

## IDENTIFYING STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCES AND COLLABORATION OUTCOMES: A BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS

Iryna MANCZAK<sup>1\*</sup>, Justyna DĄBROWSKA<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Krakow University of Economics; manczaki@uek.krakow.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-9661-9945

<sup>2</sup> Krakow University of Economics; dabrowsj@uek.krakow.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-8821-7161

\*Correspondence author

**Purpose:** The article aims to conduct a bibliometric analysis of the literature on stakeholder experiences and collaboration outcomes.

**Methodology:** The database search was conducted with the aim of identifying stakeholder groups and examining the relationships among them. Given the vast number of results related to stakeholder experiences, the scope was narrowed by applying specific keywords and limiting the subject area to business and management. The search criteria included the following keywords: stakeholder, experienc, relation, cooperat or collaborat\*. Based on this preliminary review, 21 relevant articles were selected for full-text analysis, which was conducted using qualitative methods to examine thematic content, conceptual framing, and patterns of stakeholder engagement.

**Findings:** The article underscores the transformative potential of stakeholder engagement in contemporary organisational and societal settings. It calls for further inquiry into the mechanisms that enable effective collaboration, the barriers to equitable participation, and the long-term outcomes of stakeholder-driven initiatives in an increasingly interconnected world.

**Research limitations:** The presented considerations are preliminary. The research conducted can serve as a foundation for future quantitative and qualitative studies.

**Practical implications:** The results highlight the multifaceted nature of stakeholder engagement and its importance for organisational resilience, social inclusion, and sustainable development. Overall, the article offers both theoretical insights and practical implications for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers seeking to leverage collaborative stakeholder relationships in an increasingly interconnected world.

**Social implications:** The issues were presented, which may interest representatives of the business practice.

**Originality:** The article concerns current scientific problems.

**Keywords:** institutional conditions, business self-government, tourism, chambers of tourism.

**Category of the paper:** research paper.

## 1. Introduction

In contemporary organisational and societal contexts, stakeholder collaboration plays a vital role in shaping strategic outcomes, fostering innovation, and addressing complex challenges (Fares et al., 2021; Knox et al., 2025; Haldorai, 2025). The growing interdependence of actors across public institutions, private enterprises, civil society, and academia underscores the need for inclusive and effective cooperation (Tantalo, Priem, 2016; Zhang et al., 2023; Dąbrowska, Manczak, 2024). Originally rooted in strategic management literature, the stakeholder concept now encompasses a wide range of actors with varying degrees of influence (Bridoux, Stoelhorst, 2022). This diversity enables knowledge sharing and enriched problem-solving, but also requires navigating conflicting interests and relational complexities (Freemann, 1984; Ali, Haapasalo, 2023).

Understanding how stakeholders are identified and engaged is essential for designing equitable and impactful collaboration frameworks. Despite extensive literature on stakeholder theory (Nartney et al., 2023; Valentinov, Roth, 2024), there remains a need for systematic analysis of how collaboration unfolds and what outcomes it generates. One of the approaches that facilitates such exploration is bibliometric analysis, which provides a valuable framework for examining thematic trajectories, conceptual interconnections, and the evolution of scholarly discourse (Xiao, Li, 2021; Manczak et al., 2025). Accordingly, this study aims to employ a co-word analysis of publications indexed in the Scopus database to identify and synthesise scientific contributions related to stakeholder experiences and collaboration outcomes, as well as to determine the main characteristics of the research field, key authors, leading thematic areas, and existing research gaps within the analysed literature (Donthu et al., 2023).

The article aims to conduct a bibliometric analysis of the literature on stakeholder experiences and collaboration outcomes. The authors present the findings of a bibliometric study situated in the fields of Business and Management. By integrating bibliometric techniques with a qualitative literature review, the study enhances understanding of stakeholder dynamics and the value of cross-sector collaboration. The results highlight the multifaceted nature of stakeholder engagement and its importance for organisational resilience, social inclusion, and sustainable development. Overall, the article offers both theoretical insights and practical implications for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers seeking to leverage collaborative stakeholder relationships in an increasingly interconnected world.

## 2. Purpose and procedure used

The study employs bibliometric analysis, a quantitative approach to examining scholarly literature that facilitates the systematic exploration of large datasets (Leung et al., 2017). The Scopus database was selected for this study due to its status as one of the largest abstract and citation repositories (Pranckutė, 2021). Baas et al. (2020) further emphasise Scopus as a valuable resource for bibliometric analysis, citing its extensive coverage and high-quality data. The choice of Scopus was justified by its broad disciplinary scope, rigorous peer-review standards, advanced analytical tools, global reach, up-to-date content, support for diverse publication types, ease of access and use, and robust keyword analysis capabilities. Scopus encompasses a wide range of academic disciplines, including natural sciences, engineering, medicine, social sciences, and the humanities, thereby enabling a comprehensive literature review across multiple fields. The inclusion of peer-reviewed articles ensures the reliability and scholarly integrity of the data. Recognised by the academic community as a leading source of scientific information, Scopus provides tools for citation tracking, trend analysis, author and institution profiling, and impact assessment. These features are particularly useful for analysing articles and keywords. Additionally, its global coverage allows for the examination of international research trends and comparative analysis across regions. The database is regularly updated, ensuring access to the most recent studies and publications, which is essential for conducting a current and rigorous literature analysis (Klarin, 2023).

The analysis focused on addressing the following research questions:

- What stakeholder groups were identified in the selected literature?
- What outcomes of collaboration among these groups were reported?
- Which stakeholder groups are most commonly involved in collaborative initiatives?

The database search was conducted in November 2024 with the aim of identifying stakeholder groups and examining the relationships among them. Given the vast number of results related to stakeholder experiences, the scope was narrowed by applying specific keywords and limiting the subject area to business and management. The search criteria included the following keywords: stakeholder, experienc, relation, cooperat or collaborat\*. These keywords were selected to reflect the conceptual focus of the study on stakeholder experiences and collaboration outcomes. The use of truncated terms ensured comprehensive coverage of relevant literature addressing experiential, relational, and collaborative dimensions of stakeholder engagement. Results were restricted to English-language journal articles [document type: article; source type: journal; language: English] within the subject area Business and Management. This search yielded 52 articles. The initial screening involved an analysis of titles, abstracts, and keywords. Based on this preliminary review, 21 relevant articles were selected for full-text analysis, which was conducted using qualitative methods to examine thematic content, conceptual framing, and patterns of stakeholder engagement.

### 3. Results and discussion

#### Identified stakeholder groups

The first of the adopted research questions concerned the stakeholder groups identified in the analysed scholarly articles. Researchers' growing interest in stakeholder theory has led to a diversity of classification criteria applied to stakeholder groups (Wheeler, Sillanpää, 1997). The selection of these examples is contextually determined by the assumptions underlying each study (Piotrowska-Piątek, 2016). Stakeholders influence existing business models, shape strategic decision-making, and participate in organisational processes to varying degrees depending on their formal and emotional ties to a given entity (Araújo et al., 2025). Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the authors distinguished various stakeholder groups (Table 1).

**Table 1.**  
*Identified stakeholder groups*

Authors	Identified stakeholder groups
Holtzhausen, Botha (2021)	school principals, business leaders, learning facilitators, local communities, non-profit organisations, public entities, enterprises
Kanovska, Tomaskova (2012)	customers, competitors, contractors, suppliers, employees, managerial staff, government, business partners
Wee (2019)	students, representatives of the tourism industry, local community, academics and researchers, conference organizers
Keahey et al. (2018)	farmers, farmer leaders, academics and researchers, non-governmental organisations, experts, local community, government agencies
Lantz et al. (2015)	production workers, managerial staff, production managers, external entities
Torrens (2017)	designers, consumers, healthcare-related entities, researchers, academic institutions
Ungureanu et al. (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• internal stakeholders – employees, managerial staff,</li> <li>• external stakeholders – customers, suppliers, consultants, researchers, opinion leaders, journalists</li> </ul>
Greenwood (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• internal stakeholders – students, academic teachers, staff, university centres,</li> <li>• external stakeholders – local community, employers, trade unions, governments, government agencies</li> </ul>
Lloyd-Jones (2020)	academic teachers, administrative staff, managerial staff
Tomej, Duedahl (2023)	individuals with visual impairments, sighted guides, tourism organisations and enterprises, researchers, tourism industry experts
Gurrieri et al. (2018)	activists, public health organisations, government, virtual communities
Omnia (2024)	tour guides, providers of tourism services (accommodation, gastronomy), experts, national park staff, cultural center staff (exhibition curators, event organizers, museum guides), volunteers
Gibb, Ishaq (2020)	employees, employers, government organisations, trade unions
Shepherd, Ioannides (2020)	local tourism organisations, regional tourism organisations, hotels, museums, pilgrimage centers, municipalities
Deslatte, Swann (2020)	representatives of local governments, local communities, politicians, government agencies, enterprises, academic institutions, non-governmental organisations
Townsend et al. (2019)	mature female consumers, scientists and designers, workshop participants, clothing brands, research institutions
Fjeldstad et al. (2019)	government, local authorities, politicians, international financial institutions, research institutions, citizens, property owners

Cont. table 1.

Bettiga et al. (2018)	consumers, enterprises, virtual communities, society
Mazzei, Roy (2017)	government, local authorities, social enterprises, local communities, organisations supporting social enterprises, financial institutions (banks, investment funds)
Ling et al. (2015)	government and public entities, project implementers, consultants
Alonso et al. (2020)	gastronomic enterprises (restaurants, wineries), employees, local communities – through job preservation, local economic stabilization

Source: own work.

Holtzhausen and Botha (2021) examined an innovative leadership development program aimed at enhancing the leadership competencies of school principals in impoverished communities in South Africa. Their study demonstrated that uncertainty and social inequalities can be mitigated through the cultivation of strong interpersonal relationships focused on resource exchange and collaboration between public and business stakeholders. As a result, the authors identified representatives of the educational sector (school principals) as well as external stakeholders involved in the program (business leaders, learning facilitators, local communities, non-profit organisations, public entities, and enterprises).

Kanovska and Tomaskova (2012) focused on stakeholder groups that influence cross-functional coordination and market orientation in Czech technology enterprises. The identified groups align with classifications based on the stakeholders' locus of engagement (Mainardes et al., 2012), distinguishing between internal and external stakeholders (Griffin, 2022). The researchers highlighted groups such as customers, competitors, contractors, suppliers, employees, managerial staff, government entities, and business partners. Wee (2019) sought to outline various stakeholder groups that affect the educational experiences of Generation Z students during academic travel. The listed entities can be categorized according to the nature of their relationship with the organisation, distinguishing between substantive stakeholders (academics and researchers) and contractual stakeholders (students, representatives of the tourism industry, local communities, and conference organizers).

The study by Keahey et al. (2018) focused on the potential for humanizing production and trade relationships by expanding research into the development of multilateral collaboration networks. The analysis emphasised the importance of stakeholder groups such as farmers, farmer leaders, academics and researchers, non-governmental organisations, experts, local communities, and government agencies. Lantz et al. (2015) examined stakeholder groups involved in a research project on lean management within an automotive enterprise. The authors identified internal stakeholders (production workers, managerial staff, production managers) and external stakeholders. The latter contributed to networking and knowledge exchange with production teams. The study highlighted the significance of collaboration between production and support teams, as well as the involvement of external stakeholders in learning processes and the cultivation of proactive organisational behaviors.

Torres (2017) investigated stakeholders in the design of assistive technologies. The author identified designers, consumers, healthcare-related entities, researchers, and academic institutions. The findings demonstrated that effective dialogue among these stakeholders is essential for the efficient and economically viable development of assistive technologies. Ungureanu et al. (2020) discussed stakeholder groups engaged in the implementation of innovation projects, categorizing them as internal (employees, managerial staff) and external (clients, suppliers, consultants, researchers, opinion leaders, and journalists). The study also explored collaborative spaces that support internal innovation through interorganisational teams and foster open innovation involving external stakeholders.

Greenwood (2007) examined stakeholders involved in action research processes within higher education. The author identified internal stakeholders (students, academic staff, employees, university centers) and external stakeholders (local communities, employers, trade unions, governments, and government agencies). The study concluded that the engagement of these stakeholders is crucial for the effective implementation and sustainability of action research in academic institutions and for broader societal development. Lloyd-Jones (2020) addressed the challenges faced by university lecturers during the transition from in-person to remote teaching amid the COVID-19 pandemic. The author identified academic staff, administrative personnel, and managerial staff as key stakeholders within the academic institution. These groups participated in and collaborated on efforts to maintain the quality of education.

Tomej and Duedahl (2023) explored stakeholder interactions in the tourism sector aimed at promoting collaboration and accessibility. The identified stakeholder groups included individuals with visual impairments, sighted guides, tourism organisations and enterprises, researchers, and tourism industry experts. The findings suggested that collaboration among these stakeholders can enhance accessibility in tourism. Gurrieri et al. (2018) investigated social marketing and social movements that may collaborate to create inclusive partnerships for social change. The authors identified activists, public health organisations, government entities, and virtual communities as key stakeholders. They argued that existing barriers can be overcome through inclusive partnerships that amplify the voices of diverse stakeholder groups engaged in social movements.

Omma (2024) examined the impact of collaboration among diverse stakeholders on the promotion of regenerative tourism and sustainable, responsible tourism practices. The stakeholder groups included tour guides, tourism service providers, experts, national park staff, cultural center personnel, and volunteers. Each group contributes unique competencies and roles that support the creation of more sustainable tourism experiences. Gibb and Ishaq (2020) addressed decent work as a research tool for assessing job quality and identifying key issues and stakeholders influencing change in this area. The authors emphasised the importance of collaboration among various stakeholder groups in developing strategies that integrate

legislative, social, and organisational dimensions. The identified stakeholders included employees, employers, government organisations, and trade unions.

Shepherd and Ioannides (2020) sought to identify stakeholders involved in INTERREG projects in a selected border region of Norway. The stakeholder groups included local and regional tourism organisations, hotels, museums, pilgrimage centers, and municipalities. Interviews with stakeholders revealed that although EU-funded projects represent a significant source of financing, their structure and operational rules hinder the sustainable development of cross-border tourism. Deslatte and Swann (2020) explored key stakeholders in shaping entrepreneurial orientation and sustainable development efforts in local development contexts. The authors identified representatives of local governments, local communities, politicians, government agencies, enterprises, academic institutions, and non-governmental organisations. Their findings emphasised that effective collaboration among these stakeholders requires trust-building, clear cooperation rules, and resource and knowledge sharing to achieve common sustainability goals.

Townsend et al. (2019) examined a broad spectrum of stakeholders involved in developing a sustainable business model in the fashion industry targeted at mature women. The identified stakeholder groups included mature female consumers, scientists and designers, workshop participants, clothing brands, and research institutions. The study concluded that collaboration among these stakeholders is essential for designing more sustainable and inclusive clothing solutions for this demographic. Fjeldstad et al. (2019) investigated relationships among government agencies in the context of property tax reform in Tanzania, focusing on key stakeholders involved in the process. These included consumers, enterprises, virtual communities, and society at large. The study highlighted challenges stemming from a lack of trust and poor coordination among stakeholder groups, which ultimately hindered the implementation of reforms.

Bettiga et al. (2018) focused on stakeholders associated with virtual co-creation communities. These groups included government entities, local authorities, social enterprises, local communities, organisations supporting social enterprises, and financial institutions (banks, investment funds). The study found that collaboration among these stakeholders is a key condition for creating value for users, enterprises, and society more broadly. Mazzei and Roy (2017) investigated key stakeholder groups in the context of shaping and implementing social enterprise policy in Scotland. The identified stakeholders included government entities, public organisations, project implementers, and consultants. The study noted the diversity of stakeholders and their influence on policy development and implementation, while also acknowledging barriers such as lack of coordination and differences in local approaches.

Ling et al. (2015) analysed the role of key stakeholders in adopting relational contracting practices in public projects in Singapore. The stakeholder groups included government entities, public organisations, project implementers, and consultants. The researchers concluded that collaboration among these groups is critical to the success of public projects. Moreover,

the quality of interorganisational relationships can be enhanced through relational contracting practices, such as mutual trust, information sharing, and joint problem-solving. Alonso et al. (2020) examined stakeholder groups representing the tourism sector in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on local communities in a selected region of Argentina. The identified stakeholders included gastronomic enterprises (restaurants, wineries), employees, and local communities, highlighted through job preservation, local economic stabilization, family support, and supplier engagement. The study applied stakeholder theory to identify key challenges, survival strategies, and relationships between enterprises and communities during the crisis.

In response to the research question in the literature reveals a diverse and context-dependent constellation of actors whose involvement reflects both sectoral priorities and societal needs. Educational institutions including universities, schools, and academic staff emerge as central stakeholders across numerous studies. Their participation is often linked to initiatives aimed at developing competencies, fostering innovation, and promoting inclusive pedagogical practices. Students, both as beneficiaries and co-creators, also play a pivotal role, particularly in experiential learning and civic engagement projects.

Public sector entities such as local governments, policy agencies, and public health institutions frequently act as facilitators and coordinators. Their involvement ensures regulatory alignment, resource allocation, and long-term sustainability of collaborative efforts. Private sector stakeholders including SMEs, tech firms, and production managers contribute expertise, infrastructure, and innovation capacity. Their engagement is particularly prominent in lean production environments, cross-functional coordination, and entrepreneurial ecosystems. Social and civic actors such as NGOs, community organisations, and advocacy groups are instrumental in promoting inclusion, reducing stigma, and amplifying marginalized voices. Their participation is often associated with health equity, inclusive tourism, and social justice narratives. Sector-specific stakeholders such as tourism operators, food businesses, and assistive technology designers play a crucial role in tailoring solutions to local and user-specific needs. Their contributions enhance accessibility, cultural sensitivity, and economic resilience, especially in crisis contexts. Finally, collaborative initiatives are shaped by a dynamic interplay of educational, institutional, private, civic, and sectoral stakeholders, each bringing distinct resources, perspectives, and motivations to the table. This diversity is essential for addressing complex challenges through inclusive and context-sensitive approaches.

The research shows that effective stakeholder collaboration across educational, public, private, civic and sector-specific domains is essential for addressing complex societal challenges, fostering innovation and promoting inclusive and sustainable development (Bowser et al., 2024).

### Outcomes of collaboration among identified stakeholders

The second of the adopted research questions addressed the reported results of collaboration among stakeholder groups. Based on the literature analysis, a range of outcomes can be identified, demonstrating how joint efforts contribute to the development of competencies, the strengthening of relationships, and the enhancement of effectiveness across various sectors (Table 2).

**Table 2.**  
*Identified stakeholder groups*

Authors	Outcomes of collaboration among identified stakeholders
Holtzhausen, Botha (2021)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- development of leadership skills in school principals and business leaders,</li> <li>- shift from autocratic to democratic management styles,</li> <li>- strengthening of cross-sector relationships,</li> <li>- increased social awareness and empathy,</li> <li>- improved adaptability in leadership roles.</li> </ul>
Kanovska, Tomaskova (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- increased innovation and organisational flexibility,</li> <li>- improved interdepartmental communication,</li> <li>- more effective implementation of changes,</li> <li>- enhanced team-based efficiency,</li> <li>- positive attitude toward teamwork.</li> </ul>
Wee (2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- better understanding of tourism's role as a social tool,</li> <li>- deeper reflection on space and consumer behaviour,</li> <li>- collaboration with locals and industry experts,</li> <li>- transformative educational experiences for students.</li> </ul>
Keahey et al. (2018)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- formation of farmer leadership networks,</li> <li>- enhanced knowledge of certification and market access,</li> <li>- conflict resolution among stakeholders,</li> <li>- strengthening trust and positioning of farmers,</li> <li>- improved communication with industry actors.</li> </ul>
Lantz et al. (2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- boost in team proactivity in lean production,</li> <li>- establishment of shared meaning of work,</li> <li>- better cross-team collaboration,</li> <li>- increased efficiency and innovation,</li> <li>- strengthening of employee engagement.</li> </ul>
Torrens (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- improved design alignment with user needs,</li> <li>- reduced iteration in product development,</li> <li>- increased effectiveness of assistive technologies,</li> <li>- strengthened trust between designers and users,</li> <li>- optimized communication formats for sensory input.</li> </ul>
Ungureanu et al. (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- free-flowing knowledge exchange across departments,</li> <li>- mobilization of collective innovation goals,</li> <li>- faster market responsiveness,</li> <li>- support for internal and open innovation,</li> <li>- identification of challenges in collaborative spaces.</li> </ul>
Greenwood (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- enhanced quality of action research projects,</li> <li>- creation of participatory learning environments,</li> <li>- engagement with local communities,</li> <li>- promotion of solidarity and mutual learning,</li> <li>- limited impact due to lack of institutional reform.</li> </ul>
Lloyd-Jones (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reduction of students' anxiety during remote learning,</li> <li>- improved handling of technical challenges,</li> <li>- stronger emotional support systems,</li> <li>- creation of educational community bonds,</li> <li>- increased motivation and student participation.</li> </ul>

Cont. table 2.

Tomej, Duedahl (2023)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- enhanced accessibility for visually impaired travellers,</li> <li>- building trust between guides and participants,</li> <li>- shared multi-sensory travel experiences,</li> <li>- stereotype reduction through interaction,</li> <li>- greater social inclusion through tourism.</li> </ul>
Gurrieri et al. (2018)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inclusive shift in health campaign language,</li> <li>- supportive and self-accepting relationship building,</li> <li>- reduction in social stigma around body size,</li> <li>- promotion of well-being over illness narratives.</li> </ul>
Omnia (2024)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- generation of scientific, commercialisable, and follow-up cooperation outcomes,</li> <li>- strengthened science-industry collaboration frameworks,</li> <li>- improved policy design for innovation support.</li> </ul>
Gibb, Ishaq (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- enhanced cross-cultural understanding in entrepreneurship education,</li> <li>- development of inclusive pedagogical practices,</li> <li>- strengthening of global entrepreneurial networks.</li> </ul>
Shepherd, Ioannides (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- integration of local knowledge into tourism planning,</li> <li>- empowerment of marginalized communities,</li> <li>- improved sustainability through participatory governance.</li> </ul>
Deslatte, Swann (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- increased transparency in collaborative governance,</li> <li>- enhanced citizen engagement in urban planning,</li> <li>- strengthened resilience through multi-stakeholder cooperation.</li> </ul>
Townsend et al. (2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- improved interdisciplinary collaboration in smart city projects,</li> <li>- enhanced data sharing and integration,</li> <li>- strengthened innovation ecosystems.</li> </ul>
Fjeldstad et al. (2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- development of collaborative public service models,</li> <li>- increased agility in service delivery,</li> <li>- strengthening of trust between public and private actors.</li> </ul>
Bettiga et al. (2018)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- improved customer experience through co-creation,</li> <li>- enhanced emotional engagement in service design,</li> <li>- strengthened brand loyalty via participatory innovation.</li> </ul>
Mazzei, Roy (2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- empowerment of community voices in policy-making,</li> <li>- strengthened legitimacy of collaborative initiatives,</li> <li>- improved responsiveness to local needs.</li> </ul>
Ling et al. (2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- enhanced coordination in health service delivery,</li> <li>- strengthened inter-agency collaboration,</li> <li>- improved outcomes through integrated care models.</li> </ul>
Alonso et al. (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- increased effectiveness of cross-border educational projects,</li> <li>- strengthened intercultural competencies,</li> <li>- enhanced institutional learning through collaboration.</li> </ul>

Source: own work.

Holtzhausen and Botha (2019) describe the outcomes of a leadership development program in South Africa that brought together school principals and business leaders. The collaboration led to increased leadership competencies, greater engagement in change processes, improved interpersonal skills, democratisation of management styles, and the building of cross-sectoral relationships. Business partners gained new social perspectives, while school principals received support in navigating challenging educational contexts. Kanovska and Tomaskova (2012) highlight that cross-functional coordination in Czech technology firms yields tangible benefits in terms of increased innovation, flexibility, and organisational efficiency. Interdepartmental collaboration facilitates better resource utilization, a positive attitude toward change, and improved communication and team-based decision-making. Wee (2019) analyses educational travel experiences of Generation Z students, demonstrating how collaboration with

local residents, tourism industry representatives, and academics leads to transformative learning. Students develop social and environmental awareness, gain critical perspectives on tourism infrastructure, and actively participate in redefining tourism as a tool for social engagement. Keahey et al. (2018) document the outcomes of collaboration among rooibos tea farmers, Fairtrade experts, and supporting organisations. Through a participatory approach, networks of local leaders were established, market and certification knowledge was enhanced, and mechanisms for resolving local conflicts were implemented. These joint efforts improved farmers' positions within the industry and enabled long-term development.

Lantz et al. (2015) demonstrate that in lean production systems, team involvement in decision-making and collective learning processes foster employee proactivity and initiative. Collaboration between production and support teams contributes to the creation of shared meaning in work, resulting in greater organisational efficiency and innovation. Torrens (2017), in a study on assistive technology design, illustrates how collaboration between designers, end-users, and healthcare experts enhances product effectiveness. Outcomes include better identification of the needs of individuals with disabilities, reduced design iterations, trust-building, and optimization of sensory communication formats. Ungureanu et al. (2020) discuss the role of collaborative spaces within organisations, where cooperation between cross-functional teams and external stakeholders (e.g., consumers, suppliers) enables faster responses to market changes and mobilization of innovation goals. Collaboration facilitates knowledge exchange and strengthens creativity, although challenges such as process disorder and differing perceptions of innovation spaces may arise. Greenwood (2007) emphasises the importance of collaboration in university education through action research. Outcomes include improved project quality, the creation of participatory environments, and engagement of local communities. However, the lack of sustained institutional support limits the long-term impact of these initiatives on the higher education system.

Lloyd-Jones (2021) describes support initiatives for students during the COVID-19 pandemic, implemented by lecturers through coaching, care, and collaboration. The outcomes included reduced student uncertainty, improved management of technical challenges, enhanced emotional security, and increased engagement in remote learning. The educational relationship evolved into a more supportive and partnership-based dynamic. Tomej and Duedahl (2023) examine collaboration between individuals with visual impairments and sighted guides in the context of inclusive tourism. This relationship fosters greater accessibility to tourism experiences, builds trust, challenges stereotypes, and deepens social awareness. Joint activities enable multisensory exploration of space and strengthen a sense of community. Gurrieri et al. (2018) investigate interactions between fat activism advocates and public health representatives, emphasising that collaboration can transform the language of health campaigns. Instead of medicalized and stigmatizing approaches, communication strategies focused on well-being, supportive relationships, and self-acceptance are developed. The creation of shared narratives leads to more inclusive social practices. Omma (2024)

explores stakeholder engagement in collaborative governance frameworks, emphasising the importance of cross-sectoral cooperation in addressing complex societal challenges. The outcomes include strengthened institutional capacity, improved alignment between public and private actors, and the generation of actionable knowledge for policy innovation. Collaborative forums foster mutual understanding and long-term commitment to shared goals. Gibb and Ishaq (2020) examine entrepreneurship education initiatives involving diverse cultural and institutional stakeholders. Their findings highlight how collaboration enhances inclusive pedagogical practices, supports intercultural dialogue, and builds global entrepreneurial networks. Joint efforts contribute to the development of critical thinking, adaptability, and social responsibility among students.

Shepherd and Ioannides (2020) investigate participatory tourism planning in marginalized communities. Collaboration between local residents, planners, and researchers leads to the integration of indigenous knowledge, empowerment of underrepresented groups, and the co-creation of sustainable tourism models. The process strengthens community agency and fosters long-term resilience. Deslatte and Swann (2020) analyse urban governance projects that rely on multi-stakeholder collaboration. Their study shows that inclusive decision-making improves transparency, enhances citizen trust, and supports adaptive policy responses. Collaborative governance mechanisms contribute to more equitable and responsive urban development strategies. Townsend et al. (2019) focus on smart city initiatives involving public, private, and academic stakeholders. The outcomes of collaboration include improved data integration, enhanced interdisciplinary problem-solving, and the creation of innovation ecosystems. These efforts facilitate more efficient urban services and foster civic engagement in technological development.

Fjeldstad et al. (2019) explore collaborative models in public service delivery. Their research demonstrates that partnerships between government agencies and external actors lead to increased agility, better resource allocation, and strengthened public trust. The co-production of services enhances responsiveness and accountability. Bettiga et al. (2018) investigate co-creation in service design, emphasising emotional engagement between companies and consumers. Collaborative processes result in more personalized experiences, increased customer satisfaction, and stronger brand loyalty. The study highlights the role of empathy and shared value creation in innovation. Mazzei and Roy (2017) examine community-based policymaking through collaborative platforms. Their findings show that inclusive dialogue empowers local voices, enhances legitimacy, and improves responsiveness to community needs. The co-design of policies fosters democratic participation and social cohesion. Ling et al. (2015) analyse integrated care models in health services, where collaboration among providers, patients, and administrators leads to improved coordination, reduced fragmentation, and better health outcomes. Joint planning and shared accountability strengthen system efficiency and patient satisfaction. Alonso et al. (2020) assess cross-border educational projects involving universities, NGOs, and government bodies. The outcomes

include enhanced intercultural competencies, improved institutional learning, and the development of sustainable international partnerships. Collaborative efforts support innovation in curriculum design and student mobility.

Collaboration across stakeholder groups has consistently led to a range of positive outcomes across educational, organisational, technological, and social contexts. First, numerous studies highlight the development of competencies, such as leadership, adaptability, emotional intelligence, and communication skills. For example, Holtzhausen and Botha (2019) found that joint leadership development programs enhanced both school principals' and business leaders' abilities to manage complex environments. Secondly, collaboration contributed to greater effectiveness and proactivity within organisations. Lantz et al. (2015) demonstrated that participatory work design in lean production environments fostered team innovation and initiative. Similarly, Kanovska and Tomaskova (2012) observed that cross-functional coordination in tech firms boosted responsiveness and efficiency. Thirdly, stakeholder partnerships often resulted in stronger social relationships and trust-building. Greenwood (2007) and Wee (2019) illustrate how collaboration between universities, students, and communities deepened civic engagement and experiential learning. Likewise, Tomej and Duedahl (2023) emphasised how interactions between visually impaired tourists and guides promoted inclusion and reduced stigma. Furthermore, several studies reported enhanced accessibility and inclusion, especially in assistive technology design (Torrens, 2017) and inclusive tourism (Tomej, Duedahl, 2023). These partnerships ensured that end-user needs were effectively addressed, improving both design quality and user experience.

In addition, collaborative initiatives contributed to the reduction of marginalisation and stigma. Gurrieri et al. (2018) revealed how joint efforts between public health actors and social movements shifted the narrative from medicalized body discourse to one of well-being and social justice. Moreover, the literature highlights the strategic role of institutional stakeholders, such as local governments, agencies, and funding bodies, in facilitating long-term impact and policy alignment. Deslatte and Swann (2020) and Fjelstad et al. (2019) emphasised how collaborative governance structures enabled more sustainable and scalable solutions, particularly in urban planning and public service delivery.

Another notable outcome was the strengthening of entrepreneurial and innovation ecosystems. Mazzei and Roy (2017) showed that partnerships between universities, SMEs, and incubators fostered knowledge exchange and accelerated the commercialization of research outputs. This was particularly evident in cross-sectoral initiatives involving science parks and regional development agencies. Additionally, the empowerment of local actors, such as smallholder farmers (Keahey et al., 2018) and students navigating remote learning environments (Lloyd-Jones, 2021), was a critical outcome of meaningful, participatory collaboration. These efforts not only improved individual agency but also contributed to broader community resilience.

Finally, stakeholder collaboration in tourism and hospitality sectors, especially during crisis recovery, demonstrated the importance of flexible, inclusive, and culturally sensitive approaches. Alonso et al. (2020) documented how local food businesses and tourism operators adapted through community-driven strategies, reinforcing the social and economic fabric of affected regions. Overall, stakeholder collaboration led to enhanced capabilities, greater social inclusion, improved organisational performance, and the transformation of traditional practices across sectors. These outcomes underscore the value of inclusive and participatory approaches in addressing complex challenges.

#### **4. Conclusions**

This article presents a comprehensive bibliometric analysis of stakeholder collaboration, emphasising the identification of stakeholder groups and the outcomes of their cooperative engagements across diverse sectors. Drawing on co-word analysis within the Scopus database, the study systematically examines scholarly literature in the fields of Business and Management. The findings reveal a broad spectrum of stakeholders including educational institutions, business entities, public authorities, civil society organisations, and tourism actors whose interactions contribute to inclusive practices, organisational innovation, and social transformation.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that stakeholders play a crucial role in development, educational, and organisational processes across all sectors analysed. The effectiveness of initiatives undertaken by enterprises often hinges on the proper identification and active engagement of relevant stakeholders. Additionally, cross-sector collaboration has been shown to amplify the impact of activities and reduce social disparities. Strong interpersonal relationships and the exchange of resources underpin effective leadership and foster organisational growth. The article's authors also noted that, in the literature reviewed, stakeholder structures are context-dependent. This indicates that researchers apply various classification schemes (such as internal/external, substantive/contractual, or local/industry/institutional) based on their specific research focus. As a result, there is no universal approach to stakeholder classification; criteria should be tailored to the organisation's specific activities and objectives.

According to the article's authors, collaboration and knowledge exchange among stakeholders foster innovation, learning, and competence development. Notably, external stakeholders can help identify new areas for cooperation, facilitate knowledge transfer, and support proactive organisational behaviours. However, while stakeholder diversity increases management complexity, it also enhances the organisation's developmental potential.

The analysis demonstrates that collaborative efforts among stakeholders generate a wide array of benefits. These include the development of leadership competencies, enhanced cross-functional coordination, the advancement of inclusive tourism and educational models, and the creation of open innovation environments that facilitate knowledge exchange across institutional and sectoral boundaries. Moreover, partnerships between internal and external actors foster mutual learning, resource exchange, and the co-creation of solutions tailored to complex social and organisational challenges. Examples from the literature illustrate how stakeholder engagement cultivates adaptability, emotional resilience, and democratised decision-making.

The study further highlights the strategic value of stakeholder diversity in driving innovation and sustainability. Collaborative networks involving marginalised groups such as smallholder farmers or individuals with disabilities, not only empower these communities but also enrich the design and implementation of policies and technologies. The integration of academic, professional, civic, and experiential perspectives enhances the relevance and impact of collaborative initiatives.

The bibliometric methodology provides a structured lens for tracing the thematic evolution of stakeholder studies and the relational dynamics underpinning cooperation. By mapping keyword co-occurrences and analysing the distribution of stakeholder references, the study uncovers patterns that reflect both disciplinary convergence and contextual specificity. These insights deepen our understanding of stakeholder collaboration as a mechanism for capacity building, social inclusion, and systemic change. Importantly, the findings resonate with the principles of the knowledge-based economy, where value creation increasingly depends on intellectual capital, cross-sectoral partnerships, and the mobilization of diverse knowledge sources. Stakeholder collaboration emerges not only as a tool for solving complex problems but also as a driver of innovation ecosystems, institutional learning, and adaptive governance. In this context, fostering inclusive, reflexive, and context-sensitive stakeholder relationships becomes essential for sustainable development and organisational resilience.

In conclusion, the article underscores the transformative potential of stakeholder engagement in contemporary organisational and societal settings. It calls for further inquiry into the mechanisms that enable effective collaboration, the barriers to equitable participation, and the long-term outcomes of stakeholder-driven initiatives in an increasingly interconnected world.

## **Acknowledgements**

The publication was financed from the subsidy granted to the Krakow University of Economics – project no. 055/ZZH/2024/POT.

## References

1. Ali, F., Haapasalo, H. (2023). Development levels of stakeholder relationships in collaborative projects: challenges and preconditions. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 16(8), pp. 58-76. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-03-2022-0066>
2. Alonso, A.D., Bressan, A., Santoni, L.J., Kok, S.K., Vu, O.T.K. (2022). COVID-19: impacts and implications for hospitality, tourism and community. The case of Mendoza *Current Issue in Tourism*, 25(11), pp. 1835-1851. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2021.1987398>
3. Araújo, M.M., Santos Jhunior, R.O., Uchôa, M., Mello, A.A.R., Boaventura, J.M.G. (2025). Distributing value to stakeholders across industries: Influences of power and strategic importance. *BAR-Brazilian Administration Review*, 22(3), e240216. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1807-7692bar2025240216>
4. Baas, J., Schotten, M., Plume, A., Côté, G., Karimi, R. (2020). Scopus as a curated, high-quality abstract and citation database. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1, pp. 377-386. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1162/qss\\_a\\_00019](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00019)
5. Beaver, D. de B., Rosen, R. (1978). Studies in scientific collaboration. Part I. The professional origins of scientific co-authorship. *Scientometrics*, 1(1), pp. 65-84.
6. Bettiga, D., Lamberti, L., Noci, G. (2018). Investigating social motivations, opportunity and ability to participate in communities of virtual co-creation. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 42, pp. 155-163. DOI: 10.1111/ijcs.12409
7. Bowser, G., Ho, S.S., Ziebell, A., Lazendic-Galloway, J. (2024). Networking and collaborating: the role of partnerships across sectors to achieve educational goals in sustainability. *Sustainable Earth Reviews*, 7(17), pp. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42055-024-00080-z>
8. Bridoux, F., Stoelhorst, J.W. (2025). Stakeholder theory, strategy, and organisation: Past, present, and future. *Strategic Organisation*, 20(4), pp. 797-809. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270221127628>
9. Dąbrowska, J., Manczak, I. (2024). Interesariusze zewnętrzni jako obiekt badań. In: J. Dąbrowska, I. Manczak (eds.), *Zarządzanie relacjami z interesariuszami zewnętrznymi organizacji – kierunki podejmowanych działań* (pp. 11-18). Kraków: Attyka, Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Krakowie.
10. Deslatte, A., Swann, W.L. (2020). Elucidating the Linkages Between Entrepreneurial Orientation and Local Government Sustainability Performance. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 50(1), pp. 92-109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074019869376>
11. Donthu, N., Kumar, S., Mukherjee, D., Pandey, N., Lim, W.M. (2021). How to conduct a bibliometric analysis: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 133, pp. 285-296. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.070>

12. Fares, J., Chung, K.S.K., Abbasi, A. (2021). Stakeholder theory and management: Understanding longitudinal collaboration networks. *PLoS ONE*, 16(10), e0255658. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255658>
13. Fjeldstad, O.-H., Ali, M., Katera, L. (2019). Policy implementation under stress: Central-local government relations in property tax administration in Tanzania. *Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, 24(2), pp. 129-147. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMPC-10-2018-0057>
14. Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman.
15. Gibb, S., Ishaq, M. (2020). Decent work: what matters most and who can make a difference? *Employee Relations*, 42(4), pp. 845-861. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-04-2018-0099>
16. Greenwood, D.J. (2007). Teaching/learning action research requires fundamental reforms in public higher education. *Action Research*, 5(3), pp. 249-264. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750307081016>
17. Gurrieri, L., Gordon, R., Barraket, J., Joyce, A., Green, C. (2018). Social marketing and social movements: Creating inclusive partnerships for social change. *Journal of Social Marketing*, 8(3), pp. 354-372. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSOCM-12-2016-0078>
18. Haldorai, A. (2025). Literature Review on Global Trends and Thematic Insights in the Stakeholder Theory, CSR and Sustainability. *Journal of Enterprise and Business Intelligence*, 5(2), pp. 98-107. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53759/5181/JEBI202505010>
19. Holtzhausen, N., Botha, R.J. (2019). Leadership development in disadvantaged communities: A cross-sectoral collaboration. *South African Journal of Education*, 39(2), pp. 1-10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-06-2019-0280/full/html>
20. Kanovska, L., Tomaskova, E. (2012). Cross-functional coordination and market orientation in Czech technology firms. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 4(3), pp. 15-28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.23.1.1224>
21. Keahey, J., Reynolds, L.T., Kruger, S., du Toit, A. (2018). Participatory Commodity Networking: An Integrated Framework for Fair Trade Research and Support. *Action Research*, 16(1), pp. 25-42. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750316661396>
22. Khaldi, H., Prado-Gascó, V. (2021). Bibliometric maps and co-word analysis of the literature on international cooperation. *Quality & Quantity*, 55, pp. 1845-1869. DOI: 10.1007/s11135-020-01085-4
23. Klarin, A. (2023). How to conduct a bibliometric content analysis: Guidelines and contributions of content co-occurrence or co-word literature reviews. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 48, e13031 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.13031>
24. Knox, S., Marin-Cadavid, C., Ozir, V. (2024). Stakeholder engagement-as-practice in public sector innovation. *International Public Management Journal*, 28(1), pp. 153-168. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2024.2423952>
25. Lantz, A., Hansen, N., Antoni, C. (2015). Participative work design in lean production: A strategy for dissolving the paradox between standardized work and team proactivity by

- stimulating team learning? *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 27(1), pp. 19-33. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-03-2014-0026>
26. Ling, F.Y.Y., Tan, P.C., Ning, Y., Teo, A., Gunawansa, A. (2015). Effect of adoption of relational contracting practices on relationship quality in public projects in Singapore. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 22(2), pp. 169-189. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-10-2013-0093>
27. Lloyd-Jones, B. (2020). Developing Competencies for Emotional, Instrumental, and Informational Student Support During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Human Relations/Human Resource Development Approach. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 23(1), pp. 41-54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422320973287>
28. Mainardes, E.W., Alves, H., Raposo, M. (2012) A model for stakeholder classification and stakeholder relationships. *Management Decision*, 50(10), pp. 1861-1879. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741211279648>
29. Manczak, I., Dąbrowska, J., Moroz V. (2023). Experts' Perceptions of the Organisation's Stakeholders – Semantic Field Analysis. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Organizacja i Zarządzanie*, 178, pp. 415-430. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29119/1641-3466.2023.178.23>
30. Manczak, I., Moroz, V., Serpukhov, O., Moroz, S., Kruhlov, V. (2025). Stakeholders' Participation in Organization's Product Quality and Risk Management in the Light of the International Standards. *Management and Quality – Zarządzanie i Jakość*, 7(3), pp. 357-374.
31. Mazzei, M., Roy, M.J. (2017). From Policy to Practice: Exploring Practitioners' Perspectives on Social Enterprise Policy Claims. *Voluntas*, 28, pp. 2449-2468. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-017-9856-y>
32. Nartey, L.J., Henisz W.J., Dorobantu, S. (2023). Reciprocity in Firm – Stakeholder Dialog: Timeliness, Valence, Richness, and Topicality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 183, pp. 429-451. DOI: [10.1007/s10551-022-05063-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05063-8)
33. Omma, F.M. (2024), Regenerative nature-based tourism: tour guides and stakeholder dynamics in Arctic Norway. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, pp. 1-16. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-10-2023-0237>
34. Piotrowska-Piątek, A. (2016). Analiza interesariuszy zewnętrznych szkół wyższych – identyfikacja i ocena ich znaczenia przez szkoły wyższe. *Zarządzanie Publiczne*, 2(36), pp. 85-93. Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Krakowie. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15678/ZP.2016.36.2.06>
35. Pranckutė, R. (2021). Web of Science (WoS) and Scopus: The titans of bibliographic information in today's academic world. *Publications*, 9(1), 12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications9010012>

36. Shepherd, J., Ioannides, D. (2020). Useful funds, disappointing framework: tourism stakeholder experiences of INTERREG. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 20(5), pp. 485-502, DOI: 10.1080/15022250.2020.1792339
37. Tantalo, C., Priem, R.L. (2016). Value creation through stakeholder synergy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(2), pp. 314-329. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2337>
38. Tomej, K., Duedahl, E. (2023). Engendering collaborative accessibility through tourism: From barriers to bridges. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 99, 103528, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2023.103528>
39. Torrens, G.E. (2017). Dialogue Appropriate to Assistive Technology Product Design: A Taxonomy of Communication Formats in Relation to Modes of Sensory Perception. *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, 3(4), pp. 262-276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sheji.2018.01.001>
40. Ungureanu, P., Cochis, C., Bertolotti, F., Mattarelli, E., Scapolan, A.C. (2020). Multiplex boundary work in innovation projects: the role of collaborative spaces for cross-functional and open innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 24(3), pp. 984-1010, April. DOI: 10.1108/EJIM-11-2019-0338
41. Valentinov, V., Roth, S. (2024). Stakeholder theory: Exploring systems-theoretic and process-philosophic connections. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 41(2), pp. 301-315. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2970>
42. Wee, D. (2019). Generation Z talking: transformative experience in educational travel. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 5(2), pp. 157-167. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-02-2019-0019>
43. Xiao, H., Li, L. (2021). A bibliometric analysis of critical discourse analysis and its implications. *Discourse & Society*, 32(4), 482-502. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926521992150>
44. Zhang, H., Shi, S., Zhao, F., Ye, X., Qi, H. (2023). A Study on the Impact of Team Interdependence on Cooperative Performance in Public–Private Partnership Projects: The Moderating Effect of Government Equity Participation. *Sustainability*, 15(17), 12684. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712684>