young, 2012, p. 55; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 413; Seitanidi & Lindgreen, 2010, p. 1;
Seitanidi et al., 2010, p. 239; Waddock, 1989, p. 79, 1991, p. 481). This is because without the benefits, the partner organisations will not be motivated to join the partnership (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 134; Waddock, 1989, p. 96; Waddock, 1991, p. 37).

One of the primary motivations behind a cross sector social partnership is explained through the resources dependency theory. This theory states that organisations collaborate with other organisations when they are lacking certain expertise and resources that the partner organisations can provide (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 128; McDonald & Young, 2012, p. 56; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009; Selsky & Parker, 2005, pp. 851-852). This motivation is based on the increased complexity of the environment which forces organisations to be more specialised, and in return creates more dependencies with other organisations in order to achieve the goals (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 129; Waddock, 1991, p. 484). Another reason to form a cross sector social partnership is the potential benefits that it promises for participating organisations. Several examples are the generation of more creative and innovative ideas, improved efficiency, and shared accountability (McDonald & Young, 2012, p. 55). Similarly, both Wilson et al. (2010, p. 76) and Googins and Rochlin (2000, p. 127) signify a cross sector social partnership as a vehicle for innovation due to the opportunities it creates for cross learnings among the partner organisations. Having considered these benefits, it is reasonable that global bodies, such as the United Nations (2012), suggest organisations to engage in cross sector partnerships when addressing societal issues.

It is however important not to assume that these benefits are easily realised since cross sector social partnerships involve challenges that are not easy to address. Several examples are the ambiguity in the performance evaluation (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 131) and the increased interdependencies due to the increased number of stakeholders involved in the partnerships (Slesky & Parker, 2005, p. 857; Waddock, 1991, p. 484). The challenges are even more difficult to address especially because many organisations have a poor understanding of cross sector social partnerships (Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 414; Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 850). Additionally, there is a lack of transferability of the practices which results in failure and unsustained achievement of partnerships’ goals (ibid).

1.2. Cross Sector Social Partnerships as Projects

Cross sector social partnerships are also developed through projects (Peters, 1999; Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 852) because the cross sector partnership is “a temporary social arrangement” that has a unique societal goal to achieve. This is in line with the definition of project provided by the PMBOK® (2013, p. 3) which defines project as “a temporary endeavour undertaken to create a unique product, services, or results”. This trend leads to the need of understanding cross sector social partnerships through the lens of the project management discipline. As with any other types of projects, cross sector social partnership projects are also facing the challenges of measuring the effectiveness of the project since their measures are not well defined and are often ambiguous (Hutchings & Sutherland, 2008, p. 1691; Labuschagne & Brent, 2006, p. 3). The need to have measures is even greater because of the increasing pressure from various stakeholders for organisations to deliver concrete and impactful initiatives addressing societal issues (Smith, 2003, p. 54). In fact, this is a common problem faced by almost all types of projects. Jugdev and Müller (2005, p. 19) investigated project success over the past forty years and found that the link between the project and the product value was missing. As a result, project success becomes harder to measure.
Additionally, the recent development in the project management field suggests the need to move the project management field from the tactical field to a more strategic field (Jugdev & Müller, 2005; Shenhar et al., 2001). This means that project management should not only focus on efficiency measures i.e. cost, time, and scope, but also on effectiveness measures concerning the value that the project aims to deliver (Jugdev & Müller, 2005, pp. 19-20; Shenhar et al., 2001). This is understood because eventually what really matters is the value delivered by the project to the organisation, not how well the project is being managed (Shenhar et al., 2001). An example to illustrate this suggestion is the Sydney Opera House project which according to the traditional project measures is considered a project that failed because it was over-budget and over-time (Jugdev & Müller, 2005, p. 22; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 700). However, from the point of view of modern projects, the Sydney Opera House project can also be considered successful. As Shenhar et al. (2001, p. 700) argue, it has been successful as the landmark of Australia which Jugdev and Muller (2005, p. 20) refer to the ‘value’ that the project delivered. In contrast, a project can be delivered on time and on budget nevertheless, it is considered a failure when it does not deliver the benefits to the organisation that it served (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 709).

In addition, Davis (2013) who researched about the nature of project success in the literature, points out that in the 21st century there was an increasing trend to position the project success concept in a more stakeholder-focused context. This claim is actually in line with the research results from Littau et al. (2010) on stakeholder management. They point out that there has been an increased attention on the linkage of stakeholder management with the project management field and that the attention is mainly oriented to the field of project success. Their findings suggest that a common understanding on project success by the different stakeholders of the project is critical (Davis, 2013, p. 1; Fowler & Walsh, 1999, p. 8). However, in practice this concept is unclear and not easy to achieve (ibid). There is no common agreement or clear boundaries about who the project stakeholders are (Achterkamp & Vos, 2008, p. 751). This is even more challenging to define in the case of cross sector social partnerships where there are numerous stakeholders that can be directly and indirectly involved with the project, yet their views on project success are important. Furthermore, even when the stakeholders are clearly defined, different stakeholders often perceive project success differently (Davis, 2013, p. 1).

1.3. Research Gap

In order to deliver valuable contributions through cross sector social partnerships, organisations need to be equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to address the problems that they are facing during the collaboration period. The problems include poor understanding on cross sector social partnerships (Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 414; Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 850), difficulties in evaluating project success (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 141), disintegrated views of project stakeholders towards the project outcome (Davis, 2013, p. 1), and a high project complexity as a result of increased interdependencies (Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 857; Waddock, 1991, p. 484). Coupled with the lack of research on cross sector social partnerships at the micro level (Seitanidi & Crane 2009, p. 414), a research gap in the area of project success evaluation in cross sector social partnerships from the viewpoint of stakeholders was identified. Considering the gap, in our opinion, it is important to explore how stakeholders in cross sector social partnerships perceive and assess project success. We base our choice on the assumption that a common understanding of the project success by the
different stakeholders is pivotal for the success of a project (Davis, 2013; Googins & Rochlin, 2000, pp. 133-134). With this assumption in mind, we see that this paper will contribute to improve the effectiveness of cross sector social partnerships through a better understanding of the areas to focus on in regards to project success.

1.4. Research Question

With the above analysis in mind, this thesis aims to answer the following research question: “How do stakeholders in a cross sector social partnership project perceive and assess project success?”

To answer the research question, we focus our investigation in five areas:
• What characteristics of cross sector social partnerships does the project resemble?
• Who are the stakeholders of the cross sector social partnership?
• What are the project success criteria and how and when are they assessed?
• What are the perceptions of the stakeholders on the overall success of the project?

In this particular study, we aim to answer the above questions by investigating a unique case in a cross sector social partnership project named Umeå Interactive Recycling Room. The project is concerned with addressing one of the environmental issues in the field of recycling within the city of Umeå, Sweden. It involves several partner organisations coming from different economic sectors in Sweden i.e. FältCom (an IT company), Umeå School of Business and Economics (USBE) and Umeå Institute of Design or Designhögskolan (educational institutions), Bostaden (a housing company), and UMEVA (a recycling company). In regards to the unit of analysis, the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project is the basic unit, while the organisations that participated in delivering the project are the sub-units of analysis.

1.5. Research Objectives

This thesis aims to achieve the following objectives:
• Provide empirical evidence on the characteristics of a cross sector social partnership at a micro level.
• Explore how do the different stakeholders of a cross sector social partnership project perceive and assess project success.
• Identify common themes in regards to the project success criteria in a cross sector social partnership project.
• Identify opportunities for further research in the field of cross sector social partnership projects.

1.6. Architecture of The Study

Chapter 1 - Introduction familiarises the reader with the topic of this thesis and of presenting the analysis of the research gap through which we developed a research question. This chapter comprises a brief background of cross sector social partnerships in general and in a project context, the research gap followed by the research question and the research objectives.
Chapter 2 - Research Philosophy presents our research philosophy and shows how it influences our choices of methodology. In this chapter, we present theories from which we draw our choices of research philosophy along with the choice of the research method.

Chapter 3 - Literature Review, in this chapter the theoretical frameworks that frame the thesis are presented. They are drawn from three sub-fields of disciplines i.e. cross sector social partnerships, project management, and stakeholder management.

Chapter 4 - Research Strategy presents the research strategy layout or case study. The chapter also contains the description of how the research strategy is operationalised through the selected investigative tools to collect the empirical data and the data analysis method. In addition, it also presents the truth criteria of the thesis along with the methods to fulfil the criteria.

Chapter 5 - Empirical Data and Findings is a section that aims to describe the collected empirical data which includes the results from interviews and archival documents. Furthermore, to reveal the findings from the data, the views of the stakeholders are compared and contrasted with particular emphasis on the perception revealed to look for relationships, trends, and significant findings.

Chapter 6 - Discussions with the purpose to further explain the findings revealed from the analysis by comparing and contrasting the findings with relevant literature. The discussions are organised according to theories from which we base the thesis i.e. cross sector social partnerships, stakeholder management, and project management.

Chapter 7 - Conclusion that presents the updated propositions and summarises the answer to the research question along with the managerial and theoretical implications of the research results. In addition, the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis are also presented as well as the areas for further research in the field of cross sector social partnerships.
CHAPTER 2 RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY

2.1. Critical Realism as The Research Philosophy

We assess the objective social realities from the perceptions of the participant stakeholders by considering their interpretations of their reality, positioning ourselves as critical realists (see Figure 1) (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 110). The view about the reality of the key stakeholders participating in the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project was considered as objective because they were actively involved in the situation under study. Moreover, we adhere to the selected theory, which brings in an objectivist stance to the study in order to be able to understand the social motivations behind cross sector social partnerships and project success. Also, the objective reality of the societal issues such as recycling and environmental protection is recognised as a result of the nature of the project under study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Realism</th>
<th>Interpretivism</th>
<th>Pragmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontology: the researcher's view of the nature of reality or being</td>
<td>Is objective. Exists independently of human thoughts and beliefs or knowledge of their existence (realist), but is interpreted through social conditioning (critical realist)</td>
<td>Socially constructed, subjective, may change, multiple</td>
<td>External, multiple, view chosen to best enable answering of research question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External, objective and independent of social actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology: the researcher's view regarding what constitutes acceptable knowledge</td>
<td>Only observable phenomena can provide credible data, facts.</td>
<td>Subjective meanings and social phenomena. Focus upon the details of situation, a reality behind those details, subjective meanings motivating actions</td>
<td>Either or both observable phenomena and subjective meanings can provide acceptable knowledge dependent upon the research question. Focus on practical applied research, integrating different perspectives to help interpret the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only observable phenomena can provide credible data, facts.</td>
<td>Insufficient data means inaccuracies in sensations (direct realism). Alternatively, phenomena create sensations which are open to misinterpretation (critical realism). Focus on explaining within a context or contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Research Philosophies
Source: Saunders et al. (1999, p. 119)

Critical realism extends our perspective of the reflexive and critical analysis by allowing us to acknowledge multiple explanations and methods (Hodgkinson & Starkey, 2012, p. 607; Seth & Thomas, 1994, pp. 183, 184). We are setting a personal reference on the examined situation by being social actors (Morgan & Smircich, 1980, p.493; Saunders et al., 2009, p.116) while trying to expand on a particular matter through interviews (Coviello & Jones, 2004, pp. 498-500; Hyde, 2000, p. 84). We contribute to the literature by acknowledging the

2.2. Approach

In this thesis, we are guided by pre-existing theories from the fields of cross sector social partnerships, project management, and stakeholder management. We aim to examine the case under these theories and determine whether the theories apply to the studied case or not. For these reasons, we have agreed to approach the research mainly with deductive reasoning. Noting that the use of hypothesis in the deductive approach is typical (Hyde, 2000, p. 85), as Hyde (2000, p. 85) and Yin (2009, p. 27) suggest, instead we developed propositions to guide us in examining the case since we employ the qualitative method. Another important consideration is the argument that states that the deductive approach is consistent with the critical realism stance (Hyde, 2000, p. 82), which is our choice of research philosophy.

However, it is also important to note that during our research, we may need to approach the case with inductive reasoning. As several authors (Edmondson & Mcmanus, 2007, p. 1173; Hyde, 2000, p. 83) argue, the reasoning process in research is rarely straight and often involves both inductive and deductive reasoning. This can happen, for instance, when we examine the case using the pre-existing theories, we may discover new findings that do not resemble the theories and therefore we could apply the inductive approach in order to refine the theories (Hyde, 2000, p. 85).

2.3. Theory Selection and Criteria

The theoretical frame of reference in this thesis entails theories rooted in cross sector social partnerships, project management and stakeholder management. These theories aim to provide a solid ground to address the case study while highlighting academic debates and contributing to the literature in the field where these three theories are combined (see Figure 2). A considerable amount of information used in this thesis has been gathered from scientific articles, books and previously reviewed literature during the Master of Science in Strategic Project Management (European). Nevertheless, search results were narrowed. In addition to this method, relevant articles to this study have been reviewed to use theories that are appropriate to the situation of our case study.

Figure 2. Key Theories’ Selection and Areas of Contribution
Source: Developed by Authors
Previous research has revealed that the consideration of different theories in research provides a systemic view through the use of theoretical pluralism (Coviello & Jones, 2004, p. 497; Seth & Thomas, 1994, pp. 187, 188). Hence, we have decided to combine general project management theories on the topics of project success and stakeholders and not only theory centred on cross sector social partnerships to set a common ground for the analysis of the case study. Subsequently, this thesis is vastly focused on analysing the perceptions of different stakeholders based on a project management context. Moreover, the theory is constantly linked to literature in the field of sustainable development due to the nature of the case study under research.

2.3.1. Theory Criteria

The search of the articles was conducted using the search engines accessible at Umeå University library resources, mainly JSTOR, EBSCO HOST, E-Journals and magazines, trying to get articles from different journals in order to diversify the literature review. The results of this search included the International Journal of Project Management, Project Management Journal, Journal of Business Ethics, The Academy of Management Review and The Magazine of Corporate Responsibility as a non-academic source. The search results of articles considered both recent and older articles to analyse the trend in the topics. Moreover, the Boolean logic was also used to find articles that contain a specific set of words such as ‘cross sector partnership’, ‘project success’, ‘social partnership’, and ‘stakeholders’. In addition to this method, articles that have been cited in other articles were also considered. This scrutinising approach provided outcomes related to the research context without disregarding general aspects that may be relevant (Ghosal, 2005, p. 77). For instance, articles that were too specific in certain industries and contexts were excluded from the research because the aim of this study is to gain an insight to the research question from a general perspective that can be pertinent to diverse situations. Hence, an important consideration is that the research was focused on finding theoretical studies that were conducted in a varied context. This was achieved by inspecting articles that are directly connected to sustainable development projects and general project success theories in order to increase the possibility of using theories that can be applicable to other contexts. However, the fact that we decided to adhere to the term cross sector social partnerships enabled us to narrow our research to the social context of projects.

2.4. Method

In general, research data can be classified as quantitative and qualitative (Morgan & Smircich, 1980, p. 493). Recalling that we intend to detect and distinguish the different meanings of stakeholders on project success, we analyse the replies of the interviewees and the reality of the case study based on our pre understanding of the theoretical frame of reference (Edmonson & McManus, 2007, p. 1174). Thus, our influence extends to the descriptions provided by the interviewees.

Given the nature of the research question and following our research philosophical stand, we decided to gather qualitative data. It has been claimed that qualitative research is associated with our proposed critical realist stand (Collier et al., 2004, pp. 227, 228; Morgan & Smircich, 1980, pp. 491, 499). A number of studies have found that the need for qualitative methods is increasing in social sciences (Long et al., 2000, p. 194; Morgan & Smircich, 1980, p. 491).
Qualitative research is highly descriptive and primarily focuses on the social construction of reality and on revealing how extant theory operates in particular situations (Gephart, 2004, pp. 454-455; Long et al., 2000, p. 191). Yet, “the more ambiguous and elastic our concepts, the less possible it is to quantify our data in a meaningful way” (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 482). This is because the thoughts of the interviewees and the interconnections among them all are subject to our understanding (Long et al., 2000, p. 193). Hence, this approach stimulates the deep interpretation and observation of information (Hyde, 2000, p. 84; Morgan & Smircich, 1980, p. 491) and enables us to seize the reality of the case study by understanding the meanings that the interviewees put on the investigated phenomenon (Edmonson & McManus, p. 1157; Long et al., 2000, p. 190). Likewise, much of the research delves in understanding the different perceptions of stakeholders by conducting interviews and reviewing archival documents (Eisehardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 28; Saunders et al., 2009, p. 480).
CHAPTE 3 LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1. Cross Sector Social Partnerships

3.1.1. Background of Cross Sector Social Partnerships

As business becomes more dynamic, recent literature emphasises that to excel, organisations are currently incorporating social responsibility and sustainability to their strategies and operating approach (Porter & Kramer, 2006, p. 84). This process is challenging, particularly when these concepts are not embedded in the business of the organisations. However, when effectively managed, it will generate value while engaging the society as a whole (Freeman & Moutchnik, 2013, p. 6; Porter & Kramer, 2006, pp. 83-84). This has led to changes on how organisations organise themselves to overcome social problems and cross sector partnerships are increasingly recognised as key drivers.

Business and public non-profit sector organisations have been traditionally seen as being adversaries due to their differences (LeBer & Branzoi, 2010, p. 165; Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 851; Waddock, 1991, p. 508) and complexity (Kanter, 1999, p. 126). This thought is underestimated, and an attempt has been made to step up efforts. In this respect, social partnerships (Waddock, 1991, p. 481) and cross sector partnerships (Seitanidi & Crane, 2009; Seitanidi & Lindgreen, 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 850) are becoming more acknowledged. In order to be consistent throughout this study and aligned with the nature of the case study under analysis, the term cross sector social partnership will be adopted. Furthermore, it has been claimed that when different sectors engage in a particular issue they are motivated by different goals (Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 416; Seitanidi et al., 2010, p. 142; Selsky & Parker, 2005, pp. 850-851) thus this fosters knowledge and a better understanding of the common issue (Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 851; Selsky & Parker, 2010, p. 21). Cross sector social partnerships are a new way of working and they embody a goal to address societal issues (Hutchins & Sutherland, 2008; Seitanidi & Crane, 2008; Seitanidi & Lindgreen, 2011; Waddock, 1991). It is by this interactive relationship that organisations are able to enrich the organisations’ project results, long-term competitive advantage (Porter & Kramer, 2006) and value creation (LeBer & Branzoi, 2010).

Cross sector social partnerships, also known as public-private partnerships, consist of organisations from diverse sectors collaborating together to attain a common goal (Waddock, 1991 p. 481) and to deliver a social change in an effective way (Seitanidi et al., 2010, p. 156; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 413). The concept has been developing, according to Selsky and Parker (2005, p. 850) it is vital to build a project foundation to undertake social issues and causes in cross sector partnerships. This allows the different organisations to be more flexible and respond rapidly to changes while working in pursuit of their individual and common goals. Moreover, these partnerships are cross-functional and there is a need to recognise the motivating forces that drive each party to work across sectors. It is worthy to mention that for the purpose of this research the concept of motivation denotes “the reasons behind the actions of organisations that resulted in the initiation of interactions that led ultimately to the partnership formation” (Seitanidi et al., 2010, p. 147).
In an uncertain business environment, planning and defining the motivations of each organisation in the partnership is an important part of the formation process to outline the relationship and accomplish the desired objectives. Seitanidi et al. (2010, p. 143) highlight that conducting and analysing the different motives provides organisations with a diagnostic of the partnership potential. Similarly, each partner should be able to understand the reasons of the other partner in collaborating in a partnership. This means that the partners should not only create social value, but value for all the involved partners as a consequence of converging (LeBer & Branzei, 2010). Decisions should prove beneficial to the involved partners and not to either of them at the expense of the other. In doing so, the responsiveness to the needs of each of the partners will be simplified. Hence, Seitanidi et al. (2010, pp. 147-152) suggest a framework to address the motives of each organisation at an early stage of the partnership formation. Understandably, from a management perspective, the setting out of motives is seen as favourable for the success of the partnership. The framework seeks to identify “(a) the extent to which a long-term relationship is possible, (b) the scope of benefits for the participating organisations and (c) the potential to lead to organisational and social change” (Seitanidi et al., 2010, p. 152). The framework outlines three categories for the motives: instrumental, idealistic which can be mission-led or organisational-led, and intrinsic (Seitanidi et al., 2010, p. 147). The instrumental motives are considered to be guided by the desire of organisations to enhance their reputation and take the partnership interaction to a networking level by being able to acquire future partners (Seitanidi et al., 2010, p. 147). In contrast to instrumental motives, idealistic and intrinsic motives are often attributed to non-profit organisations and are more related to the development of the societal beliefs and strategy and with the nature of the non-profit organisations respectively (Seitanidi et al., 2010, p. 149).

3.1.2. Motivation Behind Cross Sector Social Partnerships

3.1.2.1. Resources Dependency Theory

Resources dependency theory is key in the analysis of primary motivations. This theory emphasises that organisations cooperate with each other when they strive to acquire resources (financial or non-financial) and delineates how organisations should contribute resources towards a social issue (McDonald & Young, 2012; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009; Selsky & Parker, 2005; Waddock, 1991). Building on the resources of each partner fosters a more effective use of capabilities. Waddock (1991, p. 487) explains that the nature and scope of the addressed problem and a complex environment stimulates external resource, power and strategic interdependence that motivates organisations to interact with others. The author also points out that organisations rely on cross sector social partnerships to commit their specialised capabilities towards a common partnership purpose while seeking competitive advantage (McDonald & Young, 2012, p. 56; Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 851). Thus, partners distinguish their contributions and realise that they are unique and cannot be substituted by the other partner (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 128; McDonald & Young, 2012, p. 56; Waddock, 1991, p. 495). For instance, in view of the business world complexity, non-profit organisations (NPOs) might not be capable of solving issues due to the lack of financial resources. Likewise, businesses might lack the appropriate motivation to engage in social concerns since their nature is more oriented towards the generation of profit and corporate image (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 132; Porter & Kramer, 2006, p. 5). Owing to the dissimilarities and limitations among partners, cross sector partnerships call for resource dependency. It is by
uniting resources from different sectors, that social partnerships empower partners to exploit each other’s assets for individual and shared benefit such as gaining expertise (McDonald & Young, 2012, p. 55), social respect, and reputation (Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 858). As a result, resource dependency is directly correlated to reciprocity (Waddock, 1991, p. 495). This means that organisations commit resources in exchange of the attainment of the expected benefits behind the motivation of each partner.

3.1.2.2. Social Cause Theory

Cross sector social partnerships are often related to the addressing of social issues. The social cause theory ascertains that organisations join other organisations to support a mutual social cause (Waddock, 1991; Seitanidi et al., 2010; Selsky & Parker, 2005, 2010). The implications for this theory are attributed to the existence of a potential social problem or an external need directly or indirectly affecting society (Waddock, 1991, pp. 499-502) which cannot be simply solved by one sector. This sort of motivation persuades mutual aid among diverse organisations with the potential of societal well-being. Moreover, Waddock (1991, p. 486) warns that cross sector social partnerships have a tendency to be voluntary. Although, strategically speaking, from a business perspective, attention to societal issues has not been entirely voluntary (Porter & Kramer, 2006, p. 5). Owing to unacceptable practices, businesses have been forced by external pressures such as major financial risks and poor company’s image, to be vigilant and active in social issues. Controversially, literature reveals that social issues should be dealt with interests beyond the monetary (Waddock, 1988, cited in Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 413). However, the main foundation that should steer a sustainable development initiative “is whether it presents an opportunity to create shared value –that is, a meaningful benefit for society that is also valuable to business” (Porter & Kramer, 2006, p. 11). Yet, even from different theoretical standpoints, social partnerships are considered a social investment. In this sense, the social cause theory is in line with reciprocity (Waddock, 1991, p. 495), if a social cause is solved and addressed by a cross sector partnership, the partners will more likely have specific benefits in return.

3.1.3. Characteristics of Cross Sector Social Partnerships

After analysing the motivations that drive the creation of social partnerships, it is necessary to further study the characteristics that describe the nature of social partnerships. This will enable us to understand the fundamentals of what constitutes them. The literature explores several essential factors in social partnerships and there is still a lack of a common guideline. Hence, it was decided to explore the characteristics of social partnerships presented by Waddock (1991) and Wilson (2006) to build the basis for this research.

Collaborative action

Recalling that organisations from diverse sectors act together to attain collective goals (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 127; McDonald & Young, 2012, p. 55; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 413; Waddock, 1991, p. 481), remarkably, they can also underpin the formation of a ‘system of stakeholders’ (Wilson et al., 2010, p. 78) to deal with “the messes” or problems as Waddock (1991, p. 482) describes them. Usually the collaboration has a tendency to be voluntary with a particular interest of working with different sector organisations to do societal good (Waddock, 1991, pp. 481, 483). Hence, the idea of ‘social problem solving networks’ may evolve (Waddock, 1991, p. 482). Though, the accomplishment of the own
purposes of the partners needs to be fulfilled as well. Therefore, it needs to be emphasised that only when the involved organisations are fully committed to the partnership, value will be added as a result of sharing common values (Waddock, 1991, p. 483). This is because organisations affect each other and this sense of interconnection can increase the competitive advantage of the involved organisations.

**Deal with indivisible problems**

Literature underlines that cross sector social partnerships form dynamic systems with their internal and external environments. Consequently, it is expected that complexity arises since different organisations are relating with each other representing a common motif however, they are interrelating their single purposes, providing a ‘social action system’, ‘problem solving network’ or ‘system of stakeholders’ (Waddock, 1991, p. 481; Wilson et al., 2010, p. 78). In fact, one of the major requirements for the establishment of a cross sector social partnership is the presence of a problem that cannot be separated and solved by a single organisation (Waddock, 1991, pp. 481, 486). Moreover, literature emphasises that cross sector social partnerships focus on dealing with ‘indivisible’ problems, ‘metaproblems’ or ‘mega-projects’ (Waddock, 1991, p. 481; Wilson et al., 2010, p. 78). This is because the nature of the problems in cross sector social partnerships tends to be chaotic and not clearly defined (Waddock, 1991, p. 482). Along with this idea, one of the distinguishing factors is the large scale of their project scope which brings up longer time for implementation and the need to assess the goals of stakeholders (Wilson et al., 2010, p. 78).

**Resource commitment**

It is by the collaborative relationships and by the structure of organisational interaction fostered by indivisible problems, that single organisations in social partnerships are able to integrate resources. Not only do social partnerships integrate financial resources, they might as well exchange competences and information as well as commit time and active participation (Waddock, 1991, p. 486). Furthermore, there is also a sense of power and responsibility sharing between the different partners to better cope with uncertainty (Waddock, 1991, p. 483). Nevertheless, for this to occur, there must be a resource commitment, beyond the monetary, from the involved partners (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 133; Waddock, 1991, p. 483).

**Existence of interdependence**

Owing to the commitment of resources, social partnerships often present an increased resource interdependence in order to manage uncertainty while achieving their objectives (Waddock, 1991, p. 484). Moreover, social partnerships embrace interdependence among all partners, not only through resources but also through power and strategy (Waddock, 1991, p. 483). The motivation behind the collaborative action is driven by the need to close the lack of resources breach. This interdependence enables social partnerships to propagate a variety of relationships, for example, contractual relationships (Wilson et al., 2010, p. 76).

**Held together by common goals and benefits**

Social partnerships focus on collectivism (Wilson et al., 2010, p. 76) even if they have contradictory goals. For instance, the simultaneous interaction of diverse interests, primarily characterised by different sectors, calls for the need to guide all the members towards common activities (Waddock, 1991, p. 483). This might limit the efforts of the members. However, a sense of belonging to the partnership emerges and thus common goals, values and benefits are defined to unify the partners (Waddock, 1991, pp. 482, 486). Waddock (1991, p.
Waddock (1991, p. 483) highlights that the common values bring together the partners by: forming a network, promoting congruent goals and providing benefits of interest to all participants. It is worthy to mention that members of the social partnership are aware of the need of having a common visualisation grounded in the common good that will be accomplished (Wilson et al., 2010, p. 84). Having a standardised vision enables the members to place special attention to the addressed problem. This common vision is usually developed to achieve a long-term impact in the social dimension, although, members are able to directly benefit from their own immediate goals (Waddock, 1991, p. 482).

Take place in the social or public policy agenda
Cross sector social partnerships are merely attributed to the social or public policy agenda in diverse fields such as economic and technological development and education, thus, a vital characteristic is their social purpose (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 127; Seitanidi et al, 2010, p. 239; Waddock, 1991, p. 483). It is due to the social purpose that collectivity arises as a consequence of the complexity and impact on diverse interest groups (Wilson et al., 2010, p. 76). However, not all the involved partners will have the same views from the agenda items as each of them has different motives (ibid).

Present far-reaching implications
The importance that social partnerships deserve has been recently highlighted in terms of the knowledge and innovation they generate (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 127; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 424; Selsky & Parker, 2010, p. 858; Wilson et al., 2010, p. 77). This particular characteristic implies that collaboration stimulates multi-sector innovations through new technologies (Wilson et al., 2010, p. 77). It is evident that social partnerships are viewed as a source of knowledge with the potential to create opportunities and develop skills to penetrate new markets.

3.2. Stakeholder Theory

3.2.1. Needs for Stakeholder Theory in Cross Sector Social Partnership Projects

When organisations participate in cross sector social partnership projects, they are faced with the challenges from higher complexities due to the increased interdependencies and the increased requirement for transparency (Andriof & Waddock 2002, p. 27). To deal with these challenges more effectively, there is a need to understand and engage all stakeholders (Andriof & Waddock 2002, p. 20; Parmar et al., 2010). Moreover, 21st century projects have been moving towards a more stakeholder focused approach, hence there is a need to evaluate project success from the viewpoints of stakeholders rather than from the viewpoints of the traditional project measures of cost, time, and scope (Davis, 2013, p. 5). As El-Gohary et al. (2006) and Achterkamp & Vos (2008) argue, many projects have failed because of poor stakeholder management such as poor identification of the stakeholders, misunderstanding of the stakeholder roles (Achterkamp & Vos, 2008, p. 749), and misalignment of the perception of the stakeholders about project success (Davis, 2007, p. 1). The literature provides evidence in support for this argument. For instance, El-Gohary et al. (2006) conducted a research on public-private partnership projects. They point out that oppositions from stakeholders have caused many projects to be halted unexpectedly (El-Gohary et al., 2006, p. 596). Another example is the literature from Fowler and Walsh (1992) who analyse the perception of
stakeholders towards the success of a change project. They validate that despite a common understanding from stakeholders on the rationale of a project (or the why) is achieved, a project can still fail when the stakeholders do not have a common understanding on the project success criteria (or the what) (Fowler & Walsh, 1992, p. 3). This implies that stakeholder management is multifaceted and is more than just having communication among the stakeholders (Rose, 2013, p. 3).

From the above analysis and evidence, it can be inferred that effective stakeholder management is one of the imperatives to deliver successful cross sector social partnership projects (Achterkamp & Vos, 2008, p. 751; Davis, 2013, p. 1; El-Gohary et al., 2006, p. 604). Consequently, organisations participating in cross sector social partnerships need to focus their attention not only on the transactions among stakeholders but also on the relationships among them (Freeman & Moutchnik, 2013, p. 6; Parmar et al. 2010, p. 405; Andriof & Waddock, 2002, p. 20).

### 3.2.2. Applications of Stakeholder Theory in Cross Sector Social Partnership Projects

Before discussing the applications of the stakeholder theory in the field of cross sector social partnerships, we need to first understand the overarching goal of the stakeholder theory. The core of the theory, aims to integrate the value creation concept with the moral obligations of an organisation (Freeman 2013, Parmar et al., 2010). The main driver behind this goal is the assumption that the separation of value creation with the moral endeavour of an organisation is problematic, which can create more problems than benefits (Freeman, et al., 2007; Parmar et al., 2010, Freeman & Moutchnik, 2013, Porter & Kramer, 2009). There is no doubt that when organisations create, deliver, and capture values, they bring benefits to the society such as an industrial revolution, consumerism, and globalisation (Freeman, et al., 2007, p. 303). However, if the organisations separate this value creation process from morality, they can create problems that outweigh the benefits (Freeman et al., 2007; Porter & Kramer, 2009). As Porter and Kramer (2009, p. 80) argue, when organisations treat value creation in isolation to the morality, they tend to see moral endeavours as a cost that needs to be minimised instead of as an opportunity to increase organisational competitiveness. This drives the business practices into a zero-sum game between achieving economic success and delivering benefits to the society (ibid), which then creates significant problems to the life of millions of people. Some of the problems are the increased inequality between the rich and the poor, the environmental damages, global warming, and the global financial crisis (Freeman et al., 2007, p. 303). Therefore, the stakeholder theory is introduced to address these problems. Organisations will be able to pursue value creation in a sustainable manner and at the same time deliver benefits to the society by integrating the value creation concept with the moral endeavour (Freeman et al., 2007, p. 301).

This theory has been applied in several disciplines such as strategic management, finance, accounting, and marketing (Parmar et al., 2010). Particularly in the field of cross sector social partnerships, the applications of the concept can be approached from three different disciplines. The first is from the business ethics discipline where the stakeholder theory is used to evaluate the purpose of an organisation and to identify to whom the organisation is responsible of (Parmar et al., 2010, p. 409). Then, from the sustainable development discipline, as Parmar et al. (2010, p. 412) point out, the stakeholder theory can be used to evaluate the obligations of an organisation seen from three perspectives: economic, social,
and environment. Lastly, from the project management discipline, the stakeholder theory is used to define the project context, such as the environment and social context, and to evaluate project success (Littau et al., 2010, p. 7; Parmar et al., 2010, p. 428).

Particularly in the project management field, which is the focus of this thesis, practitioners and academic professionals have increasingly focused their attention on the uses of the stakeholder theory, which implies the significance of the theory for project delivery (Achterkamp & Vos, 2008, p. 750; Davis, 2013, p. 5; Littau et al., 2010, p. 1; Rose, 2013, p. 3). Project management professionals have recognized that engaging stakeholders to achieve project success is more than merely communicating with them (Rose, 2013, p. 3). Furthermore, several authors (Achterkamp & Vos, 2008, p. 749; Davis, 2013, p. 6) researched about the uses of the stakeholder notion in project management literature and discovered that effective stakeholder management has been recognized as one of the key success factors of projects. They also point out that the application of the theory in the project management field is mostly dedicated to the concept of project success (ibid). However, despite being recognized as an important theory, research on the conceptualisation and the implementation of the theory in the project management field is lacking (Achterkamp & Vos, 2008, p. 750).

3.2.3. Nature of Stakeholders

The term of ‘stakeholder’ first appeared in 1963 in an internal memorandum in the Stanford Research Institute (Parmar et al., 2010, p. 405). However, it was not until 1984, which was marked as the ‘year of birth’ of the stakeholder theory (Littau et al., 2010, p. 1), that the concept was developed in a more detailed way (Andriof & Waddock 2002, p.29; Littau et al., 2010, p. 1). That time, it was Freeman who developed the theory (Andriof & Waddock 2002, p. 29; Littau et al., 2010, p. 1). Freeman (1984, p. 46) defines stakeholders as “any group or individuals who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organisation’s objectives”. A year after that, in 1985 Cleland published another definition of stakeholders, which has also become one of the key definitions used in various academic literature particularly in project management literature (Littau et al., 2010, p. 6). Cleland defines stakeholder as an individual or organisation “who have a vested interest in the outcome of the project”. (Cleland, 1985 cited in Littau et al., 2010, p. 6). Since then, there has been abundant literature on the definition of stakeholder; however, the definitions were not applied consistently (Andriof & Waddock 2002, p. 30). Despite this criticism, there is one thing in common, the application and the development of new definitions which were mostly built on the definitions from Freeman and Cleland (Littau et al., 2010, p. 6).

Since cross sector social partnerships can also be seen as projects (Peters, 1999; Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 850), it is important to discuss the stakeholder definition from a project management perspective. In the project management practice, the term of ‘stakeholder’ is often used interchangeably with the terms of ‘key player’, ‘major participant’, and ‘project environment’ (Littau et al., 2010, p. 3). The PMBOK® (2013, p. 30) defines it as an “individual, group, or organisation who may affect, be affected by, or perceive itself to be affected by a decision, activity, or outcome of a project”. This definition is very similar to Freeman’s (1984) definition. Furthermore, the PMBOK® (2013, p. 30) also adopts Cleland’s (Littau et al., 2010, p.6) definition when it mentions that stakeholders can also be those who have interests on the project. Considering that the PMBOK® adopts the two most widely accepted definitions of stakeholder (ibid) and that this definition has been used as a standard
3.2.4. Identification of Stakeholders

The stakeholder identification process aims to understand the individuals and/or groups who, either negatively or positively, impact or will be impacted by the project (PMBOK®, 2013, p. 391). There are many different ways to perform this process. The PMBOK® (2013, p. 393), for example, suggests to first analyse the project business case, the organisation process, and the environment in which the project is delivered. However, the process should not be stopped there. It must be followed with assessments of the stakeholders’ impact and interest levels towards the project (PMBOK®, 2013, p. 392). The project team then uses this information to prioritise on which stakeholders they should focus their attentions on and what appropriate action plans are required to best manage them in order to achieve project success. One of the ways to perform this is by using the framework presented by Johnson et al. (2011). They suggest to map the stakeholders using two dimensions of power and interest (p. 142) as depicted in Figure 3. In fact, this is the model that the PMBOK® (2013) uses as a main example about how to identify stakeholders (p. 395). By mapping the interest levels of stakeholders, the project team will be able to understand the expectation of the stakeholders towards the project goals (Johnson et al., 2011, p. 142). For instance, a higher interest level implies a higher expectation imposed by the stakeholders towards project success. Furthermore, by mapping the power level, the project team will understand the level of influence that a stakeholder can have on the project (ibid). In other words, a higher power level implies a higher influence of the stakeholders. Using this framework, the stakeholders are classified into four groups, which are ‘key players’, ‘keep satisfied’, ‘keep informed’, and ‘minimal effort’ (PMBOK®, 2013, p. 397; Johnson et al., 2009, p. 142). The group names imply the type of action plans required for each stakeholder group.

Another framework for classifying stakeholders is provided by Turner (2006), who is one of the most cited authors in the field of project management (Davis, 2013, p. 3). Turner (2006, p. 189) classifies project stakeholder groups into seven groups depicted in Table 1. However, in practice, as Achterkamp and Vos (2008, p. 751) point out, the process of applying this
concept is not straightforward or easy to achieve. This is because the process needs to be adapted to the situation in which the project is delivered (Achterkamp & Vos, 2008, p. 750) while on the other hand each project has a unique attribute (PMBOK®, 2013, p. 2). Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the PMBOK® (2013, p. 32), unlike Turner (2006), does not provide an exhaustive list of stakeholder groups, instead, it only provides examples such as ‘project sponsor’, ‘customer’, and ‘user’ which are open for further elaboration by the users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Provides the resources to buy the asset and derives the benefits from its operation”</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Operates the asset on the owner’s behalf”</td>
<td>User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Channels the resources to the project on the owner’s behalf”</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Is assigned to the project and will do the work to deliver the asset”</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Works with the owner and the sponsor to define the required outcome of the project, and the output which will achieve that”</td>
<td>Broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Works with the broker to identify the means of obtaining the output, the work and the resources required”</td>
<td>Steward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Manages the temporary organisation to ensure that the right work is done to deliver the defined output, and to monitor and control progress”</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Project Stakeholder Classification
Source: Adapted by Authors from Turner (2006, p. 189)

In the field of cross sector social partnerships, Wilson et al. (2010, p. 80) suggest to use two categorisation frameworks of primary stakeholders and secondary stakeholders. Primary stakeholders are the individuals or organisations that must collaborate in order to deliver the project outcome (Wilson et al., 2010, p. 80), or the individuals or organisations whose participations are essential to the success of the project (Clarkson 1995, p. 106). For instance, in the project management field, as Achterkamp & Vos (2008, p. 753) argue, the stakeholder groups in Turner’s framework are primary stakeholders because their participation is essential for the achievement of project success. Then, secondary stakeholders are the individuals or organisations that are not involved directly in the project yet they can affect or be affected by the outcome of the project (Clarkson, 1995, p. 107; Wilson et al., 2010, p. 80).

For this thesis, we will not fully adopt a particular stakeholder identification framework, instead we will use the available frameworks to understand and analyse the empirical data that we collect. It may mean that we need to combine several frameworks from the project management field such as the one from the PMBOK® (2013) and Turner (2006) with the framework from the field of cross sector social partnerships from Wilson, et al. (2010). This can be done for several reasons. First, by adopting Turner’s framework, the analysis of the primary stakeholders can be done at a more micro level (Achterkamp & Vos, 2008, p. 753). However, since Turner’s framework does not take into account the secondary stakeholders (ibid), it is reasonable to combine it with the framework from Wilson, et al. (2010) in order to ensure that the secondary stakeholders are not missed. An example from the combined frameworks is displayed in Figure 4.
3.3. Project Success

3.3.1. Nature of Projects

To better address cross sector social partnerships, a relationship between them and projects is being sought. It is argued that ideally, cross sector social partnerships are delivered through projects (Peters, 1999; Selsky & Parker, 2005). Under this circumstance, the concept of project needs to be introduced. Several definitions have been made on the concept, however this thesis will focus on the definition provided by the PMBOK®. A project is considered to be “a temporary endeavour undertaken to create a unique product, service, or result” (PMBOK®, 2013, p. 3). This definition also emphasises that projects can involve multiple organisations and in addition, have long-lasting social impacts. Within this definition, a project is considered a ‘temporary organisation’ influenced by internal and external systems (Haniff & Fernie, 2008, p. 2). With this in mind, Selsky and Parker (2005) recognise that cross sector projects may be short or long-term oriented. They argue that short term cross sector projects tend to be constrained by an individualistic motivation. On the contrary, long-term cross sector projects seek a common interest and are more prone to carry out a flexible relationship. In this case, cross sector social partnerships can be considered as projects organised in a unique way to undertake a specific issue with multiple individuals and predetermined resources. Moreover, the outcomes of a project create enduring benefits and generate change. Likewise, cross sector social partnerships will create a result expected to outlive the partnership and also, a stronger relationship might develop over time between the partners after the social partnership.

The current growth in the use of sound project tools and methods is reshaping the use of projects in organisations. This has been leading to a ‘projectification of society’ (Haniff & Fernie, 2008) in which projects are extensively used in organisations, particularly as means to fulfil strategy (Cicmil et al. 2006; Peters, 1999). Recent literature reveals an insistence to study the effects of aligning organisational strategy with project and sustainable development.
objectives (Porter & Kramer, 2006; Srivannaboon & Milosevic, 2006). As more and more organisations learn that projects are expected to carry out business objectives, the use of projects and project management procedures will only increase. Thus, social partnerships can be viewed as vital when seeking to implement social responsibility initiatives. This arguably influences the respective context of social partnerships that are mutually immersed on a unique cause that is susceptible to diverse expectations of the result. Central to this perspective, every project has unique characteristics and outcomes. Similarly, each organisation is unique and consequently, the use of robust approaches will depend on particular needs (Dietrich & Lehtonen, 2005).

3.3.2. Approaches to Project Management

To gain an additional insight of cross sector social partnerships in the context of projects and their uniqueness, there is a need to lay the foundations of project management. Much of the recent literature recognises project management as a crucial process. According to the PMBOK® (2013, p. 5) project management is “the application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to project activities to meet the project requirements”. Alternatively, Srivannaboon (2006) explores project management in terms of a specialised form of management used to complete objectives and activities within the pre-established time and cost. The core purpose of project management is thought to be to support the execution of the organisational strategy through projects while ensuring the accomplishment of the results (Srivannaboon & Milosevic, 2006). Moreover, project management can also be seen from two different perspectives, the process domain and the performance domain, focusing on project objectives and performance goals, respectively (Toor & Ogunlana, 2008, p. 428). This standpoint covers the whole process to deliver project management through the different project stages, and proves beneficial to organisations as it relies on a meaningful understanding of projects. In the same way, project management can create value by impacting several factors that drive the success and performance of organisations positively (Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 27). In this thesis, we use the project strategy framework from Patanakul and Shenhar (2012) in order to understand the linkage between what needs to be done in a cross sector social partnership project and in the project plan. It is comprised of three main elements: the drivers of the project, what to deliver, and how to do it (Patanakul & Shenhar, 2012, p. 5). This framework is summarised in Figure 5.
Moreover, this framework will be of use when seeking to link cross sector social partnerships and project management. The fact is, the predominant approaches to cross sector social partnerships are usually isolated from project management. If instead, organisations use the foundations of project management to cultivate their partnerships across sectors, cross sector social partnerships can boost the partners’ opportunities and competitive advantage. In effect, the use of project management has gained significant importance in transferring strategic objectives to projects and in the improvement of the project selection process (Archer & Chasemzadeh, 2007; Englund & Graham, 1999; Srivannaboon, 2006). Likewise, project and partner selection in cross sector social partnerships is vital when seeking to successfully develop organisational needs (Walters & Anagnostopoulos, 2012, p. 423). Instead of working towards a social cause by impulses or as a reaction to an external pressure, organisations should seek the best effect of social opportunities based on their knowledge (Porter & Kramer, 2006). This understanding and learning process is valued as a type of project success (Müller & Jugdev, 2012).

3.3.3. Evolution of Project Success

Project success arose as a way to achieve competitiveness in the current business world. Equally important, the urge to understand the context of project success within a cross sector social partnership has risen. Nevertheless sustainable development is an emergent topic (DeBakker et al., 2005; Walsh et al., 2003) and little is known about its success criteria (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 141). Thus, there is a lack of agreement on the topic because success requirements are constantly evolving. In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in the transition of tactical project management to strategic project management (Jugdev & Müller, 2005; Shenhar et al., 2001). Central to the transition of project management is the idea of trying to sync the project objectives with the organisational strategy. This conveys the thought that project management should go beyond the traditional concept of project success based on cost, time, and scope (Atkinson, 1999; Müller & Jugdev, 2012, pp. 23-24; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 699; Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, p. 10). As a result,
traditional project management claims have been challenged arguing that there is no standard framework for assessing project success from a multi-dimensional perspective (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 701). It was this thought what recently led to developing the idea that strategy alignment with project objectives enriches the performance of an organisation by allowing projects to develop the business strategy (Srivannaboon & Milosevic, 2006).

The success of projects is still dependent on individuals’ perspectives and on the role and context of all projects and organisations (Freeman & Beale, 1992, p. 8, Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 23). Even though standards or frameworks have been set, the view on project success remains subjective (Shenhar et al., 1997). For this thesis, the analysis of project success aims to lead to the recognition of the interconnections between the perspectives of different authors. This will be used to acknowledge and confront diverse ideas.

It is necessary to set the foundations of a definition for success. Success involves “meeting or exceeding expectations and goals” (Dietrich & Lehtonen, 2005, p. 387). The traditional approach to project success is based on cost, time and scope only (Freeman & Beale, 1992, p. 10; Müller & Jugdev, 2012, pp. 23-24). However, Atkinson (1999) identified that measuring success with the iron triangle will not provide reasonable assessment. Furthermore, Shenhar et al. (2001) claim that project success is not only concerned with cost, time and scope constraints, instead it is a multidimensional concept. Cooke-Davies (2002, p. 185) views project success in terms of the “criteria” that will determine the success and the “factors” that will ensure the success of a project. In like manner, Shenhar et al. (2001) proved that there are several factors that contribute to the successful achievement of an organisation. They viewed the success of projects with a multidimensional approach in terms of success dimensions and measures. These dimensions are: project efficiency, impact on customer, business success and preparation for the future (Shenhar et al., 1997; Shenhar et al., 2001). Likewise, Artto and Dietrich (2007, p. 8) examined the success of projects based on four domains:

- “Technical performance, project functionality, client satisfaction, and technical and financial performance of the deliverable for the sponsor/customer”
- “Project management: on budget, on schedule, and on technical specification”
- “Suppliers/commercial performance: commercial benefit for the project service providers”
- “The learning that project stakeholders acquire”

This thesis will be focused on the modern approach to project success and not on cost, time and scope. For instance, a common trend was found with the general project management theory based on strategic alignment and project success (Srivannaboon & Milosevic, 2006). Among the challenges when seeking alignment is the definition of project objectives (Artto & Dietrich, 2007, p. 17). This results in a lack of clarity of the purpose of tasks. Consequently, project teams tend to focus only on time, cost and quality constraints without considering the impact their tasks have on the overall strategy of the organisation (Cleland, 2007). Therefore, literature suggests that organisations need to be familiar with their responsibilities in order to be able to transpose strategy to the project teams (Morris & Jamieson, 2005). Moreover, several authors have attempted to view the success of sustainable development projects with a strategic approach (Maingnan et al., 2005; Maon et al., 2009, p. 78; Porter & Kramer, 2002; Porter & Kramer, 2006; Sangle, 2010; Venugopal, 2011). Previous research suggests that within the modern business world, a social responsible project is considered successful and
capable of creating competitive advantage based on its connection to the business strategy (Porter & Kramer, 2006; Venugopal, 2011).

Social partnerships as well as projects, are part of a system hence, they have an impact on other projects and the organisation as a whole (Carroll, 1979). As a consequence, literature reveals that project success is to be valued in terms of the financial performance and stakeholders’ response and management it has on the organisation’s strategy (Maon et al., 2009, p. 79; Sangle, 2010, p. 210; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 701). However, these views support the idea that strategy alignment needs to be reinforced from the project objectives to the organisational strategy, not only from top executive management to project management (Haniff & Fernie, 2008, p. 8) to motivate and promote the commitment to sustainable development projects (Maon et al., 2009, p. 79). Nevertheless, success criteria and requirements vary from one organisation to the other and even from project to project. This is because a project might develop in a complex external environment where more than one strategy has to be aligned with the project objectives, such is the case of a partnership sustainable development project (Cummins, 2004, p. 91; Sangle, 2010, p. 210).

Some authors claim that the success of sustainable development projects is about balancing the diverse demands of communities without focusing much on the financial aspect (Gössling, & Vocht, 2007; Maon et al., 2009; Zadek, 2004). Yet Porter and Kramer (2002, p. 20) argue that the more an organisation donates to sustainable development projects, the more that it is expected from them. This idea is reinforced by the transparency concept presented by Snodgrass (2012) as a success factor. These authors along with Pomering and Dolnicar (2009) view sustainable development success as a form of advertising and building a company’s brand. This debate raises an interesting contradiction that will be further analysed in this study.

In this thesis, success will be viewed from the viewpoints of the selected stakeholders that were involved in the cross sector social partnership. Though success can also be viewed from the perspectives of the sponsor or project manager (Freeman & Beale, 1992, p. 13). It is clear from the reviewed literature that there are not many studies which examine the success of social responsibility projects by presenting a framework that could be used as a guide for organisations to attain success in social responsibility projects. It is worthy to mention that most of the literatures (Carroll, 1979, Cramer et al., 2004, DeBakker et al., 2005, Pomering & Dolnicar, 2009; Walsh et al., 2003) refer to general aspects of sustainable projects and the origins of sustainable development and not the success criteria of sustainable development projects. This might be because sustainable development is just starting to draw attention from practitioners and industry to further analyse its impact in organisations. There remains a need in the literature for a rather flexible and general approach to success measurement in social responsibility projects.

### 3.3.4. Project Success Measurement

The PMBOK® (2013, p. 35) stresses that project success should be measured “in terms of completing the project within the constraints of scope, time, cost, resources, and risk as approved between the project managers and senior management”. Other authors claim that there is a gap between the project and the product or service value, and this prevents project success to be measured (Jugdev & Müller, 2005, p. 20). Correspondingly, Artto and Dietrich (2007, p. 8) propose that the “evaluation of success depends on the stakeholder and its
perspective on the project”. Whereas several authors discuss project success measurement, it appears that the topic is still debatable in the literature. This raises difficulty, when an attempt is made to measure success in cross sector social partnerships. The urge to have standard success measures is evident, and is mainly attributed to the divergent perspectives from different stakeholders (Googins & Rochlin, 2000, p. 141; Hutchings & Sutherland, 2008; Smith, 2012).

In like manner, in their analysis of project success, Müller and Jugdev (2012) draw the attention to the measurement of success in terms of the values that projects create. They refer to the learning process that enables organisations to identify valuable information for future improvements (Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 27). They refer to the value created in terms of the efficiency and effectiveness that projects create after their delivery (Müller & Jugdev, 2012, pp. 21, 24). This also implies looking at the value from the perspective of the stakeholders and through three clusters that they identified in their study: meeting design goals, impact on the customer and benefits to the organisation (Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 26).

Recalling the five dimensions to approach project success (Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, p. 30) Figure 6 shows that they are all dependent on time. The dimension of ‘project efficiency’ refers to the completion of the project within the constraints of time, cost, and scope; ‘impact on customer’ assesses the functional and technical requirements related to the end customer or final result. ‘Business success’ considers the overall impact and improvement on the organisation as a whole based on measures of performance within time and quality; ‘impact on team’ recognises the team’s growth and learning; and finally, the ‘prepare for the future’ dimension refers to being able to prepare the organisation for future uncertainty and challenges (Shenhar et al., 1997; Shenhar et al., 2001; Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, p. 27).

![Figure 6. Five Dimensions of Project Success Criteria](source)

This model facilitates project success measurement at different stages of the project, in the short term, during the progress and in the long-term even after some achievements have been reached. Also, it provides a wider and strategic perspective by allowing project managers and project teams to concentrate on all business aspects (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 701). For
example, measuring project success by these five dimensions (Shenhar et al., 1997; Shenhar et al., 2001) highlights the fact that project teams focus on improving their organisational performance rather than being fully operational, in return, this will result in market opportunities, growth and added value (Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 20; Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 701).

A key aspect that will be analysed throughout this thesis is the perception of success and success assessment from the views of different stakeholders. The approach used to assess the case study consists of a combination of the presented theories.

3.4. Propositions Development

The theoretical frame of reference emphasises that the theory on cross sector social partnerships, project and stakeholder management is a strong foundation to manage the perceptions on success of different stakeholders in a social partnership. Therefore we have developed the propositions below to identify the representative theoretical areas to our study throughout the analysis.

Proposition 1:
The organisations that participate in a cross sector social partnership are motivated to involve in collaborative benefits and/or for a common interest in a social cause.

Proposition 2:
Time, cost, and scope are not the only project success measures but also the measures based on the benefits or the value the project delivers.

Proposition 3:
Project success is assessed at multiple points in time.

Proposition 4:
Project success measurement reflects the interests of various stakeholders.

Proposition 5
A common view of stakeholders on project success is required to achieve success.

These propositions will guide our analysis by outlining the scope of our arguments in answering the research question. Additionally, they delineate the context of our study through the examination of the selected theories in our case study.
CHAPTER 4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1. Case Study as The Research Strategy

This thesis aims to investigate how stakeholders in cross sector social partnerships measure and perceive success using a real life case. Considering our research question, the available resources, and our research philosophical standpoints, case study research is the strategy that best aids us in answering our research question and achieving our research goal. Following Yin’s definition regarding research strategy, case study research is:

“An empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real life context and when the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2009, p. 18)

From the above definition, it can be inferred that since case study research is concerned with real life phenomena, unlike experimentation, it does not deal with a controlled environment (Saunders, 2009, p. 146). The fact that the border between the investigated phenomenon and the context are not clear also implies that the meanings that are put on the phenomenon are inseparable from its context (Yin, 2009, p. 18). Furthermore, since case study research is an ‘empirical inquiry’, it requires verifiable observations instead of pure reasoning based only on theories. However, the empirical data is gathered from multiple sources (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 145) in order to allow a deeper understanding from multiple facets to occur (Yin, 2009, p. 18).

4.2. Motivations

This thesis aims to investigate a phenomenon in the field of cross sector social partnership projects and it deals with complex issues as the results of the increased interdependencies among the stakeholders (Andriof & Waddock 2002, p. 27). Through case study research, we are able to obtain a greater amount of descriptions pertaining the case being investigated (Eisehardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 25) and therefore this enables us to understand the social realities in depth and to better contribute to the literature (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 2).

Another consideration for pursuing case study research is the feasibility of achieving the research objectives within the available time frame (i.e. October 2013 – January 2014). There were not many samples available for us during the delivery period of this thesis. Even though the samples are limited, through case study research we can still conduct scientific works. This means that an opportunity to make a knowledge contribution is not missed and the results can be used for future scientific works for the advancement of knowledge in the field of cross sector social partnerships.

4.3. Case Study Design

Following Yin’s (2009, p. 27) framework of case study design, we employ five components:
Study Question
The thesis aims to answer how the stakeholders in cross sector social partnership projects perceive and assess project success.

Propositions
To guide our examination of the case, we developed five propositions based on theories drawn from the field of cross sector social partnerships, stakeholder management, and project management. The propositions are presented in Chapter 3 - Literature Review section 3.4. on Propositions Development.

Unit of Analysis
This thesis is based on a single case study from the project of Umeå Interactive Recycling Room with the main goal of discovering insights in regards to project success in the context of cross sector social partnerships. As Yin (2009, pp. 7-8) named it, this is identified as an ‘exploratory’ aim. In regards to the unit of analysis, there are two levels of analysis that will be applied. The project itself i.e. Umeå Interactive Recycling Room is the basic unit while the organisations that participated in delivering the project are the sub-units of analysis. Therefore, we classified the case as ‘embedded’ (Yin, 2009, p. 46). The summary of the classification of case studies is displayed in Figure 7.

![Figure 7. Types of Case Study Design](source: Yin (2009, p. 46))

It is also important to note the rationale behind choosing the single case study research. One of the rationales Yin (2009, p. 47) suggests is that the single case needs to be extreme or unique. We see the case in this thesis fits with this rationale. The Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project is a unique case because it comes from a tripartite cross sector partnership which involves stakeholders coming from all economic sectors i.e. government, non-profit organisations, and private organisations. The second rationale is that the case involved organisations from all economic sectors, meaning that the case contains complex situations as the result of the increased interactions among the organisations, i.e. five different
organisations, which in turn provide us with more ways to investigate the topics under investigation.

*Logic of Linking the Data to the Propositions and Criteria for Interpreting the Findings*

According to Yin (2009, p. 34), linking the data to the proposition and the criteria for interpreting findings are the least developed components in the case study design. However, they are considered important because they provide a foundation for the analysis (Yin, 2009, p. 33). To achieve this goal, we organised the evidence by putting it in an array of categories to explore the notions of who, what, how, when, and why that relates to the project success:

- Who – the stakeholders
- Why – the motivation behind the stakeholders’ participation in the partnership
- What – the project success criteria
- How – the means for assessing the success criteria
- When – the conducted success evaluation
- What – the perception on the overall success of the project

We incorporated this organisation of data to the templates where we can compare and contrast the views of the stakeholders. Furthermore, we interpreted the evidence from the theoretical framework perspective taking into account the propositions that guide us in deciding which areas need to be deeply examined.

### 4.4. Techniques

To gather data, two investigative tools were employed, the interview and archival documents.

**Interview**

There are three types of interviews i.e. structured interview, semi structured interview, and unstructured interview (Saunders et al., 2009, pp. 320-323). Their characteristics are displayed in Figure 8 below.
In line with the exploratory aim of the thesis, we chose to employ the ‘semi-structure interview’ because it provides us with opportunities to gather rich empirical data in a highly efficient manner (Eisehardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 28). Moreover, we are able to control the structure of the discussions without missing the detail information about the explored issues through a set of interview questions that are based on themes.

Archival documents
Since the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project has been closed in 2012, in our opinion, it is also important to study the archival documents of the project. This is because, as Saunders et al. (2009, p. 150) point out, the archival documents are also the ‘by product of the day to day activities and therefore part of the reality being studied’. Furthermore, by studying the archival documents, we provide opportunities to better understand the responses of the interviewees and to assess if there is any evolution on how the interviewees refer to the investigated topic. Some of the documents are in Swedish, therefore we used Google Translate to change the language.

4.5. Quality Criteria
Aligning with our case design, we applied the criteria from Yin (2009, p. 40) for assessing the quality of the thesis named ‘construct validity’, ‘external validity’, and ‘reliability’.

4.5.1. Construct validity
The construct validity criterion refers to whether or not the “operational measures for the concept being studied” are correctly applied (Yin, 2009, p. 40). The force behind this criterion is the argument that states that researchers can be subjective when interpreting findings (Eisehardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 25; Yin, 2013, p. 322). To meet this criterion, we applied the triangulation method where we analysed the case from multiple perspectives (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 146; Guion et al., 2011, p. 1) in two ways:

- **Investigator triangulation** refers to when more than one investigator from the same discipline analyses a case using the same method and then compares his/her findings with another investigator (Guion, 2011, p. 1). Since this thesis is done in pairs, we have the opportunity to perform investigator triangulation. We achieved this by doing the data collection process together, summarizing the evidence and then comparing our findings.

- **Data triangulation** refers to the method of using different sources of data (Guion, 2011, p. 1). In this thesis, this is achieved by collecting empirical data from both interviews and archival documents. The archival documents include several factual data that are used to provide another view of the investigated phenomenon. Additionally, by having representatives from all primary stakeholders as the research participants, a more comprehensive view of the reality can be achieved and thus subjectivity could be reduced (Eisehardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 28).
4.5.2. Generalisability

Generalisability has been one of the main critiques in case study research, particularly in single case study research (Flyvbjerg, 2006) such as this thesis. Questions are raised on generalisability because the context is inseparable from the case and the findings are drawn from very few cases or even from a single case (Yin, 2013, p. 323). However, as Flyvbjerg (2006, p. 3) argues, ‘context-dependent’ knowledge is not inferior to ‘context-independent’ knowledge. Furthermore, other authors (Barzelay, 1993, p. 306; Hyde, 2000, p. 84) claim that a single case can still generate meaningful knowledge contributions particularly if it is used for investigating problem solving that involves various stakeholders. This is because single case study research typically offers deeper insights than multiple case study research (Yin, 2013, p. 325; Eisehard & Graebner, 2007, p. 27). Besides, the researchers typically sacrifice the depth of the analysis if they are trying to increase the number of cases using the same level of resources (Yin, 2013, p. 325). Considering these arguments, ‘analytic generalisation’ (Yin, 2013; Hyde, 2000, p. 84) and ‘strategic choice of case’ Flyvbjerg (2006, p. 8) are suitable to meet the criterion of generalisability.

- ‘Analytic Generalisation’ refers to the abstract ideas from the findings that are applicable to other situations (Yin, 2013, p. 325). We achieved this by linking the theories with empirical evidence (Eisehardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 29) and by using the findings to explain the theoretical gap (Yin, 2013, p. 327). Additionally, we also carefully developed the contextual conditions in which the ‘abstract ideas’ can be applied (Yin, 2013, p. 326). Furthermore, to increase the generalisability of the findings, we suggest the replication of this thesis in further case study research (ibid).

- ‘Strategic choice of a case’ has been seen as one of the ways to improve generalisability of the findings (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 8). We achieved this by selecting a less likely case (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 14) which is a tripartite cross sector partnership (i.e. government, non-profit, and private organisations) instead of a bipartite cross sector partnership which is more common. Through a tripartite project, there are also more actors that can reveal more and multifaceted information (Flyvbjerg, 2006, pp. 8, 17).

4.5.3. Reliability

The reliability criterion refers to the consistency of the study process applied in the research (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 278). For instance, when other researchers perform a similar research process, if this criterion is met, they would achieve the same results (Yin, 2009, p. 45). We achieved this by documenting an interview guide and employing the same guide in all interviews. In addition, we also documented in detail the collected data through interview transcripts and requested the interviewees to peruse them.

4.6. Data Collection

4.6.1. Case Sample Criteria

Instead of assessing the interpretations of stakeholders from diverse projects, our intention is to examine in detail a single project that was carried out through a cross sector social partnership. We recognise that this will enable us to better understand the interaction between
the different stakeholders from a single context and provide an insightful analysis. Therefore, the project was selected on purpose to have a better representation of what we strive to study. The following criteria were defined to select the project.

**Criterion 1: Part of a cross sector partnership**
Considering that our research question seeks to demonstrate different interpretations in cross sector partnerships, it is essential that we ensure that the project is formed by cross sector organisations. Therefore, we only considered projects that require collaboration between public, private and non-profit organisations or involving the three sectors. This is because we are interested in examining the different views of the partners on a particular context.

**Criterion 2: Social cause as a project driver**
The project should focus on contributing towards a social cause. This also implies that only projects that are related to sustainable development initiatives were considered. Moreover, most of the cross sector partnerships call for collaboration to mitigate a societal issue (Waddock, 1991, p. 483).

Considering these criteria, the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project was eligible to take part in our research since it is aligned with our research objectives and will allow us to address the central topics of our thesis from diverse perspectives.

### 4.6.2. Interviewees Sample Criteria

To be able to interact with individuals that are well acquainted with the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project we have set criteria to select them.

**Criterion 1: English speaking**
Considering that the project under study was carried out among Swedish organisations, we need to be able to communicate with the interviewees. Therefore, the interviewees need to speak in English confidently as we do not speak Swedish.

**Criterion 2: Active participation in the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project**
Interviewees should be familiar with the project in general and with the organisation through which they participated in the project.

Based on these criteria, we approached the Umeå University’s point of contact for the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project and he/she provided us with the contact details of potential interviewees from diverse organisations. We directly asked each of the potential interviewees to participate in our research. Additionally, we asked the majority of them to suggest us another contact from their organisation who was also involved in the project that we are investigating.

### 4.6.3. Interviewees and Organisations

We interviewed individuals from the participating organisations in the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project in Umeå in Sweden. The total number of the primary and secondary involved organisations is ten. However, five are primary stakeholder groups and they were all considered. This was decided on the basis of their active enrolment in the project since we are
studying the perceptions of key stakeholders. Out of these organisations, seven individuals were contacted and all of them agreed to participate in our research (see Table 3).

Since we tried to expand our research to secondary stakeholders, we contacted an individual from one additional organisation (i.e. Be Green). However, he/she decided not to participate and his/her reason was that he/she was not involved in the project and therefore was unable to provide information regarding the project.

4.6.4. Interview Procedure

We contacted Umeå University’s point of contact for the project before the interviews. He/she briefed us on the background and general aspects of the project. We prepared for the interviews by developing an interview guide and revising it with our supervisor. We made the necessary adjustments particularly by adding follow up questions in case we needed to expand on specific matters during the interviews.

The request interview e-mails that were sent to the interviewees included the expected interview duration of one hour. All of the interviewees claimed to be available for one hour and replied with their choice of time and place to meet. We decided not to send the interview guide before the interview in order to avoid preconceptions. However, one of the interviewees requested to be sent the interview guide before the interview and we sent it to him/her. The reason behind his/her request was that English is not his/her mother tongue and he/she wanted to be familiar with the language during the interview.

All of the interviews were conducted in English, in person and in the desired location and time of the interviewees. Meeting them physically enabled us to be closer to the participants and exchange gestures. Interviewees were told that they had the choice of being tape-recorded or not and that they had no obligation to answer all of the questions in case they thought they concern confidential information. We informed them that taping the interview will allow us to gather all the details and that their names were going to be kept confidential and anonymous in our research. Only one participant refused to be tape-recorded the rest were tape-recorded with their approval. During the interviews, the two of us asked questions. We alternated the questions for each interview and we agreed on feeling free to contribute or expand on each other’s questions in case there was a need to clarify either the question being asked or the interviewees’ answers. Moreover, since some of the questions were dependent on previous answers, some of the interviews lasted longer than others yet within the expected half to one hour duration (see Table 3).

After the interview, the interviewees that were tape-recorded were asked if we could send the interview transcript for their perusal. All of them agreed on receiving the transcription of the interview. All the interviewees agreed on following up via e-mail after conducting the interviews in case there was a need to ask additional questions, request data or documents.

4.6.5. Interview Guide Design

The interview guide was organised based on seven themes, namely, introduction, project background, interviewee’s role in the project, organisation motivation, stakeholder identification, project success, and closing. We developed alternative follow-up questions for each theme and these were used to guide us when we needed to further explore certain
answers. In this manner, during each interview we added and/or omitted certain questions depending on the flow of the discussion. Furthermore, although we applied the same interview guide to all interviewees, when we interviewed the project manager and one representative from USBE, we elaborated more on the theme of stakeholder identification and roles. This was because, in our view, they could best identify the stakeholders considering the leading role of the project manager which included coordinating all of the stakeholders to achieve the project goals (PMBOK®, 2013, p. 16) and the fact that they were both involved from the project initiation to the closure stage.

A brief explanation of each theme is described below. The interview guide is available in Appendix I.

**Theme 1 – Introduction**
This theme includes the description of the purpose and the process of the interview, the expected outcome, and the reasons why each interviewee was asked to participate. Besides this, we also gathered general information regarding the organisations.

**Theme 2 – Project background**
In this theme, we adopted the framework from Patanakul and Shenhar (2012) with the goal to understand the interpretations of the interviewees about the investigated project. The framework includes the perspective (why), the position (what), and the guidelines (how) regarding what to do and how to do the project (Patanakul & Shenhar, 2012, p. 8).

**Theme 3 – Interviewees’ Role**
Having obtained the explanation regarding the project, through this theme, we aim to understand the role of the interviewees in the delivery of the project.

**Theme 4 – Organisations’ motivation**
The topics covered by this theme are the reasons for participating in the project and the expected benefits of the organisations out of the project.

**Theme 5 – Stakeholder identification**
The topics covered in this theme are mainly the identification of primary and secondary stakeholders along with their roles in the project.

**Theme 6 – Project success**
This theme aims to identify the perception of the interviewees regarding project success. The topics include the success criteria, the process of assessment, and the timing of the assessment.

**Theme 7 - Closing**
This theme aims to allow interviewees to provide additional comments that have not been covered in the interview. We thanked the interviewees for their participation in the interview.

**4.6.6. Data Processing**

We have decided to separate the empirical data section from the data analysis section. This approach will enable us to provide an objective view of the data to the readers and to ensure consistency without a strong influence from our interpretation. The data will be categorised...
into focus areas based on the views of the stakeholders and with the foundation of the theoretical framework. This will facilitate a systemic view with theory and data.

The categories used to group the information from the interviews are found in Appendix III. Some of the categories were subdivided into sub-variables that are dependent on our analysis and the obtained data. These categories allow us to compare the data in a consistent and simple manner throughout the thesis. We then contrasted the data gathered from all of the interviews placing particular attention on the relationships between the views of all the stakeholders. Additionally, we continuously seek to link our data to the theoretical frame of reference by adapting our data to theoretical models.

4.6.7. Ethical Considerations

We have adhered to the following ethical considerations while conducting our study:

Consent of participants
Participants were involved in the study with their informed and voluntary consent. We informed them of their participation rights and of the data use.

Permission to collect and report information
We requested the permission to gather data from the participants. We gave them the right to decide whether to share information or not as certain types of information could be confidential. Also, information was accurately reported and processed upon the approval of the interviewees and in accordance to the purpose of the study.

Maintenance of confidentiality
We protected the confidentiality of the interviewees by keeping the results anonymous. Likewise, the information provided by the interviewees was not shared with other interviewees for other purposes than the ones of the study.
CHAPTER 5 EMPIRICAL DATA AND FINDINGS

5.1. Empirical Data

The empirical data that we collected and analysed includes primary data and secondary data such as archival documents. The selection of archival documents is a compilation from multiple sources such as journals, pictures, websites of the organisations, and organisational documents (records of recycling improvement, project brief/proposal and brochures). In this case, we divided the presentation of the data into two sections. The first section is ‘The Case’ solely using the archival documents and the second section presents the interview results.

5.1.1. The Case

5.1.1.1. The Context

Recently, Sweden has shown an increased interest in waste management from the housing sector (Thormark, 2001, p. 113). This makes recycling an important way of developing a sustainable society (Engkvist et al., 2011, p. 357). In Sweden, laws and strategic waste plans such as ‘Avfallsplan 2020’ have been introduced to promote increased recycling (Thormark, 2001, p. 114; UMEVA, 2013). ‘Avfallsplan 2020’ aims to recycle 65% of the waste (UMEVA, 2011). However, one of the main challenges is to guide users to sort and find the right container for their waste (Engkvist et al., 2011, p. 358). Consequently, the demand for innovation products that supply knowledge to the end-users is growing (Designhögskolan, 2013; VINNOVA, 2013).

5.1.1.2. Introduction to The Case Study

The project that will be the foundation of our case study throughout the thesis is the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project. This project has been developed with organisations from diverse sectors as a result of a call for applications from VINNOVA, a Swedish governmental agency for innovation systems. Since the mission of VINNOVA is to “promote sustainable growth by improving the conditions for innovations, as well as funding needs-driven research” (VINNOVA, 2013), the organisation raised a call through the “Everyday IT” campaign which focuses on how technology can assist in daily activities. This, in order to encourage collaboration between organisations to combine research, design and information technology (IT) development into a sustainable development project (Blomquist et al., 2013, p. 219). VINNOVA had presented a unique opportunity to expand a traditional sustainable development project beyond innovation in order to formulate new collaboration opportunities with diverse industry partners and academic institutions and to enhance the standard of living for the people living in Umeå.

In response, researchers from USBE and Designhögskolan as well as personnel from FältCom met to discuss the initiative. These organisations were keen to undertake research, innovation and sustainable development projects. After meeting with the key parties and other interested organisations (see Figure 9), the organisations agreed on working together towards the
proposed research initiative (Blomquist et al., 2013, p. 219) and FältCom applied for the funding offered by VINNOVA.

A proposal was sent in. The proposed project was named Umeå Interactive Recycling Room and it consisted of the following:

“Umeå Interactive Recycling Room seeks to change households’ behaviour and attitudes to waste management and thereby improve the contribution that individuals’ daily behaviour provides for the creation of better environment and a more sustainable society. The overall aim of the project is to develop an interactive information service that helps individuals and households to make environmentally sound decisions regarding waste management. We start from households and individuals, those in their everyday lives, who choose to sort or not sort their household waste”
- Project brief provided by Bostaden (2011).

The proposal was accepted six months later and the project was financed by VINNOVA (VINNOVA, 2013; Blomquist et al., 2013, p. 220). The main actors were Designhögskolan, USBE, FältCom and Umeå municipality. The project owner was FältCom, therefore the project was led by them. The project started on May 2011 with ten organisations, including VINNOVA. Frequent meetings were held with the involved organisations in which each of them presented their organisation and the work they do. Then the partners started to discuss several possible ideas to proceed with the project. Students from Designhögskolan conducted a pre-study of the recycling behaviour of the citizens in Umeå (Blomquist et al., 2013, p. 222) and based on this they proposed a prototype. This prototype was discussed by all the participant stakeholders and it was decided to proceed with the project. An evaluation of the actual state of the recycling room in Ersboda was done in order to keep a record before the introduction of the prototype.

Then, the device was brought in the recycling room and it was left there for several weeks. During this period, surveys were given to the inhabitants of Ersboda to examine key aspects of their perception towards recycling and the interactive recycling room. Finally, the project was closed on September 2012. FältCom did a project evaluation supported with photos of the interactive recycling room before and after the implementation of the device (VINNOVA, 2011)

The project offered a new challenge and the potential for future collaboration. The incursion of technology in the recycling rooms essentially means that recycling is to be performed in a more dynamic way by educating and raising awareness among citizens. Success in this endeavour could see the participant organisations using the project model to expand the implementation of this project to other cities in Sweden, wishing to educate and change the behaviour of the community and potentially in Scandinavia (Blomquist et al., 2013, p. 220).

5.1.1.3. Project Overview

We have decided to use the model proposed by Patanakul and Shenhar (2012, p. 8) to define the project based on providing a general explanation of the motivation, purpose and means behind the project (see Figure 5). Considering this model, the table below (Table 4) illustrates some of the main characteristics of the project for a better comprehension of the case study.
Project strategy: The project perspective, position, and guidelines for what to do and how to do it, to achieve the highest competitive advantage and the best value from the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>How</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective: develop the services and structures that reduce household waste by 40%</td>
<td>Product: prototype of interactive information service (device)</td>
<td>Scope: prototype and pilot test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor: VINNOVA</td>
<td>Competitive advantage: promotion of sustainable development</td>
<td>Organisation: cross sector partnership lead by FältCom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-users: people living in Ersboda</td>
<td>Success/failure criteria: change in the behaviour and attitudes of people towards recycling</td>
<td>Time: May 2011 – September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic concept: Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic focus: Multi-disciplinary efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Definition of the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room Project
Source: Developed by Authors from The Framework that is adapted from Patanakul and Shenhar (2012, p. 8); and Content from VINNOVA (2011).

5.1.1.4. Introduction to The Participating Organisations

The structure of the project consists of several different organisations. A breakdown of the involved groups and stakeholders is given in Figure 9. All the partners reported back to FältCom which, in turn, reported to VINNOVA, the project sponsor.

![Figure 9. Stakeholders Involved in The Project](source: Blomquist et al. (2013, p. 223))

For the purpose of this thesis, we have decided to focus our study on the main partners as the key stakeholders: Fältcom, Designhögskolan, USBE, Bostaden and UMEVA. A brief
A description of these organisations is provided below. It is worthy to mention that all these partners work with an environmental focus. Hence, their intention is to raise environmental awareness while increasing the knowledge and the participation from the people in Umeå. The agendas of the participant organisations include objectives on energy consumption, waste disposal and efficient use of resources to approach issues with sustainable solutions.

**FältCom**
FältCom Communications is a private company that embraces advancements in technology to drive efficient systems with machine-to-machine communication (M2M). They offer a wide variety of products and services that modernise operations through innovative and reliable communication solutions. Overall, the company operates with an environmental and sustainable focus to drive profitability while maintaining an effective use of resources to achieve competitive advantage (Umeå University, 2013).

**Umeå School of Business and Economics (USBE)**
This academic institution has over 170 employees including 90 PhDs and researchers. One of the core activities of the school is to undertake research in business administration, economics and statistics. Among the main areas of focus in research are: marketing, PIN (Projects, Innovations and Networks) and RiseB (Research Institute for Sustainability and Ethics in Business) (USBE, 2013).

**Umeå Institute of Design (Designhögskolan)**
The Designhögskolan is part of Umeå University and was founded in 1989 centred on the idea of teaching industrial design. The Designhögskolan is a world-renowned leader in industrial design education. The philosophy of Designhögskolan recognises the commitment that the students and graduates have to design products with usage and cultivate “the interaction between the individual and the object in the development of the produced products” (Designhögskolan, 2013). Special emphasis is placed on the interaction between users and products by participating in real projects in cooperation with diverse industries.

**Bostaden**
Bostaden is a public housing company owned by Umeå Municipality. Additionally, Bostaden operates and manages a large part of the student housing. This has enabled the organisation to contribute to the growth of Umeå and to work for the wellbeing of its customers (Bostaden, 2013).

**UMEVA**
UMEVA (Umeå Water and Waste Ltd, UMEVA) is owned by Umeå municipality and is the organisation responsible for water and sewage, and waste and recycling in Umeå. UMEVA operates with 114 employees and with the mission “to provide the citizens of Umeå municipality with good and high-quality drinking water and to manage household waste products, as well as sewage solid waste and recyclable materials – all with an environmental focus”. The company mainly collects household waste and is responsible for emptying the bins in recycling centres. (UMEVA, 2013).
5.1.2. Interviews

Seven persons were interviewed regarding their perception on the success of the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project. The interview durations ranged from 27 minutes to 59 minutes with the two longest interviews being with Interviewee 1, the Project Manager and with Interviewee 3 a partner from USBE. This is reasonable considering that in the two interviews, apart from discussing the questions around the project success, we also deeply explored the role of the partner organisations of the interviewees. The shortest interview was with Interviewee 3 who was the web developer for the project. Interviewee 3 stated that he/she was not involved in certain parts of the project tasks and therefore was unable to provide the answers to several questions. Another important aspect is that Interviewee 5 preferred the interview not to be tape-recorded therefore, the number of transcript pages for Interviewee 5 in Table 5 refers to the page numbers of the notes taken during the interview. Another factor that influenced the length of the interviews was the English proficiency since all of the interviewees were not English native speakers. All interview transcripts and minutes of the meetings were sent back to the interviewees for their perusal. They were invited to provide input if any important point was missed. Out of the seven interviewees, one interviewee (i.e. Interviewee 6, Interviewee 7) replied back with a revised transcript. The revisions were related to the way they expressed their thoughts and not on the discussed content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Duration* (minutes)</th>
<th>Transcript (pages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interviewee 1</td>
<td>FältCom</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interviewee 2</td>
<td>FältCom</td>
<td>Team member</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
<td>USBE</td>
<td>Team member</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interviewee 4</td>
<td>USBE</td>
<td>Team member</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Interviewee 5</td>
<td>Designhögskolan</td>
<td>Team member</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Interviewee 6</td>
<td>Bostaden</td>
<td>Team member</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interviewee 7</td>
<td>UMEVA</td>
<td>Team member</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Interview Summary

NOTE: Interview times include only the recorded time which does not include our introduction and presentation time i.e. approximately 5 minutes.

5.1.2.1. Interviewee 1

Role in the project
The Interviewee was the manager of the project who was responsible for planning, controlling, and directing the different parts of the project works.

Project overview
The Interviewee informed that the project was driven by the opportunity provided by VINNOVA to work on an innovation project for societal benefits. Together with USBE and Designhögskolan, FältCom submitted a project proposal to VINNOVA. The main purpose of the project, as the Interviewee said it, was “to change people’s behaviour considering recycling”. This purpose was to be achieved through the development of an interactive screen that will be put in a garbage room. However, the Interviewee also mentioned that the interactive screen was not the main product of the project. Instead, he/she viewed the learning
obtained from this project as the main product of the project considering the innovative nature of the project and the need to have learning as an input for the next innovation phase.

There were two main benefits that the Interviewee expected out of this project. The most tangible benefit was the higher recycling percentage, which refers to the fraction of the recycled trash to the non-recycled trash. The other benefit is the learning for future innovation. As the Interviewee said, “the results are opportunities and possibilities which the team would not know if you don’t know and try them.” Furthermore, he/she signified the depth of the lessons gained from the project by emphasising the different kinds of parties involved in the project which provided opportunities for cross learning regarding the recycling business.

Motivation to participate
The motivation of FältCom to participate is related to the business agenda: “FältCom is a business company, we sell products and services so we thought that if this was successful, then there are a lot of recycling rooms in Sweden or in general so we can use this is a service.”

The Interviewee also identified that the project integrated the business agenda with the sustainable development agenda, in his/her opinion this made the project much more interesting for FältCom to pursue: “That would of course generate more profit for the recycling company and it would generate better environment […] if you get both then it’s possible to succeed…it’s very positive in two ways, so there shouldn’t be any reason why we shouldn’t do it”.

Stakeholder Identification
The Interviewee identified three groups of project stakeholders as follows:

Core teams comprised by FältCom, USBE, and Designhögskolan. They are the teams that utilised the fund from VINNOVA for the achievement of the project goal. FältCom, as the owner of the project was responsible for managing the overall project as well as the hardware development. Then, USBE was responsible for measuring the behavioural changes of the end-users through the survey results. Lastly, Designhögskolan was responsible for developing the interface and the website. Each of the three organisations had a representative that sat in the ‘Control Group’ with the responsibility to provide guidance on the overall direction of the project.

Project teams consisted of Bostaden and UMEVA with the responsibility of providing feedback and information regarding the waste management process. In addition, Bostaden was also responsible for providing a ‘Test Environment’ for the implementation of the interactive screen.

Indirect stakeholders were the stakeholders that were not involved in the day-to-day activities of the project but whose views were important for the success of the project. According to the Interviewee, they were VINNOVA, IL Recycling, and Avfall Sverige. The Interviewee identified VINNOVA as both the sponsor and the customer, and IL Recycling and Avfall Sverige as the providers of information and knowledge regarding recycling.
**Project Success**

The Interviewee identified three success criteria as presented in Table 4. Although not all of the success criteria were met, the Interviewee stated that it was a “good project”. This is because he/she views the project as an innovation project from which the lessons learned gained from the project are an important outcome to be used in the next innovation phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success criteria</th>
<th>Main quotes</th>
<th>Timing of measurement</th>
<th>Process of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in the fraction of the recycled trash</td>
<td>“We had an idea of a percentage of improvement in the recycling room […]. But when we can’t measure it, from week to week or bin to bin it was very difficult to see the improvement. But even if we would have, it wouldn’t have been that much of improvement that we were hoping for.”</td>
<td>Before and after the testing</td>
<td>Weighting trash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in the cleanliness of the garbage room</td>
<td>“Another thing that we thought it was interesting is how it looked in the recycling room […]. When we installed the equipment and run the project I was there couple of months after that and it looked very nice and neat in the recycling room. So that was a big improvement […] We’ve got some before and after pictures.”</td>
<td>Before and after the testing</td>
<td>Documented observation (i.e. photo and report development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of lessons learned for future innovation project</td>
<td>“This was a project for innovations and if you look at it as an innovation project then you should look more at the end-users and what are they looking for, what are they lacking […] There should be the next step. Because now we know what the end-users need in order to improve”.</td>
<td>At the closure</td>
<td>Development of evaluation report that was submitted to VINNOVA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Perception of Project Success - Interviewee 1

5.1.2.2. Interviewee 2

**Role in the project**

The Interviewee was one of the project team members from FältCom in the web developer role with the responsibility of implementing the design from Designhögskolan into the hardware (i.e. interactive screen).

**Project overview**

The purpose of the project, according to the Interviewee, was to establish a technical solution that can aid people in sorting trash in the garbage rooms. To achieve this purpose, the Interviewee identified two products of the project. The first product is the interactive screen with the web interface. The second product is the survey, which the Interviewee deemed more important as it could provide the project team with insights of whether the solution is viable or not. The Interviewee also emphasised the importance of the survey by mentioning that the project had a new concept and therefore the probability of the solution to work at the first time was not high. Furthermore, he/she mentioned that a survey would tell the project team the problems that the solution has. In regards to the customers of the project, the Interviewee identified two customers. They are VINNOVA who funded the project, and Bostaden who owned the garbage rooms in which the product was to be installed. However, he/she also mentioned that he/she was not very sure about this because he/she was not involved in every part of the project.

**Motivation to participate – network for getting knowledge about their project**
According to the Interviewee, FältCom participated in the project because it was convenient to do so. FältCom is based in Umeå and in terms of company size it is relatively small. Consequently, FältCom would find it easier to collaborate with other stakeholders in Umeå. The Interviewee also saw that it was natural for FältCom to collaborate with the university because the founder is an alumnus of the university. Other important motivations that the Interviewee identified were: being able to get knowledge from different stakeholders about the product, and the expectation that FältCom had to develop saleable services that can be applied to larger groups of stakeholders. As he/she said, “if the solution is successful, that we could make a saleable solution and able to deliver it to another city and to the whole city of Umeå”.

Project Success
The Interviewee identified two success criteria that are around the performance and the acceptance of the end-users of the interactive screen. According to him/her, the project was not “overall” successful. His/her main consideration was that he/she did not see that the project produced a solution that is saleable or accepted by the end-users. However, the Interviewee also mentioned that the project could be considered successful if the survey had some insights into why the solution was not successful. According to the Interviewee, this is because innovation projects, like the one under study, result in learning as a very valuable outcome that can be used in further innovation iterations. Another observation that the Interviewee conveyed was on the stakeholder management. Since there were five different organisations participating in the project, according to the Interviewee, the project became more difficult to manage. He/she perceived that the participating organisations were rather disintegrated and this influenced the performance of the project. He/she added that the approach to the project could have been more holistic because there were many different ways to approach the issue that the project aimed to address, which can be more than just the interactive screen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success criteria</th>
<th>Main quotes</th>
<th>Timing of measurement</th>
<th>Process of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of the solution by the end-users</td>
<td>“This project would have been successful if the survey had shown that the solution is acceptable. It could be the solution that we could sell to other cities… It does not matter if all the technical matters work but if it is not used by the users, it is still not unsuccessful… I am not sure about the survey. I never saw the survey and took part of the survey. So I don’t know the result of the survey.”</td>
<td>After the testing</td>
<td>Survey to the end-users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable performance of the solution</td>
<td>“We of course have criteria that we can deliver solution that is deployable and that is working physically, that you can use it… I don’t think the screen was that reliable and it needed to be restarted a lot.”</td>
<td>During and after the testing</td>
<td>Observation using the technical platform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Perception on Project Success - Interviewee 2

5.1.2.3. Interviewee 3

Role in the project
The interviewee was one of the project team members from USBE with the responsibility of assessing the behavioural change of the end-users through the survey.
Project overview
According to the interviewee, there were multiple purposes of the project that depended on the stakeholders. He/she considered FältCom and USBE as examples. According to him/her, for FältCom the purpose of the project was to develop a saleable product while for USBE it was to build a network with different organisations for future academic research. However, as the overall project, the interviewee identified the purpose of the project as to improve the behaviour of the end-users in regards to sorting out trash. Furthermore, he/she saw the ‘demonstrator’ as the product of the project. The demonstrator was a touch-screen that demonstrated the concept with the potential to change the behaviour of end-users. He/she also pointed out that the product needed to be IT-related in order to align with the sponsor’s objective i.e. ‘Everyday IT and Sustainability’.

Motivation to participate
The interviewee identified three motivations of USBE to participate in the project. USBE aimed to expand its network for future research by collaborating with parties participating in the project. Then, by partnering with other organisations in delivering the project, UBSE would increase its chance of getting granted a research fund since collaboration with different organisations was one of the requirements set by the sponsor. The last motivation was for the purpose of learning from the participating organisations (e.g. their business process) as well as for collecting data for future research.

Stakeholder Identification
The interviewee identified three categories of stakeholder groups:

The project team, which consisted of five different organisations with different responsibilities:
- **FältCom** comprised three different roles i.e. Project Owner, Project Manager, and Team Members. The Project Owner, which was the senior manager of FältCom, was responsible of ensuring that the project fund was used accordingly to deliver the expected outcome. The Project Manager was responsible of managing the day-to-day activities of the project. The team members were asked to develop and install the hardware.
- **USBE** was responsible of measuring the behavioural changes of the end-users.
- **Designhögskolan** was responsible of developing the website or the interface.
- **Bostaden** was responsible of providing the test environment
- **UMEVA** acted as a knowledge expert and provided data regarding the recycling performance

According to the interviewee, FältCom, USBE, and Designhögskolan were considered the main project team and Bostaden and UMEVA were considered as part of a support team. Furthermore, he/also added that Bostaden and UMEVA were asked to be involved in the project by their parent organisation which is the city municipality represented by ‘Be Green’. Furthermore, the interviewee also identified VINNOVA as the project sponsor who provided the fund and the strategic objective for the project.

The customers that comprised three different organisations. The first customer is VINNOVA, which was also the project sponsor since it was the organisation that the project team wanted to find a solution for. The second customer is the potential buyer of the demonstrator such as
recycling and housing companies. Lastly, the interviewee also identified the end-users as the customer since they were the ones who were going to use the demonstrator.

The indirect stakeholders or the organisations whose opinion mattered for the success of the project but were not involved actively throughout the project. The interviewee identified the city municipality, which is represented by ‘Be Green’ as part of the indirect stakeholder groups since their sustainability goals direct the housing and recycling companies in Umeå. Furthermore, the interviewee also identified IL Recycling as an indirect stakeholder because they were the provider of certain data on the recycling performance. However, their involvement was only in the beginning of the project.

**Project Success**

The interviewee did not see time, cost, and scope as the main criteria for evaluating success. Instead he/she identified four success criteria, which are centred on the idea of achieving the change in the behaviour of end-users and creating opportunities for future academic research (See Table 6). In addition, the interviewee mentioned that, “it is impossible to measure the project success because each stakeholder has different aims and views on what is successful and what is not”. What is of significant importance, as the interviewee said, is “to be aware of the difference and that the stakeholders need to communicate”. However, as the overall project, despite not all success criteria were achieved successfully, the interviewee thinks that the project success is more on the “positive side” considering the benefits that the project produced in preparing for future research and collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success criteria</th>
<th>Main quotes</th>
<th>Timing of measurement</th>
<th>Process of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tidiness of the garbage room</td>
<td>“From the pictures of the room before and after we could say that there are differences”</td>
<td>Before and after testing</td>
<td>Documented observation (i.e. photo and report development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tested demonstrator with evaluations</td>
<td>“I think success criteria is if we will be able to make a demonstrator […]. We made the demonstrator, we were also selected by VINNOVA to get to other conference or national conference for sustainable cities and to be there to present the results. So if we were totally out of scope, we will not be there and selected.”</td>
<td>End of the project</td>
<td>Report evaluation that was submitted to VINNOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded network for future collaboration</td>
<td>“Today we have been successful because now we have some friends to contact; I have much closer relations to them […]. With stakeholder X, I have a lot of works with them now”</td>
<td>Post closure</td>
<td>No structure evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of data collection for academic research</td>
<td>“I will end with the project to collect data […]. Our hope that we will be able to use the data from them to analyse the different in the society […]. My hope that with this type of collection, we should be able to work with the data for a couple of years after the project is ended”</td>
<td>Before and after testing</td>
<td>Survey on end-users on behavioural change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Perception on Project Success - Interviewee 3

5.1.2.4. Interviewee 4

*Role in the project*
The interviewee was one of the project team members representing USBE with the responsibility of assessing the behavioural change of the end-users through survey. However, he/she was not involved until the end of the project.

**Project overview**

The interviewee identified two main purposes of the project: to educate the city citizens on how to recycle and to help FältCom in their product development project. Furthermore, he/she viewed the ‘interactive screen’ as the product of the project. In regards to the project’s customer identification, the interviewee differentiated the end-users with the customers. He/she referred to the housing companies like Bostaden as the customer because at the time of the project they were the ones who will potentially buy the product. Then, he/she referred to the people living in the area as the end-users since they were the ones who will potentially use the product.

**Motivation to participate**

There were three motivations of USBE as identified by the interviewee:

- To increase the chance of getting the sponsorship from VINNOVA. As the interviewee said: “that was one of the prerequisites for this project, that you needed to have companies or municipality or it could not be just a university research project, it had to be involving many different stakeholders also”.
- To take the opportunity for doing market research in the marketing field since the project considered the behavioural change of end-users.
- To pursue the sustainable development agenda of USBE.

**Project Success**

According to the interviewee, the assessment of project success was not formally discussed during the project life cycle. He/she however identified one main success criterion although he/she did not know if the criterion was assessed during the project life since he/she was not involved until the end of the project. According to him/her, the project was not really successful considering that the users were not using the product. Another highlight that the interviewee saw was the need to assess project success as he/she mentioned: “Some things should have, and this I don’t know if it was done, should have been evaluated after a while [...] It is something that we should have evaluated if people use it to see if something had to be changed, [...] and then of course an evaluation has to be done afterwards”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success criteria</th>
<th>Main quotes</th>
<th>Timing of measurement</th>
<th>Process of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High utilisation of the device</td>
<td>“That [high utilisation of the device] would be a criteria because if the end-users never used it means they don’t use the device then Bostaden would [not] be interested in buying it and Faltcom would have no production [...] This is only my guess. I think we did not really succeed in making this device user friendly […]. People entering this recycling room they did not quite understand how to use it, it wasn’t working properly”</td>
<td>The interviewee does not know if the criterion was measured or not</td>
<td>The interviewee does not know if the criterion was measured or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Perception on Project Success - Interviewee 4

5.1.2.5. Interviewee 5
Role in the project
The interviewee was one of the project team members representing Designhögskolan he/she was tasked to provide ideas and to elaborate the design of how the interface of the interactive screen should look and work. Additionally, the interviewee also worked with Struktur Design (a private organisation) to develop the space layout and service design. Quotes will not be provided in this section because the interviewee preferred the interview not to be taped-recorded.

Project overview
According to the interviewee, the purpose of the project was to make people understand and commit to do the recycling process properly. The product of the project was the interactive screen containing relevant information regarding recycling. In regards to the project customer, the Interviewee viewed it as the end-users, the people living in the community.

Motivation to participate
The interviewee saw the opportunity to apply knowledge and to learn as the main motivation. This is because the project concerned investigating the users’ point of view and transforming these views into a product, which is an area of interest of Designhögskolan.

Project Success
According to the interviewee, the project was quite focused on the solution instead of the problem it aimed to solve. He/she mentioned that he/she was not convinced whether the solution (i.e. interactive screen placed in the garbage room) was the right solution to change the behaviour of the end-users in recycling. He/she pointed out that there were many different ways to approach the problem such as using posters and establishing dialogues with the end-users. He/She also added that this might have been because the owner of the project (i.e. FältCom) is in the IT business, therefore the selection of the solution was inclined towards an IT-related product.

As an overall project, the interviewee saw that the project was not very successful considering that the users did not spend much time in the garbage room and therefore the utilisation of the device was low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success criteria</th>
<th>Main quotes</th>
<th>Timing of measurement</th>
<th>Process of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided solution that changes the behaviour in recycling</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No structure or formal evaluation</td>
<td>The interviewee acknowledges that there is a report that described the before and after situation. However, he/she is not sure where the data came from.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Perception on Project Success - Interviewee 5

5.1.2.6. Interviewee 6

Role in the project
The interviewee was one of the project team members representing Bostaden with the responsibility of preparing and providing information regarding the testing environment.

Project overview
As the interviewee said, “the project was part of a larger EU project i.e. Green Citizen of Europe” with the purpose to “create an interactive service that will help people and households make environmentally smart choices when it comes to garbage disposal”. The product of the project, according to the interviewee, was the ‘interactive screen’.

**Motivation to participate**
The interviewee mentioned that it was ‘Be Green’ via the Green Citizen of Europe Project, the one who invited Bostaden to participate in the project. Nevertheless, as said by the interviewee, Bostaden saw it as “an opportunity for the company to get people to change their behaviour”, particularly in the neighbourhood in which the device was tested. Another motivation was to align with the sustainability agenda of Bostaden since the project involved waste management. In regards to the project’s customer identification, the interviewee perceived that the project had no particular customer.

**Project Success**
According to the interviewee, the project was successful at the beginning since there was evidence of change in the behaviour of the end-users. However, he/she mentioned that the improvement was not sustained because after some time, the performance of the garbage room was back to the previous state. Additionally, the interviewee also mentioned that the evaluation of the performance of the garbage room ended after the project closure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success criteria</th>
<th>Main quotes</th>
<th>Timing of measurement</th>
<th>Process of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The reliability of the interactive screen</td>
<td>“We have a lot of trouble with the screen. It was not working all the time”.</td>
<td>No formal evaluation</td>
<td>No formal evaluation; observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tidiness of the room</td>
<td>“But in the beginning, I think it was a success, because we saw a difference in the garbage room. But when the time went, it didn’t make so much difference”.</td>
<td>Before testing, after testing, and post closure</td>
<td>Photo taking; observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved fraction of the recycled trash</td>
<td>“The weights of each fraction […] not so much [improvement] if I remember it rightly”.</td>
<td>Before testing, after testing, and post closure</td>
<td>Recycled trash weighting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Perception on Project Success - Interviewee 6

**5.1.2.7. Interviewee 7**

**Role in the project**
The interviewee was one of the project team members representing UMEVA who acted as the knowledge expert in waste management and provided the recycling performance data.

**Project overview**
According to the interviewee, the project was part of a bigger initiative called ‘Avfallsplan 2020’ which is an initiative by the city municipality with the aim to achieve 65% of the recycled trash fraction by year 2020. He/she mentioned that the purpose of the project was to test if the interactive screen was going to be a better solution to change the recycling behaviour of the end-users than using more conventional means such as informative posters.

**Motivation to participate**
UMEVA joined the project because UMEVA believed that the project’s purpose was aligned with Avfallsplan 2020’s goal, which is the goal of the city municipality, the owner of UMEVA.

**Project Success**

The interviewee identified three success criteria of the project (Table 10). Although not all of the success criteria were met, as the interviewee said: “the project was pieces of success” for two reasons. First, the project has provided a valuable learning experience for the involved parties which each of them can take for future projects. Second, the journey to achieving the end goal (i.e. improvement in the fraction of the recycled trash) according to the interviewee is a long-term endeavour which requires many different initiatives. Therefore, he/she mentioned, that the project under study should not be seen as the only solution to achieve the end goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success criteria</th>
<th>Main quotes</th>
<th>Timing of measurement</th>
<th>Process of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliable interactive screen</td>
<td>“In winter, the device was working slower and not proper with this weather.”</td>
<td>During testing</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Improved fraction of the recycled trash  | “This [improve faction of the recycled trash] is the main goal for us. [There was] only a small [improvement].”  
                                         | “[This is] not successful for recycling but successful for learning.”  | Before and after testing       | Weighting of the recycled trash |
| Lessons learned from the project         | “I think it is successful to take that we learn about the others, we learned about our customer: Bostaden, we learned about the Design school how they work, and then we can learn about that and take it that to another project. We can take this information that we learned.” | During the closure and post closure | Report documentation and informal evaluation by UMEVA |

Table 10. Perception on Project Success - Interviewee 7

**5.2. Analysis**

**5.2.1. Stakeholder Identification**

There are two levels of stakeholder identification performed during this study: the identification of the partner organisations and of other stakeholders.

**Partner organisations**

The identification of partner organisations along with the description of their roles and responsibilities was only done with Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 3. In our opinion they are the ones who could best provide information regarding partner organisations considering their roles in the project.

We have identified five organisations as the partners of the project, which are the organisations that collaborated actively to achieve the project goal. These organisations however are divided into two groups (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3) based on the distribution of the project fund by the sponsor (Interviewee 1). The groups are the ‘core project teams’ and ‘the project teams’ according to interviewee 1 or the ‘main project teams’ and the ‘supporting project teams’ according to interviewee 3. To be consistent, we named them as
‘core partners’ and ‘extended partners’ in order to avoid confusion since both are ‘project teams’.

The core partners are the organisations that received the project fund, these comprise FältCom, USBE, and Designhögskolan. Each of these organisations had a representative sitting in the “Control Group” with the task of providing the overall direction of the project. In addition, the interviewees (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3) also viewed FältCom as the Owner of the project. Then, the extended partners were considered to be Bostaden and UMEVA, they participated actively in the project but did not utilise the project fund.

Other stakeholders
We asked all interviewees to identify other stakeholders. The interviewees had various views on the project stakeholders. These are explained below:

Sponsor
Although all interviewees agreed that the sponsor was VINNOVA, they had different views on whether VINNOVA was a primary or secondary stakeholder. Since the sponsor’s investment in the project was mainly financial, several interviewees (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 6) viewed them as external to the project since they saw VINNOVA’s involvement was indirect.

End-users
All interviewees agreed that the end-users were the individuals living in the local community. Similarly, all interviewees viewed the end-users as secondary stakeholders as compared to the partner organisations. However, Interviewee 5 also considered the end-users as the project customer.

Customers
According to Interviewee 3, there had been a discussion as for whom the solution was to be developed. However there was no common agreement. This indeed is reflected in the interview results. The interviewees identified various project customers i.e.:
- VINNOVA, which is the organisation for whom the project team developed a solution (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2; Interviewee 3)
- The end-users, who were to use the solution (Interviewee 3; Interviewee 5)
- Bostaden, who owns the garbage rooms (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 6)
- The housing or recycling companies, as the potential buyers of the project’s product (Interviewee 3; Interviewee 4)

In addition, Interviewee 6 was unable to identify the project customer.

Other organisations
The interviewees also identified other secondary stakeholders who were not directly involved in the project but whose views and/or influence were important for the success of the project. They are IL Recycling (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 5), Avfall Sverige (Interviewee 1), Be Green representing the city municipality (Interviewee 3), and the research students that developed the design under the supervision of Designhögskolan (Interviewee 5).

The summary of the stakeholder categorisation is displayed in Figure 10 and the detail can be found in Appendix II.
5.2.2. Cross Sector Social Partnership

**Partner organisations**

Each partner worked on the different tasks of the project as summarised in Table 11 below. It can be inferred that the partners committed resources in terms of expertise, information, and time or active participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinated the overall project tasks</td>
<td>FältCom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed hardware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measured the end-users behavioural changes</td>
<td>USBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Designed the interface</td>
<td>Designhögskolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinated with Struktur Design the layout and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acted as knowledge expert and provided data</td>
<td>Bostaden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provided the test environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acted as the knowledge expert and provided data</td>
<td>UMEVA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11. The Roles and Responsibilities of The Partner Organisations**

**Motivations**

Each partner organisation participated in the project for different motivations, which can be grouped into the economic and social agendas. The economic agenda refers to the motivations that relate to the growth of the organisation while the social agenda refers to sustainable development. As summarised in Table 12, the scope of business of the organisations influences the organisations’ motivation to join the project. For FältCom, for example, as a private business, the project meant an opportunity for product innovation with the main goal to develop a saleable solution (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 4). Likewise, USBE, as an academic institution, was interested in the motivations centred on providing opportunities for academic research i.e. developing network, collecting data, increasing the chance to get the research fund (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 3). Similarly, for
Bostaden, the project was seen as an opportunity to fix one of their problematic garbage rooms (Interviewee 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social motivation</th>
<th>Economic motivation</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To pursue the sustainable development agenda</td>
<td>• To develop a saleable solution</td>
<td>FältCom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To pursue the sustainable agenda</td>
<td>• To develop a network</td>
<td>USBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>• To collect research data</td>
<td>Designhögskolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To pursue the sustainable development agenda</td>
<td>• To increase the chance to get research funds</td>
<td>Bostaden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To pursue the sustainable development agenda</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>UMEVA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. The Motivations of The Partner Organisations

Despite being motivated by different agendas, the empirical data reveals that the partners had a shared interest and value, which is related to waste management. Out of the five interviewed organisations, four pointed out that the project aligned with their sustainable development agenda. Only the Interviewee 5 from Designhögskolan did not identify sustainable development as one of their motivations to participate. However, when accessing the website of Designhögskolan, the school sets Sustainable Design as one of their main focused areas which conveys the school’s interest in sustainable development. It is also interesting to highlight that Interviewee 1 from FältCom recognised that the pursuit of the sustainable development agenda should not be separated from the pursuit of economic goals. As he/she mentioned, when the economic agenda aligns with the sustainable development agenda, the chance for success increases and the results will be more sustainable for the organisation.

5.2.3. Project Success

5.2.3.1. Criteria

All of the interviewees highlighted success criteria that was thought to generate strategic value and not only operational value, based on cost, time and quality. Therefore, the expected benefits at the start of the project that were mentioned go beyond the traditional project management success criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Success Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Evaluation Timing</th>
<th>Evaluation Result</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Improved fraction of the recycled trash</td>
<td>Weighted the trash</td>
<td>Before and after the testing</td>
<td>Delivered little improvement</td>
<td>Interviewee 1, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved tidiness of the garbage room</td>
<td>Documented</td>
<td>Before and after the testing</td>
<td>Delivered significant improvement Interviewee 1, 3, 6 but not sustained Interviewee 6</td>
<td>Interviewee 1, 3, 6, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Success Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation Process</td>
<td>Evaluation Timing</td>
<td>Evaluation Result</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Available lessons learned</td>
<td>Evaluation report; personal reflection</td>
<td>At the closure; post closure</td>
<td>Report submitted to the sponsors</td>
<td>Interviewee 1, Interviewee 3, Interviewee 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lessons are used for internal product development projects</td>
<td>Interviewee 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repeat business with sponsor through participation in a national conference</td>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Highly utilised solution by the end-users</td>
<td>End-users survey</td>
<td>After testing</td>
<td>Unable to identify</td>
<td>Interviewee 2, Interviewee 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not convinced that the criterion was met</td>
<td>Interviewee 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliably performing the solution</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>During and after the testing</td>
<td>The performance of the solution was not stable</td>
<td>Interviewee 2, Interviewee 6, Interviewee 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed and tested demonstrator</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>After the testing</td>
<td>The demonstrator was installed</td>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a solution that can change the behaviour in recycling</td>
<td>Unable to identify</td>
<td>Unable to identify</td>
<td>Acknowledged a project evaluation report but not sure where the data came from.</td>
<td>Interviewee 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Expanded network for future collaboration</td>
<td>Personal reflection</td>
<td>Post closure</td>
<td>Built network, have more projects with one of the stakeholders</td>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of data for academic research</td>
<td>Survey to end-users on behavioural change</td>
<td>Before and after testing</td>
<td>Low response in the survey</td>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Summarised Project Success Criteria

Interviewees explored the project in terms of the value they generated to their organisations, to themselves, to the society and to the further development of the project. This value creation process was thought to be enhanced by a change in behaviour, the creation of a stronger network between the participant stakeholders and by the learning generated during and after
the project. It can be implied that success criteria was linked to stakeholder satisfaction and
the benefits for the organisations based on the achievement of the purpose of the project and
of each of the stakeholders. The following success criteria were highlighted because
according to the interviewees, they seemed to determine how the project will create value.
Table 13 illustrates the main characteristics of the success criteria that were mentioned by
each of the interviewees. After analysing the success criteria for each interviewee, we decided
to classify the criteria using simplified categories for a better analysis. Table 13 shows the
chosen categorisation for all the mentioned success criteria. The success criteria that are
directly related to change in behaviour and product were the most mentioned among the
interviewees.

Outcome
Outcome refers to the impact that will be generated as a consequence of the change in
behaviour of the end-users regarding recycling. This dimension was further described by the
interviewees in terms of the cleanliness of the recycling room and of the fraction of
improvement in recycling in the recycling room after the implementation of the device. The
project was seen as an opportunity to analyse and test the behaviour of the end-users. For
instance, Interviewee 7 placed emphasis on being up to date with technology use in order to
adapt to the dynamic behaviour of the end-users. Therefore, this caused the partners to believe
that a change in behaviour was to be achieved through the design of an innovative solution
that generates value for the users of the recycling room and the society in general. Notably,
the value created through the change in behaviour was identified as a major success criteria
for the organisations to understand what to expect out of the project and to define the long-
term improvement of a sustainable society.

Organisational Benefits
The main benefits that the interviewees identified were the opportunity to build a network
with the participant partners and the availability of data for further research after the project
closure. Building relationships with other participant organisations was thought to help the
interviewees in the value creation process. Developing a network with cross sector
organisations includes collaboration and learning from internal and external factors that affect
the project. Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 3 identified sources of value in other partners as an
essential tool to achieve success. Consistently, they recognised that interactions with several
partners and the combination of resources allow them to leverage a vast network (see Table
15). This could be achieved by gaining knowledge by exchanging information and experience
with a cross sector partner. In fact, Interviewee 3 mentioned that he/she was keen on
participating in the project in order to obtain data for research in USBE. This motivated the
interviewees to look forward to the possibility of future collaboration and provided the
partners with a systemic view of the project. Moreover this emphasized how each of them
contributed to form an interactive network and generate valuable information for further
research.

Learning
The relation between success criteria and learning as an expected outcome of the project was
a fundamental success factor in order to exhaust the possibilities of value creation. This was
due to the nature of the project: an innovation project. Innovation projects tend to leave a
solid foundation of learning that can be shared and carried out in future projects. Additionally,
from the given replies in the interviews, it can be implied that this success criterion is
influenced by the agendas of the organisations. For example, Interviewee 1 expected to gain information from this project in order to explore the possibility of exploiting new markets and generate a new business opportunity in Umeå and potentially in other cities in Sweden. Additionally, Interviewee 3 was seeking to strengthen the relationship with industry partners in order to build up a partnership with the University for future research projects. Interviewee 2 focused more on the operational learning such as whether the device will be useful or not and on the learning that can be gained from working with other partners. Overall, the interviewees expected the project to foster knowledge and to generate valuable information for future use. Viewing the project as a source of knowledge was central to the understanding of value creation of the Interviewee 1, Interviewee 2 and Interviewee 3. This is because they need to know what information is valuable and what is not relevant to their specific purposes.

Product
Success criteria was often attributed to the end product: a screen prototype that is developed, used and reliable. Five of the interviewees (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 5; Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7) mentioned a success criterion that is directly related to the end product. Interviewee 2, Interviewee 6 and Interviewee 7 focused on the reliability of the device as a basis for determining the success of the project, while Interviewee 3 and Interviewee 5 emphasised the ability of the product to generate a change in the recycling behaviour. This indicates that the final product should be functioning properly with stability over time.

Additionally, according to the project proposal there was a measurable objective to achieve (40% reduction of household waste) (VINNOVA, 2011). This was reflected in the interviews where they acknowledged waste reduction as one of the main success criterion (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7). However none of the interviewees specified a measurable extent of the expected achievement.

5.2.3.2. Means

Several means were applied to assess the success criteria identified by the interviewees as summarised in Figure 11 (Detail is available in Appendix III). The means differ from an informal to a more formal evaluation process.

The formal assessment, includes:
- The survey to measure whether the goal of improving the behaviour of end-users was met or not (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 4)
- The development of a project evaluation submitted to the sponsor (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 7)
- The documented observations through photos of the garbage room before and after the implementation (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 6)
- The application of a technological platform to measure the reliability of the solution remotely (Interviewee 2)

The more informal assessment processes, include:
- Personal reflections (Interviewee 3)
- Observations (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7)
The various means of evaluating the success criteria also imply that there is no single way to assess the success of the project and that the assessment process can be formal and/or informal.

5.2.3.3. Timing

As Figure 11 depicts, the timing for assessing the project success criteria was spread over the project lifespan as well as to the post closure phase. Only two of the interviewees (Interviewee 4; Interviewee 5) did not identify the timing of the project success evaluation. Interviewee 4 was not involved in the monitoring of the identified criteria while Interviewee 5 was not involved to the end of the project and was therefore unable to provide an answer. The remaining five interviewees pointed out that the success of the project was assessed multiple times as described below.

Before Implementation
During this phase, the project team performed a survey on the behavioural change of the end-users, observed the garbage room and documented the observations in a project report, and weighted the trash of the garbage room (i.e. recycled and non-recycled). Measuring success criteria before the implementation (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7) was logical because the team needed to understand the current state of the garbage room, before the implementation of the device, in order to identify whether a change is generated or not. Hence, the measurement prior to the implementation aimed to set the baseline or reference point for the improvement.

After Implementation
Right after the implementation, success criteria were assessed again (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2; Interviewee 4; Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7). The criteria that were measured during this phase were mostly the same as the criteria that were assessed before the implementation. They were the tidiness of the garbage room through documented observations/photos and the fraction of the recycled trash by weighting the recycled and non-recycled trash. According to Interviewee 3, the project team planned to perform another survey after the implementation to see if there was a change in the behaviour of the end-users. However, they decided to cancel this plan considering the very low participation response on the pre-implementation survey (Interviewee 3; Interviewee 4). Nevertheless, they acknowledged that the success criteria of the end-users’ behavioural change should have been measured after the implementation of the solution.
During closure phase

Three interviewees (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 7) mentioned that a formal evaluation report was developed during the closure stage, which was later submitted to VINNOVA, the sponsor organisation. However, several interviewees (Interviewee 3; Interviewee 7) pointed out that they did not have nor read the document since the document was prepared and submitted by the project manager. This implies that the assessment of the project success during the closure phase might not have involved all of the partner organisations.

Post closure

Interviewee 6 mentioned that there was no evaluation after the project was closed in September 2012. Additionally, Bostaden and UMEVA stopped sending the recycling performance data (i.e. fraction of the recycled trash) to FältCom. However, Interviewee 3 recognised that the assessment at the post closure phase was done. Few months after closure, VINNOVA, the sponsor, asked the project team to present the results of the project in a national conference about sustainable cities in Sweden. The fact that the sponsor placed a follow up request to the project team implies that the project was assessed as successful at that time, after the project closure (Interviewee 3). This demonstrated that Interviewee 3 assessed the success of the project during that time although it was not done in a formal and structured way.

Another important highlight was provided by two interviewees (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3) that assessed the project success based on their current situation. Interviewee 1 pointed out that the project could have been considered successful taking into account that the lessons learned from the project are currently being used in the internal innovation projects of FältCom. Similarly, Interviewee 3 viewed the project as successful considering that nowadays he/she has a strong network with the partner organisations and has been able to participate in more projects with them. The fact that they all assessed success using their current situation implies that project success is viewed far after the project closure.

5.2.3.4. Assessment Results

In particular, all of the interviewees demonstrated to have diverse views of the general success of the project after its completion. Whilst some of the mentioned successful outcomes were not formally assessed or expected at the beginning of the project, interviewees recognised the impact they have generated in current operations in terms of their economic and social agendas. Table 14 presents the diverse overall views of the success of the project mentioned by the partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th>Overall Assessment Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 1</td>
<td>Inclined to success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 2</td>
<td>Not a success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
<td>Inclined to success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 4</td>
<td>Unable to assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 5</td>
<td>Not a success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 6</td>
<td>Mixed view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. The Overall View on Project Success

It is clear from the above table that all of the partners had a different perception of the actual outcome of the project. It is worth noting that although the partners had different views of success of the project, they all fall in the economic or social agendas. This provided them with a mixed view of the project success and it seems that the view of success of the partners is related to their self-interest, to the motivation to participate and to their agenda. Out of the seven interviewees, two considered the project to be successful (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3), two considered it unsuccessful (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 5), two presented a mixed view (Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7) and one was unable to assess the success of the project (Interviewee 4). For example, FältCom, as a company, showed a mixed view of the overall project success. This was because the core business of the company is to develop IT solutions, hence both interviewees (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2) focused on delivering a reliable device. However, both interviewees considered the economic agenda of the company as an important factor to define the overall assessment of the project success. Whereas the project manager (Interviewee 1) mentioned that one of the motivations of the company was to develop a solution that could be used to open new market opportunities, the developer (Interviewee 2) highlighted as well that the technical device should have been saleable.

Moreover, all the interviewees agreed that the success of the project cannot be determined based on one criteria only. For example, Interviewee 1 argued that the project was successful based on the learnings it generated, however, it was unsuccessful from the operational and tactic point of view as it delivered little improvement and lacked the interest from the end users. This view was also shared by several interviewees (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 5; Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7) who had the operational aspect of the product as a success criterion. Furthermore, other interviewees (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 4; Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7) had a view of success that corresponded to the economic impact that the project had. These criteria are linked to the potential of generating new projects, partners and products.

The fact that most of the success criteria were not associated with metrics to indicate the progress of the project, contributed to the mixed views of project success. For example, some interviewees (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7) had the percentage of improvement in waste recycling as one of the criterion to define success. This is a measured criterion that was measured prior to the implementation of the prototype in the recycling room and assessed during and after project closure. Hence, it was easier for them to refer to the metrics to define whether the project was successful or not. However, Interviewee 4 acknowledged that he/she does not know whether the criterion was measured or not. Nonetheless, all of the interviewees discussed that this was only one of the meaningful criterion needed to assess the project as whole and others should be included.
CHAPTER 6 DISCUSSION

6.1. Stakeholder Identification

As Figure 10 depicts, there are thirteen different stakeholder groups, they are the organisations that affected or were affected by the project outcome (Freeman, 1984, p. 46; PMBOK®, 2013, p. 30) and/or were interested in the project outcome (Cleland, 1985 cited in Littau et al., 2010, p. 6; PMBOK®, 2013, p. 30). They can be grouped into six categories named core partners, extended partners, sponsor, end-users, customers, and other indirectly involved organisations.

Partner organisations
Following the definition of Wilson et al. (2010, p. 80) on primary stakeholders, we considered that both core partners and extended partners were the primary stakeholders of the project. Each of the organisations in the partner category delivered different parts of the project and therefore their collaboration was essential for the achievement of the project outcome. Particularly FältCom, during the project life, took multiple roles: project owner, project manager, and project team member (i.e. web developer). However, when the interviewees (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3) identified FältCom as the owner, they referred to the organisation that “channelled the project fund on behalf of the owner of the fund”, which according to the typology of Turner (2006, p. 189) this is called a sponsor, not an owner. As according to Turner (2006, p. 189), an ‘owner’ is the organisation or individual who “provides the resources and derives benefits from the project” which in the project, the interviewees (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3) referred to as ‘sponsor’ i.e. VINNOVA. Nevertheless, despite the different typologies applied, FältCom is considered part of the primary stakeholders along with the other four partner organisations.

Sponsor
There are different views from the interviewees on whether VINNOVA, the organisation that provided the fund for the project should be considered as a primary or secondary stakeholder. Interviewee 2 and Interviewee 6 considered VINNOVA as a secondary stakeholder because VINNOVA was not actively involved in the project and their investment was seen as merely financial. Referring to the definition of Wilson et al. (2010, p. 80), this indeed is categorised as a secondary stakeholder since the organisation did not involve directly but affected the outcome of the project. Although other interviewees did not mention whether VINNOVA was a primary or secondary stakeholder, in our opinion, it should be part of the primary stakeholders. As Parmar et al. (2010, p. 412) point out, a primary stakeholder can also be the individual or organisation that provides essential support to the team and to whom the team has to report back with special duties. Being the provider of the fund and the strategic direction of the project (i.e. IT-related solution), VINNOVA played an important role in the project. Placing it as the secondary stakeholder might put the project in jeopardy because it might receive less attention than it should and therefore could influence the success of the project.
End-users
All interviewees agreed that the local citizens living in the neighbourhood were the end-users of the project. They also identified end-users as secondary stakeholders because they were not actively involved throughout the project but only on certain parts of the project such as during the survey application and the testing period of the solution. End-users can be seen as secondary stakeholders because they did not have any formal claim on the project and the project team had no special duties for them (Parmar et al., 2010, p. 412). However, they can also be seen as primary stakeholders since their involvement was essential for the success of the project (Wilson et al., 2010, p. 80). All interviewees had a common understanding that the project aimed to change the recycling behaviour of end-users. This implies that the end-users were an important part of the project, without them the objective could have not been achieved. Moreover since the project was an innovation project, where the view of end-users was considered important for the development of the solution (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2), the end-users should have been engaged more actively (Interviewee 4). In an innovation project, placing the end-users as primary stakeholders could help the team to analyse and engage the end-users at a micro level (Achterkamp & Vos, 2008, p. 753). However, in the case under study, this did not seem to happen. The end-users were not actively engaged (Interview 2; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 4; Interviewee 5). There was a low participation from the end-users in the survey, which resulted in the cancellation of the post implementation survey (Interviewee 3). Additionally, the end-users did not really use the implemented solution (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 4; Interviewee 5).

Customer
According to Interviewee 3, the project team never discussed the identification of the customer of the project. However, he/she mentioned that at that time there was no agreement on a single customer but instead there was a list of potential customers, i.e. the sponsor, the end-users, and the potential buyers of the solution i.e. housing and recycling companies. The interviews with the remaining six interviewees also revealed the claim made by the Interviewee. Each interviewee had a different view of who the customer was. This could have been a problem for the project. As Patanakul and Shenhar (2012, p. 9) argue, identifying the project’s customer is an important part of the project strategy. Similarly, in their model of project success, Shenhar et al. (2001, p. 716) dedicate one of the five success criteria to the customer i.e. ‘impact on customer’. This is understandable because without knowing who the customers are and what their needs are, the project team could not know the required product specifications that might make the customers choose their product among other alternative products (Patanakul & Shenhar, 2012, p. 9).

Other organisations
There are five organisations that fall under this category, i.e. city municipality, IL Recycling, Research Student, Struktur Design, and Avfall Sverige. They are the organisations that had no formal claim or special duty for the project but whose opinion and input were used by the project team (Parmar et al., 2010, p. 412). Therefore they were the secondary stakeholders of the project.

Implications
Although we did not explore how the project team managed the stakeholders, since it is not the focus of the thesis, it is important to note that one of the objectives of stakeholder identification is to provide input to develop a stakeholder management plan (Achterkamp &
Therefore it is an important part of project management (Rose, 2013, p. 3). The interviews however, revealed that the process of identifying project stakeholders is neither straightforward nor easy as also pointed out by Achterkamp and Vos (2008, p. 751) and Parmar et al. (2010, p. 412). For instance, the interviewees had different views on who should be placed on a particular stakeholder category. Furthermore, they also had different views on whether to treat them as primary or secondary stakeholders. Not having common views on the project might have caused the lack of engagement from some of the stakeholders, which in turn could have influenced the success of the project.

As for this thesis, the purpose of the stakeholder identification process is to identify whose views should have been considered for the project success assessment. We limit the scope of our research to study the views of the primary stakeholders. Furthermore, we have decided to narrow down the scope in order to study the views of the partner organisations only.

6.2. Cross Sector Social Partnership

6.2.1. The Presence of Characteristics of Cross Sector Social Partnerships

Common goal with societal agenda
It is evident that the partners’ participation was driven by different agendas. FältCom, USBE, and Bostaden were guided by instrumental motives where they sought to enhance the performance of their organisation through the project (Seitanidi et al, 2010, p. 147). In contrast, UMEVA was guided by the idealistic motive (ibid) of improving the recycling performance. Nevertheless, they were brought together by a common interest under a societal agenda (Selsky & Parker, 2005; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 414; Waddock, 1991). Six of the seven interviewees agreed that the project was part of their sustainable development agenda. Only one Interviewee (Interviewee 5) did not mention the relation of the project with the organisational sustainable development agenda. However, the website of the organisation (Designhögskolan, 2013), shows that ‘sustainability in design’ is one of the research interests of the organisation. In addition, Interviewee 1 from FältCom, the only organisation in the partnership that was purely coming from the business sector, pointed out that the sustainability agenda should be an integral part of the economic endeavour of an organisation. His/her reason behind this claim, as also Freeman and Moutchnik (2013, p. 6) and Porter and Kramer (2006, p. 83) advocate, is that by integrating the sustainable agenda as part of the core business operations, the organisation could create value in a sustainable manner both for the organisation itself and for its stakeholders.

Indivisible Problem
The case under study was seen as part of a bigger initiative i.e. Green Citizens of Europe (Interviewee 6) and Avfallsplan 2020 (Interviewee 7), this implies that the project dealt with an indivisible issue. The problem was relatively big or complex and in order for it to be divisible it must have been approached by several organisations (Waddock, 1991, p. 481; Wilson et al., 2010, p. 78). As Interviewee 6 mentioned, the project goal of the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project was part of Avfallsplan 2020’s goals to be achieved in year 2020. Therefore, it can be inferred that although the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project lasted for 17 months (i.e. May 2011 to September 2012), the project contributed to addressing an indivisible problem although by the time the project was closed the problem was not yet fully addressed (Interviewee 6).
Collaborative and voluntary actions
Interviewee 1, Interviewee 3 and Interviewee 4 pointed out that the project was initiated merely in response to the call from VINNOVA to work on an innovation project in the field of sustainable development. There is no evidence of involuntary involvement such as a need to comply with regulations. Furthermore, having secured the sponsorship, the partners came together and agreed upfront on the assignments of the different parts of the project which directly related with the partners’ main expertise. This outlines not only the voluntary involvement of the partners but also the collaborative nature of the participation.

Resources Commitment
The project involved the partners’ commitment of resources beyond financial aspects include competencies, information, and time. For instance, Designhögskolan utilised its expertise to develop a design for the interactive screen (Interviewee 3; Interviewee 5). Likewise, FältCom used its expertise to transform the design from Designhögskolan into the hardware (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2; Interviewee 3). Similarly, Bostaden provided information about the neighbourhood in which the solution was going to be implemented and UMEVA provided the knowledge and the data on the recycling performance. Finally, USBE used the information from Bostaden to develop the end-users behavioural survey. The above evidence shows that there was an exchange of resources in the partnership and that it was more than a financial exchange (Waddock, 1991, p. 486). In addition, even though VINNOVA provided the fund for the project, the fund was distributed only among the core partners. This implies that although there was no explicit financial investment made by the extended partners, the time invested by the personnel into the project indicated financial investment besides information and expertise (Interviewee 4). In contrast, VINNOVA, as the provider of the fund, was not part of the partnership because their commitment was merely financial (ibid).

Existence of Interdependence
The interdependence characteristic of a cross sector partnership refers to the mutual and reciprocal relationships among the partners (Waddock, 1991, p. 484). The findings revealed that the partner organisations were guided by different motives. For instance, FältCom expected to utilise the outcome of the project to develop new products (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2; Interviewee 3) and USBE expected to utilise the project as a mean to create a network and to collect data for academic research (Interviewee 3). In order to attain these benefits, the partners needed to collaborate with other partners. Indeed, this is similar to the conveyed idea in the resources dependency theory (Seitanidi & Crane, 2009; Selsky & Parker, 2005; McDonald & Young, 2012; Waddock, 1991), which emphasises the need of organisations to cooperate with each other in order to acquire certain resources or capabilities. This can be seen for example, in the need of USBE to work with different organisations to create opportunities, develop relationships and understand other organisations (Interviewee 3). Consequently, without the partnership, each partner would have found it difficult to realise the benefits they expected from the project, and thus interdependencies exist.

Far reaching implications
Considering the expected project benefits, it is evident that the project has far reaching implications. Through the project, FältCom gained knowledge to develop new products and to penetrate new markets other than the one in Umeå (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2). Moreover, since the project was an innovation project, there was a high probability that the product will be further developed in the next iteration of the innovation (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2)
which will in turn contribute to the improved recycling behaviour of the end-users. Considering these far reaching implications, it is understandable why several interviewees (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 2; Interviewee 3) claimed that the availability of lessons gained from the project was one of the main success criteria since it is an important input for the future needs.

6.2.2. The Type of Cross Sector Social Partnership

From one point of view, the project under study can be categorised as bipartite partnership because of the partners coming from two different sectors (Seitanidi & Crane, 2009, p. 414; Selsky & Parker, 2005, p. 854). From the business sector, FältCom, Bostaden, and UMEVA were involved and from the not for profit sector USBE and Designhögskolan. However, considering that UMEVA and Bostaden are fully owned by the city municipality with the aim to provide housing and waste management services to the public, the project can also be seen as a tripartite partnership because the city municipality belongs to the public sector. According to Selsky and Parker (2005, p. 853) there is a need for organisations to perform the role of another sector that is out of the scope of their natural role, this has caused the boundaries between the public and private sectors to become unclear. For instance, non-profit organisations are forced to perform commercial activities due to reduced sponsorships. Similarly, the need to gain public confidence has caused the government to rely more on the private business for delivering public services. Therefore, it is also reasonable to consider Bostaden and UMEVA as part of the public sector since the city municipality directs their business agendas and they aim to provide public services i.e. housing and waste management services to Umeå citizens. In fact, their participation was initiated by the invitation of the city municipality represented by Be Green, and not by the invitation of the core partners (Interviewee 3; Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7).

6.3. Project Success

6.3.1. Success Criteria, Assessment Process, and Assessment Timing

Success criteria came from different perspectives and varied among the participant partners. Although the project manager (Interviewee 1) mentioned that all the partners gathered at the start of the project to discuss the purpose and outcome of the project, our analysis demonstrates that project success criteria remained subjective throughout the project life cycle. This is aligned with the idea that project success remains subjective even if standards are set (Shenhar et al., 1997). It is evident that there was no consensus among the partners on the general success criteria of the project. Some interviewees (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 4; Interviewee 5) focused more on the success criteria that is directly related to their function throughout the project, such as the technical performance of the device after the installation and mentioned that they were unable to define the overall success criteria. However, this is supported by Artto and Dietrich (2007, p. 8) who define technical performance as one of the key aspects of project success. Nevertheless, Interviewee 6 highlighted that success cannot be determined at one point in time, instead it has to be continuously assessed, even after the project closure.

Additionally, all of the interviewees are in line with the idea that project success goes beyond the traditional project management measures (Atkinson, 1999; Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 23,
Literature revealed that project success is not only concerned with cost, time and scope (Freeman & Beale, 1992, p. 10; Müller & Jugdev, 2012, pp. 23, 24). In fact, the interviewees did not mention success criteria based on them. Instead, they argued that the success of the project is associated with dimensions such as impact on customer and preparation for the future (Shenhar et al., 1997; Shenhar et al., 2001). Viewing the end-users needs and preparation for the future are key factors that enable the generation of value.

This denotes that a project can be successful on different levels and within several timeframes. For example, our theoretical frame of reference presents theory that supports this idea through the establishment of change dimensions dependent on time (Shenhar et al., 1997; Shenhar et al., 2001; Shenhar & Dvir, 2007, p. 27). Referring to behaviour, it requires a long timeframe to reach its attainment, and all of the interviewees said that there was little or no change in the behaviour. Interviewee 7 recognised “recycling work is long-term, it requires many years to work and work, you have to take small steps”. This statement suggests the idea that the device should have been left in the recycling room for a longer period in order to frequently assess the change in behaviour or the end-users. It also implies that the effect on the end-users can be seen in the long-term. From our analysis, it seems that the interviewees expected a change in behaviour in a short term. However, regarding networking, Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 3 were motivated by the networking opportunities that might be available to them after the project closure and they expected to gather data that could be used in future research to exploit market opportunities. This success criteria is directly linked to Shenhar & Dvir (2007, p. 30) business success and prepare for the future dimensions with long-term effects.

The combination of findings provided support for the theory of Müller & Jugdev (2012, p. 26) and Arto & Dietrich (2007, p. 8). Table 15 shows the mapping between the four categories that we have identified combined with our analysis of the success criteria of the interviewees. These categories are directly related to the nine success criteria that were identified and previously classified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Organisational Benefits</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FältCom</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USBE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designhögskolan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostaden</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMEVA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Mapping of Success Criteria Categories of The Partner Organisations
Source: Developed by Authors Based on Müller and Jugdev (2012, p. 26)

Moreover, the interviewees were asked whether they considered time, cost and scope as success criteria and none of them mentioned to have used them. They centred their success view on the categories identified above. Therefore, this enables us to refer to a claim that states that using time, cost and scope is considered to be using simple metrics to evaluate only the project management success and not the overall project success (Müller & Jugdev, 2012, p. 23; Shenhar et al., 2001).
There was a significant difference between our proposed theory and one of the findings. The project manager (Interviewee 1) recognised that “if you want good success and make this business work we should have started by considering return over investment (ROI). But unfortunately we did not”. Interestingly, Freeman and Beale (1992, pp. 10-16) suggest that success should be viewed from the financial business performance using ROI and discounted cash flow (DCF) analyses from the viewpoints of a sponsor and a project manager “even though success means different things to different people, a common focus was found on the financial factors (e.g., ROI and DCF analysis) for evaluating the success of a business venture” (Freeman & Beale, 1992, p. 16).

Overall these findings suggest that connections exist between the success criteria, the timing of the project and the role of the organisations in the partnership. This impacts the way that success criteria can be determined based on several dimensions. However, general success criteria were not clear to the interviewees as a common basis for success criteria was not defined, nor common measures were established. These findings contradict the theory that states that in an ideal situation all of the stakeholders should have a common understanding of the requirements of project success, this includes coming to an agreement upon the definition of success criteria and measurements (Davis, 2013, p. 8).

Clearly there is also a need to understand and acknowledge the long-term impact of the success criteria to assess the success of the project. This is central to the success criteria. The success criteria that are based on change in behaviour were the criteria that we considered to be the most influential in the viewpoints of the interviewees. They relied on this criteria measuring it through the cleanliness seen in the pictures, on the fraction of recycling waste and on the lack of user participation in answering the survey, this was considered regardless of the time perspective and the time that the device was left in the room for further analysis of the end-users. From our analysis, it seems that the success criteria that relate to changing the behaviour of people is a continuous process and thus requires a long-term perspective. Hence, this could have been the reason why some interviewees argued that the project was not successful as these criteria were not attained. Nevertheless, short and long-term aspects should be combined as supported in theory (Freeman & Beale, 1992; Müller & Jugdev, 2012; Shenhar et al., 1997; Shenhar et al., 2001; Shenhar & Dvir, 2007).

6.3.2. View about The Overall Project Success

The analysis of the interviews revealed that the partners did not develop a standard framework to assess project success (Shenhar et al., 2001, p. 701). The study also demonstrated that it is hard to identify the relationship between the partners and their perceptions of success. We have distinguished four different perspectives that impact both the project and the organisations.

By analysing such outcomes and relating them to project success criteria and measurement it is clear that different stakeholders used different measures. Consequently, they attribute success to their own perception and not to common project criteria. For example Interviewee 4 and Interviewee 5 were unable to mention whether the device was used or not and whether the behaviour of the users was changed or not. Nevertheless, an agreement was observed concerning the change in behaviour as one of the main success criteria with a high impact on the success of the project. This was one of the characteristics that outline the purpose of the
interactive recycling room project and was not attained. Overall, it was evident that the opinions of all the interviewees did not reflect the traditional perspective of project success based on the time, cost, and scope. Instead, they varied from outcome, organisational benefits, learnings and product perspectives. We can claim that the perspective on success is directly associated to the role of the interviewees. For example, Interviewee 2 had a mixed view of the success of the project with the technical implication of the device and with a business perspective:

“I think the screen that was used in the project was a bit too old. It was kind of out dated, the technology. So I don’t think the screen was that reliable and it needed to be restarted a lot […] I don’t think the end solution is a solution that is saleable”. (Interviewee 2, web developer from a business organisation)

Interviewee 5 was not convinced that the interactive device was the right solution to change the behaviour of the users. Moreover, Interviewee 1, Interviewee 3 and Interviewee 7 focused on a bigger picture of the project by highlighting the new opportunities that were available to them after the project.

“Faltcom is a business company, we sell products and services so we thought that if this was successful then there are a lot of recycle rooms in Sweden or in general so we can use this as a service” (Interviewee 1, project manager from a business organisation)

“Bostaden is the customer to us if they think that this is a good idea, then we can deliver the idea to other customers” (Interviewee 7, recycling expert from a business organisation)

Hence, we noticed that there was no agreement among the stakeholders. This made it difficult for them and us to generalise and have a better grasp of the success perceptions. However, from the established success criteria of the interviewees and our analysis, we can say that project success was viewed with a combination of the four developed categories (outcome, organisational benefits, learnings and product). This is in line with the theory proposed by Shenhar et al. (2001) and Artto and Dietrich (2007, p. 8) which assesses success in multiple dimensions.

One observation was that Interviewee 2 said:

“I think the problem with this project was all the difference stakeholders were too separated”

Similarly, Interviewee 3 mentioned something that could be directly linked to the above comment by Interviewee 2:

“I think it is impossible to measure the project success […]. And that means different stakeholders have different aims and views on what is successful and what is not successful”

Despite the individual interests of each participant organisation, Googins and Rochlin (2000, pp. 138, 139) argue that in order to create value, all partners must work together towards a plan that seeks to meet the individual and common interests through the commitment of their own separate resources. In return, this enables the partners to operate independently from each other to achieve the common goals yet in a dependent relationship which Googins and
Rochlin (2000, p. 139) call symbiotic value creation. According to the theory (ibid) they should “make the assumption that the issue at hand requires joint problem-solving”.

Overall, it seems that the interviewees were overemphasizing short-term outcomes over long-term success. Consequently, the time perspectives for their success criteria were not clear to them. Although they had divergent views about success criteria, most of them viewed the overall project as (partially) successful (see Table 14). This challenges our main assumption which states that a shared understanding on the success of the project by the different stakeholders is needed in order to achieve success (Davis, 2013; Googins & Rochlin, 2000, pp. 133-134).
CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION

7.1. Updated Propositions

The data analysis enabled us to compare and contrast our findings with the theories discussed in the literature review. This has led us to update our initial propositions.

Proposition 1:
The organisations that participate in a cross sector social partnership are motivated to involve in collaborative benefits and/or for a common interest in a social cause.
The findings revealed that out of the five organisations, four were motivated by the collaborative benefits that are linked with the scope of the business of each organisation. In the same manner, all of the organisations were interested in participating due to a common interest in addressing environmental issues in the field of recycling. Therefore, this proposition is confirmed.

Proposition 2:
Time, cost, and scope are not the only project success measures but also the measures based on the benefits or the value the project delivers.
Most of the authors that are included in the theoretical framework point out that the success of modern projects should be measured not only in terms of time, cost, and scope, but also in terms of the value the project delivers to the organisation it serves. This implies that time, cost, and scope should also be also part of the success measures. The findings revealed that success measures were indeed centred on outcome, organisational benefits, and product performance. However, there was no evidence that time, cost, and scope were considered as success measures. Therefore, this proposition needs to be refined.

Proposition 3:
Project success is assessed at multiple points in time.
There is evidence that the success measures were assessed multiple times at different points in time, both during and after the project life. Hence, this proposition is confirmed.

Proposition 4:
Project success measurement reflects the interests of various stakeholders.
There are four categories of success criteria: outcome, product, learning, and organisational benefits. Each criterion reflected the interests of the stakeholder groups: outcome for sponsor and municipality, product for end-users, learning for sponsor and partner organisations, and the benefits for partner organisations. Considering these findings, the proposition is confirmed.

Proposition 5
A common view of stakeholders on project success is required to achieve success.
The findings revealed that despite the fact that the stakeholders have divergent views on project success measures, most interviewees perceived the project as (partially) successful. Therefore, there is not enough evidence to confirm this proposition.
7.2. Answer to The Research Question

This thesis aims to answer how do stakeholders in a cross sector social partnership perceive and assess project success. The propositions have guided us in exploring the areas of investigation in order to answer the research question. We developed the answer to the research question in four areas:

What characteristics of cross sector social partnerships does the project resemble?
The case under study is a tripartite partnership because the partner organisations are from three different sectors, i.e. private, non-profit, and public. Furthermore, it is evident that the project resembles main characteristics of a cross sector partnership. The partners were brought together under a common goal with a societal agenda and participated voluntarily. They came together and committed resources that were more than monetary such as expertise, information, and active participation to deliver results that have far reaching implications. The problem that the partnership aimed to solve was an indivisible problem that is part of the long-term focus of the city municipality. Furthermore, interdependencies were present in the partnership since the benefits that a partner expected out of the project could only be realised with the participation of the other partners.

Who are the stakeholders of the cross sector social partnership?
There are thirteen different groups of stakeholders affected and/or were affected by and/or interested in the project under study. These groups can be categorised into partners, which comprises of core partners and extended partner, sponsor, end-users, customer, and other secondary stakeholders.

What are the project success criteria and how and when are they assessed?
There were multiple criteria in which they could determine whether the project was successful or not. None of the criteria were based on the traditional project management measures i.e. time, cost, and scope. In fact, the criteria relate to four categories centred on outcome, product performance, learning, and organisational benefits to the individual partner organisation. The outcome category refers to the condition when change in the end-users behaviour is achieved. The product performance category refers to the technical performance of the product. Then, the learning category refers to the lessons gained from the project. Finally, the organisational benefits category includes the advantages that the partner organisations obtained from the project.

In regards to the timing, the success criteria are also assessed throughout the lifespan of the project and after the project was closed. During the project life, the success criteria were assessed before and after the implementation of the solution, and during the closure stage. After the project had been closed, there were indications that the success of the project continued to be assessed when they assess the success criteria based on their current endeavours and opportunities. There were also various ways of evaluating project success that ranged from informal ways to more formal ways.

What are the perceptions of the stakeholders on the overall success of the project?
Although not all of the success criteria were met, most of the interviewees considered the project as (partially) successful with learning as the main cited criterion for assessing the
overall success of the project. This might have been because the project was an innovation project in which lessons learned are an important input for the next iteration of the innovation.

Having answered the four questions above, our research question: “How do stakeholders in a cross sector social partnership project perceive and assess project success?” is answered. To conclude, stakeholders had a divergent view of project success. They assessed success in multiple dimensions centred on value creation within several timeframes. This was achieved by applying formal and informal methods of assessment.

7.3. Managerial Implications

This study has yielded findings that can be applicable to other cross sector social partnership projects and serve as a basis for further investigations. However, the study does not provide a framework that can be used as a guideline to define success criteria and measurements. Nevertheless, we believe that this thesis adds value to participants in cross sector social partnerships as the findings emerge from a real case study.

The results of this study highlight the need for a systematic view to reflect the motif of the expected outcome of the partnership. Hence, the study encourages managers and key stakeholders to interrelate all the elements of the cross sector partnership in order to comprehend the interaction among them. Therefore, from this study it is possible to learn that efforts should be made to sync all stakeholders and define common success criteria, in a way that can be measured and communicate it to all the involved partners and keep everyone informed. Moreover, all the involved partners should focus on compromising for the success of the project. Additionally, it is essential that the actors of a cross sector social partnership communicate well and have a shared vision. Although each stakeholder can have different goals and motivation, they should be aligned with one another and with the intended purpose of the partnership. Managers must take into consideration that ongoing communication is central to the partnership.

Another important implication is to consider conducting frequent evaluations for assessing project success throughout the project life cycle and after the project is closed, and not only at the project closure. The analysis of the interviews has raised awareness on the risks of keeping all the stakeholders separated and not actively involved in the project. Considering this, managers should involve all partners in the evaluations and seek to maintain them motivated to pursue the common purpose of the project.

7.4. Theory Implications

This thesis aims to address the research gap on the lack of micro level studies in cross sector social partnership projects and on the challenges organisations face when measuring project success in cross sector social partnerships. We believe that by investigating one case of a tripartite partnership project, we provide in-depth insights that are beneficial for:

- Providing empirical evidence of detailed characteristics and motivations of cross sector social partnerships in the context of a tripartite partnership.
- Providing insights of which success criteria are deemed important for the stakeholders in the context of cross sector social partnerships and innovation projects i.e. the ability to
meet time, cost, and scope requirements is considered less important than success measures that are based on value and benefits delivery.

- Challenging the assumption that a convergent view of project success among the key stakeholders is a critical success factor.

7.5. Strengths and Limitations of The study

This study enabled a better understanding of a complex situation: tripartite cross sector social partnerships. Furthermore, the case study approach provided a platform to analyse a single context in detail. However, the findings of the research are applicable to other real life cross sector social partnership contexts, though the transferability of the findings should be in the same context as in this study i.e. an innovation project delivered through a cross sector social partnership. Additionally, one of the main strengths of this study is the relevance of the theories. This has fostered a holistic analysis of the case study within three theories rather than examining them independently.

The findings are coming from leader organisations in the fields of recycling, sustainable development and research in Umeå where we carried out our research. This enriches our study by yielding reliable findings by being allowed to have access to organisational documents.

We have recognised the factors that limited our research. For example, the participant organisations are Swedish and we do not speak Swedish. Therefore, engaging in an English discussion posed some difficulties. Also most of the provided archival documents are in Swedish and we used Google Translate to change the language. This might have resulted in missing or misunderstanding important information. The ability of the interviewees to provide information was another limitation. Due to the fact that the project under study was closed in September 2012, the interviewees could have found it difficult to provide details about their experience in the project.

Finally, this study does not provide a basis for generalisation but only for ‘analytic generalisation’. However, we acknowledge that the “replication of the same findings by conducting a second or third case study can strengthen the (analytic) generalisation even further” (Yin 2013, p. 325). Thus, in order to be able to generalise further case studies in the same context need to be elaborated.

7.6. Suggestions for Future Research

We believe that the thesis will provide more complete insights of the stakeholders’ views regarding project success through further investigation on the perspectives of the sponsor, customer, and/or end-users regarding project success. The case to be studied however should be from a similar context, which is a cross sector partnership with a societal agenda delivering an innovation project. In this way, the result of the research would be comparable with the result of this thesis. It would be beneficial to check if these stakeholder groups have similar views of project success as the partner organisations, which are related to the outcome, product performance, learning, and organisational benefits. If the results are congruent with this thesis, a better understanding on the areas to focus on when delivering a similar project will be achieved.
In addition, the thesis reveals four groups of success criteria however, as the study shows, they are not always valued in the same manner. Therefore, another suggestion is to investigate which success criterion matters the most in specific points in time. Similar to the previous suggestion for future research, this research should also be conducted under a similar context. Thus, the result can be used to complement the findings from this thesis in order to provide both practitioners and academics in the field of project management with better insights on what to focus on when delivering a project in a cross sector social partnership.
APPENDIX I – INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTERVIEW GUIDE
STAKEHOLDERS’ PERCEPTION ON PROJECT SUCCESS
UMEÅ INTERACTIVE RECYCLING ROOM PROJECT

Introduction (5-10min)
1. Greetings
2. Thank interviewee
3. Introduce Interviewers
4. The purpose of the interview
   • To talk about the interviewee’s experience in the Umeå Interactive Recycling Room project
   • In specific, to discuss about the interviewee’s views in regards to the success evaluation of the project
5. Confidentiality agreement
6. Duration of the interview i.e. one hour
7. Permission for tape-recording

Interview Questions (30-45 min)

Project Definition
1. The ‘why’ – what drove this project or what was the rationale behind it?
2. The ‘why’ – what were the expected benefits out of the project?
3. The ‘why’ – who were the customers of this project?
4. The ‘what’ – what is the specific purpose of the project?
5. The ‘what’ – what is the expected output or product of the project?
6. The ‘how’ – when was the project started and ended?
7. The ‘how’ – what was the budget (if not confidential)?
8. The ‘how’ – how was the project structured (i.e. project organisation)?

Interviewee’s role in the project
9. What was your role in the project? This may be answered when the interviewee answers Question 8.

Stakeholder’s identification and motivations
10. Primary stakeholder – Which groups were involved directly in the project and what were their roles? This may be answered when explaining Question 8.
   • Are there any other groups that were important for the achievement of the project goal?
11. Secondary stakeholders – Which are the groups that were not directly involved (not in the structure) but whose views were considered valuable for the success of project?
   • Considering they were really important, why were they not involved?
12. Motivation – Why did your organisation participate in the project? What was in it for your organisation? What benefits did your organisation expect out of the project?

Project Success

Criteria
13. How do you define project success for this project?
   - In what condition did you determine that the project was successful or not and why?
   - Did you evaluate the success of your project from the cost/time/scope perspectives?
   - Did you agree on the project success criteria when the project was started?
   - Do you have other success criteria?

*Means of Evaluation*
14. Did you evaluate the success criteria of this project?
   - If No: why didn’t you measure it?
   - If No: do you think that it should be measured?
   - If No: How do you think the measurement should be?

15. If yes: What measurement did you apply when evaluating the project success?
   - How did you measure it?

*Timing of Evaluation*
16. When was the project success evaluated and why?
   - Was it before the project was closed, during the closure period, or sometimes after the project was closed?
   - Did you continuously evaluate the project against those criteria?
   - After the project was closed did you consider re-evaluating the success of the project?

*Closing (5 min)*
1. Is there anything else you that would like to comment?
2. Applicable to the Project Manager only: Would it be possible to share with us the project main document such as project proposal, business case, and closure document?
3. Information on the next step:
   - We will be transcribing the recorded interview and send to you for your perusal.
   - We will be analysing the information you and others gave us and submitting the draft of the report in one month. We will be happy to send you a copy of the report if you are interested
4. Thank you for your time
## APPENDIX II – STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Core Partners</th>
<th>Extended Partners</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Other indirect Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 1</td>
<td>FältCom • USBE • Designhögskolan</td>
<td>Bostaden • UMEVA</td>
<td>Sponsor: VINNOVA • Customer: VINNOVA • End-users: Not identified</td>
<td>IL Recycling • Avfall Sverige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 2</td>
<td>FältCom • USBE • Designhögskolan • Bostaden • UMEVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor: VINNOVA • Customer: VINNOVA • End-users: N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 3</td>
<td>FältCom • USBE • Designhögskolan</td>
<td>Bostaden • UMEVA</td>
<td>Sponsor: VINNOVA • Customer: VINNOVA • Potential buyers: (housing &amp; recycling companies) • End-users: Local citizens</td>
<td>Be Green • IL Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 4</td>
<td>FältCom • USBE • Designhögskolan • Bostaden • UMEVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor: VINNOVA • Customer: Bostaden (or potential buyers) • End-users: Local citizens</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 5</td>
<td>FältCom • USBE • Designhögskolan • Bostaden • UMEVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor: VINNOVA • Customer: End-users (local citizen) • End-users: Local citizens</td>
<td>Struktur Design • Research Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 6</td>
<td>FältCom • USBE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor: Not identified • Customer: Not identified • End-users: Local citizens</td>
<td>IL Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Partners</td>
<td>Extended Partners</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Customer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Interviewee 7 | • Designhögskolan  
• Bostaden  
• UMEVA | • FältCom  
• USBE  
• Designhögskolan  
• Bostaden  
• UMEVA | • Not identified | • Bostaden | • Not identified | • Not identified |

*NOTE: Roles and responsibilities of partner organisations were asked only for Interviewee 1 (Project Manager) and Interviewee 3 (Representative from USBE) considering their leadership role in the project and their involvement in the project from the initiation to the post closure of the project.*
## APPENDIX III – SUCCESS CRITERIA CATEGORISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Success Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Evaluation Timing</th>
<th>Evaluation Result</th>
<th>Evidences from Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Improved fraction of recycled trash</td>
<td>Weight trash by the recycling company</td>
<td>Before and after the testing</td>
<td>Delivered little improvement (Interviewee 1, Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7)</td>
<td>Interviewee 1: “We had an idea of a percentage of improvement in the recycling room […] But when we can’t measure it, from week to week or bin to bin it was very difficult to see the improvement. But even if we would have, it wouldn’t have been that much of improvement that we were hoping for.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 6: “[…] not so much [improvement in the fraction of recycled trash] if I remember it rightly”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 7: “No, only a small [improvement] […] Not successful for recycling but successful for learning, Yes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Improved cleanliness of the garbage room</td>
<td>Documented observation (i.e. photo taking and report development)</td>
<td>Before and after the testing</td>
<td>Delivered significant improvement (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 6) but not sustained (Interviewee 6)</td>
<td>Interviewee 1: “Another thing that we thought it was interesting is how it looked in the recycling room […] when we installed the equipment and run the project I was there couple of months after that and it looked very nice and neat in the recycling room […] so that was a big improvement […] We’ve got some before and after pictures.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Available of lessons learned</td>
<td>Development of evaluation report and submission to the project sponsor; Personal evaluation</td>
<td>At the closure; Post closure</td>
<td>Report submitted to the sponsors (Interviewee 1; Interviewee 3; Interviewee 7); lessons are used for internal</td>
<td>Interviewee 1: “This was a project for innovations and if you look at it as an innovation project then you should look more at the end-users and what are they looking for, what are they lacking […] There should be the next step. Because now we know what the end-users need in order to improve”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 7:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Success Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation Process</td>
<td>Evaluation Timing</td>
<td>Evaluation Result</td>
<td>Evidences from Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product</strong></td>
<td>Accepted solution by the end-users (Interviewee 2)</td>
<td>Survey to the end-users (Interviewee 2)</td>
<td>After testing</td>
<td>Did not to see the result therefore unable to determine (Interviewee 2)</td>
<td>“Yes, we learn if it is good for people or not good for people […] we also learn about others, we learned about our customer: Bostaden […] and can take it [the lesson] to another project”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High utilisation of the solution (Interviewee 4)</td>
<td>Unable to identify (Interviewee 4)</td>
<td>Did not know if this was measured but the interviewee was not convinced that this criterion was achieved (Interviewee 4)</td>
<td>Interviewee 2: “For our company, this project would have been successful if the survey shown that the solution is acceptable. It could be the solution that we could sell to other cities”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 4: “[…] this is only my guess. I think we did not really succeed in making this device user friendly… people entering this recycling room they did not quite understand how to use it, it wasn’t working properly […] and the information has to be formed in such a way that it feels inspiring, motivating and so on and I’m not sure that we succeeded in making it all those things”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product</strong></td>
<td>Reliable performance of the solution</td>
<td>Observation (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 7); Using technical platform (Interviewee 2) No formal evaluation</td>
<td>During and after the testing</td>
<td>The performance of the solution was not stable (Interviewee 2; Interviewee 6; Interviewee 7)</td>
<td>Interviewee 2: “We of course have criteria that we can deliver solution that is deployable and that is working physically, that you can use it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee 6: “We have a lot of trouble with the screen. It was not working all the time.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Success Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation Process</td>
<td>Evaluation Timing</td>
<td>Evaluation Result</td>
<td>Evidences from Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Provided solution that change the behaviour in recycling</td>
<td>No structure and formal evaluation</td>
<td>Unable to identified since there is no formal evaluation</td>
<td>The Interviewee acknowledges that there is a report that described about the before and after situation. However, he/she is not sure where the data came from.</td>
<td>Interviewee 5: No quote available since the interview was not tape-recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Developed and tested demonstrator</td>
<td>Observation to the garbage room</td>
<td>After the testing</td>
<td>Demonstrator was installed</td>
<td>Interviewee 3: “I think success criteria is if we will be able to make a demonstrator […] we made the demonstrator, we were also selected by Vinnova to get to other conference or national conference for sustainable cities and to be there to present the results. So if we were totally out of scope, we will not be there and selected.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Benefits</td>
<td>Expanded network for future collaboration</td>
<td>No structure evaluation; based on personal evaluation of the Interviewee</td>
<td>Post closure</td>
<td>Built network, more projects with one of the stakeholders</td>
<td>Interviewee 3: “Today we have been successful because now we have some friends to contact; I have much closer relations to them […] with stakeholder X, I have a lot of works with them now”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Benefits</td>
<td>Availability of data for academic research</td>
<td>Survey on end-users on behavioural change</td>
<td>Before and after testing</td>
<td>Low response of survey</td>
<td>Interviewee 3: “I will end with the project to collect data […] our hope that we will be able to use the data from them to analyse the different in the society […] my hope that with this type of collection, we should be able to work with the data for a couple of years after the project is ended”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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