Governance terminology confusion in management and project management reference documents

Dr. Stephen Keith McGrath

Dr. Stephen Jonathan Whitty

University of Southern Queensland, Australia

Abstract

This paper attempts to reduce confusion in project management practice by applying academic rigor to an evaluation of governance terminology in the project and general management practitioner reference documents. It compares definitions in these documents against each other as well as against a set of previously published definitions of governance terms developed using a rigorous definitional refining method. It finds many inconsistencies in governance terminology between the reference documents analyzed. These include the relationship with accountability, presumption of the joint-stock company model, inclusion of items considered unwarranted by the reference definitions and the means of handling legitimate inclusions. The existence of these inconsistencies indicates there is a need for a general acceptance of a set of internally consistent governance terms and for these to be brought into the various practitioner reference documents. A set of terms is proposed.

This paper contributes to the literature reviewing terminology in management and project management as well as the literature reviewing the veracity and interoperability of commercially available project management products. Projects, business, and academic research can all benefit from the removal of confusion from the definition of governance and related terms. This can potentially avoid waste of time, resources and money, facilitating building social and physical systems and infrastructure, benefitting organizations generally, whether public, charitable or private.

Keywords - governance; govern; definition; define; project management; review.

1.   Introduction

It is stating the obvious to say that the academic project management community needs to keep in touch with the practitioner project management community and serve its needs. This paper proposes to do that by filling a need that is not immediately apparent. Various project management practitioner reference documents have been developed over the years, originating from completely different sources, claiming to be generic to the whole project management field. However, some of these documents have incompatible assumptions and even completely different definitions of terms. If academics are not involved in evaluating project management practitioner reference documents which become de-facto standards, then it will be difficult for practitioners in general management or those immersed in any sub-field of project management to know:

1. whether practices derived from other project types are appropriate for them to adopt,
2. what standard of proof has been applied to practices that are claimed to be generic, or
3. how competing frameworks and their claims to genericity across all project types can be satisfactorily evaluated.

Because of the commercial nature of these products, achieving consensus is not a straightforward exercise. It is also one that is not readily amenable for a practitioner organization to undertake to the level of theoretical rigor necessary. It is most effectively undertaken with academic independence, free of funding from any impacted commercial organization. This paper contributes to the literature reviewing terminology in management and project management as well as the literature reviewing the veracity and interoperability of commercially available project management products. Projects, business, and academic research can all benefit from the removal of confusion from the definition of governance and related terms. This can potentially avoid waste of time, resources and money, facilitating building social and physical systems and infrastructure, benefitting organizations generally, whether public, charitable or private.

Confusion over the definition of governance and related terms have existed within the academic community, as noted by (Ahola, Ruuska, Artto, & Kujala, 2014; Biesenthal & Wilden, 2014; Cepiku, 2013; Pitsis, Sankaran, Gudergan, & Clegg, 2014). McGrath and Whitty (2015) traced this confusion back and found that the terms governance and corporate governance had been used interchangeably in the seminal report by Cadbury (1992) which popularised use of the word. That report was prepared for the government to address bad behavior of companies at the time. These were private sector companies whose owners (shareholders) held shares in them (stocks) and this organizational form is referred to as the joint-stock company model. The Cadbury Report was not concerned with addressing the behavior of other types of entity and so did not accommodate the application of the governance concept to other organizational forms. McGrath and Whitty (2015) comprehensively investigated definitions of governance and applied their definitional refining method to Cadbury's definition in developing separate essential definitions of both governance and corporate governance. They considered historical and current usage across many fields by tracking academic sources. They also noted that many papers on governance did not actually define it, although none disputed its importance. This paper moves beyond academic considerations and investigates whether confusion exists in the reference documents used by practitioners, while still, of course, applying academic rigor.

McGrath and Whitty (2015) also noted that the root of the lack of definitional precision they found in governance terminology lay in not distinguishing between the definition of a word (governance) and the definition of a phrase containing it (corporate governance). This was not a problem for the Cadbury Report authors or recipients at the time as, for them, there was no difference between the two. But it has become a terminology problem since then following its wider application outside the joint-stock company model.

The term corporate governance has come to be used whether the governance being referred to is of a corporation or not. Once a term has been arrogated for field-specific usage and usage of the term has spread outside that field, confusion can result in producing a situation that is difficult for those other fields to resolve. To resolve this type of confusion, we rely on John Stuart Mill who said:

> It would, however, be a complete misunderstanding … to think that because a name has not at present an ascertained connotation, it is competent to anyone to give it such

a connotation at his own choice. The meaning of a term actually in use is not an arbitrary quantity to be fixed, but an unknown quantity to be sought. … To fix the connotation of a concrete name, or the denotation of the corresponding abstract is to define the name. When this can be done without rendering any received assertions inadmissible, the name can be defined in accordance with its received use (Mill, 1874, pp. 469,470).

This means that the definition of a conceptual term already in use cannot be determined arbitrarily, let alone by a vote of a small sample or simply by the first person to popularise it.

The term governance itself is not dependent upon and has no claim to be 'owned' by the joint-stock company model. Corporate governance is not a term relevant to government departments that do not operate on a joint-stock company model. Corporations and government departments are simply different organizational forms and so both can be considered as requiring organizational governance as defined by McGrath and Whitty (2015). In other words, corporate governance and public governance are simply organizational governance as applied to two different organizational forms.

Tricker (1984), from whom Cadbury had derived his theoretical inspiration, had also paid some attention to definitional precision in noting that governance:

> is concerned with giving overall direction to the enterprise, with overseeing and controlling the executive actions of management and with satisfying legitimate expectations for accountability and regulation by interests beyond the corporate boundaries. If management is about running the business; governance is about seeing that it is run properly. All companies need governing as well as managing (Tricker, 1984, pp. 6-7).

White (1986) had also stated that "scant attention had been paid to governance in the British Company" and that the first reason for rethinking corporate governance was "preventing abuses of corporate power" (White, 1986, p. 188). In distinguishing between management and governance, he also noted that "if ownership, direction, and management all rest in the same entrepreneurial individual, there is little opportunity for a distinction between management and governance" (White, 1986, p. 188). This gives a strong hint as to a potential source of later confusion.

McGrath and Whitty (2015, p. 782) noted that

> Tricker acknowledged a generic characteristic of governance that he did not pursue. He proceeded in a combined accounting and legal direction in addressing the difficulties that the mid-nineteenth century conceptual invention of the joint-stock company inadvertently created when it did not envisage the circumstance of one company owning another. He did not distinguish between governance and corporate governance.

However, while McGrath and Whitty (2015) identified the issues and proposed this resolution to the confusion found in the academic literature, they did not investigate practitioner reference documents or practitioner views to see if there was empirical evidence of that confusion having translated into practice. The former is the purpose of this paper.

As we see it, there is a need for an independent examination of practitioner documents to determine what practices work and what don't in what circumstances and we consider this is vital for healthy debate and the avoidance of commercially induced group-think.

This paper addresses the question of how practitioner reference documents deal with governance terminology. This question is of concern to academics, as well as practitioners, as the academic literature needs to and does reference practitioner documents e.g. (Joslin, 2017, pp. 162, 168; Muller, 2017c, p. 108; Muller, Andersen, Klakegg, & Volden, 2017, p. 61) referencing PMBOK.

A literature review is first conducted to identify any previous reviews of project management reference documents. A research question is then posed, and the research design determined. The documents to be examined are selected and the method of review and assessment determined before proceeding to carry out an examination of practitioner documents. The findings are then presented in tabular form, allowing ready evaluation and comparison. An analysis of each document then follows.

2. Literature review

We will first examine recent work on governance to establish context. A recently published book on project governance edited by Muller (2017a) provided an overview of governance as related to project management. It was concerned with implementing governance in accordance with the Millstein (1998) principles of good governance - transparency, accountability, responsibility, and fairness (Muller, 2017b, pp. 15,16). He discussed diversity in terminology around governance, saying "whenever we talk about governance we must first clarify the perspective we are taking towards the governed object" (Muller, 2017b, p. 11). He defined organisational project governance as "the means by which individual projects, groups of projects (such as programs or portfolios), and the totality of all projects in an organization are directed and controlled and managers are held accountable for the conduct and performance of them" (Muller, 2017b, p. 14). However, the singular term governance was not defined. He discussed governmentality, referring to it as "the governing of people, or the 'art' of governance, which is known as governmentality (Foucault, 1991)" (Muller, 2017b, p. 20). Furthermore, "Governmentality is defined as the mentalities, rationalities, and ways of interaction, chosen by those in governance roles to implement, maintain and change the governance structure. The term governmentality comes from the words governance and mentality" (Muller, 2017b, pp. 20-21).

However, this is contradicted by Senellart in Foucault, Senellart, and Davidson (2007) who said:

> Contrary to the interpretation put forward by some German commentators… the word 'governmentality' could not result from the contraction of 'government' and 'mentality', 'governmentality' deriving from 'governmental' like 'musicality' from 'musical' or 'spatiality' from 'spatial' (Foucault et al., 2007, p. 502).

That is to say, it was coined simply by adding government + -al- *adjective* + -ity *abstract noun*. Senellart noted that governmentality was "Formulated for the first time in the fourth lecture of 1978 (1st February 1978)" (Foucault et al., 2007, p. 502) meaning that it was Foucault who coined the term. He also said it had "given birth to a vast field of research for a number of years in Anglo-Saxon countries and, more recently in Germany – '*governmentality studies*'" (Foucault et al., 2007, p. 506).

Senellart noted Foucault did not use the term in just a political sense but also in a broader definition of governing or government that was employed until the eighteenth century. He said:

> The Classical Age developed therefore what could be called an 'art of government' in the sense in which 'government' was then understood as precisely the 'government' of children, the 'government' of the mad, the 'government' of the poor, and before long, the 'government' of workers (Foucault et al., 2007, p. 500).

Senellart also noted "The analysis of 'government' in this course was not limited to the disciplines, but extended to the techniques of the government of souls forged by the Church around the rite of penance" (Foucault et al., 2007, p. 500). He also noted:

> The shift from 'power' to 'government' carried out in the 1978 lectures… result(ed) from its extension to a new object, the state, which did not have a place in the analysis of the disciplines (Foucault et al., 2007, p. 495).

He noted that:

> From 1979, the word no longer only designates the governmental practices constitutive of a particular regime of power (police state or liberal minimum government), but "the way in which one conducts people's conduct... Government of children, the government of souls and consciences, the government of a household, of a state, or of oneself (Foucault et al., 2007, p. 503).

That is to say that for Foucault, it also signified self-control and more generally, the conduct of conduct.

This broad approach involving the generic application of the concept to all possible circumstances aligns with the view of John Stuart Mill above and with the approach to defining governance taken by McGrath and Whitty (2015). Given the confusion of meaning surrounding the base term documented above, we consider that clarity is unlikely to be achieved by further constructions upon an already confused base term.

We also restrict ourselves here to definitions of governance and do not attempt to describe current governance practice or comment on ways of implementing 'good' governance.

We adopt the approach that any confusion in governance terminology existing in practitioner reference documents would become evident by examining and comparing their definitions of governance-related terms, as McGrath and Whitty (2013); McGrath and Whitty (2015) had done in examining the academic literature. Consequently, we searched for previous reviews of practitioner reference documents before conducting our own review.

A search of all EBSCO databases on 1/10/2017 for both 'review of standards' in the title and 'project management' in the text found no relevant reviews. A similar search for 'comparison' in place of 'review' found no relevant reviews and a similar search for 'examination' found one relevant review, namely Crawford, Pollack, and England (2007) which is considered below. Similar searches of Taylor and Francis and Emerald databases on 2/10/2017 also found no relevant reviews. A Google Scholar search of 'project management standard' with at least one of comparison, examination or review in the title returned one result, Sadeanu, Candea, and Bodea (2013). This was concerned with comparing PMBOK (2013), PRINCE2 (2009) and ICB V. 3.0:2006 and was not concerned with questioning their content. We were not concerned with ICB as it is not our purpose here to make any comment on competency.

Other subsequent investigation located two further reviews. One was Zandhius and Stellingwerf (2013). This also provided a basic comparison of PMBOK (2013), PRINCE2

(2009) and ICB Version 3 as well as Agile, Lean Six Sigma and others and was concerned with comparing these documents rather than with questioning their content.

The other was by Xue, Baron, Esteban, and Zheng (2015). This provided a basic comparison of ISO 21500 with PMBOK and ISO/IEC TR 29110 (on Software engineering – Lifecycle profiles for very small entities). Again, this comparison did not question the content of any of these documents.

The reviews mentioned so far came after a long period of consensus making in developing ISO21500 between 2007 and 2012 (Sadeanu et al., 2013). The impression we gained from these reviews was that they were more concerned with the general alignment between various standards and were not examining or questioning any fundamental assumption behind any particular document or definition which may have contributed to the earlier difficulty of reaching a consensus view.

Crawford et al. (2007) was the closest to our interest and was concerned with the "relationship between project management performance-based standards through an analysis of differences in language use between the standards of different nations". They noted:

> Through language, we give transferable meaning to the world. Our use of language structures our perception and the possibilities available to us for transferring those perceptions. This paper examines the use of words within the different project management standards, using established statistical linguistics techniques… It is easy to assume that within a field such as a project management, where profession-specific terminology is common, those different people attach the same meaning to a particular word. However, this is not necessarily the case. A standard is not a single and unvarying thing interpreted by different cultures in the same way. In light of endeavors to develop internationally applicable project management standards, this paper examines just how standard the project management standards actually are (Crawford et al., 2007, p. 6).

They were concerned with "the threat of fragmentation of project management due to competition, not cooperation, in the development of standards and qualifications" (Crawford et al., 2007, p. 6).

Their analysis sought to identify cultural factors across the full range of language usage, and so even though "The original intention of this study was to compare the various countries' project management standards directly" (Crawford et al., 2007, p. 10), a more broad-scale technique was found to be necessary and they used computational corpus linguistics techniques to conduct keyword analysis. However, our purpose here is to analyze the usage of a single word and its associated terms and so direct comparison of documents is possible and appropriate for this task, using the documents' own declared definitions. Governance was not one of the 48 topics Crawford et al. (2007) identified and their paper contains no mention of it. Analysis of their reference list indicated no references to other comparisons of practitioner documents.

The review of governance terminology in the academic literature by McGrath and Whitty (2013); McGrath and Whitty (2015) did examine the Cadbury Report definition which has been adopted by various practitioner documents; "The report's recommendations have been used to varying degrees to establish other codes such as those of the OECD, the European Union, the United States, the World Bank, etc." (Wikipedia, 2017). This indicates that current practitioner documents are likely to contain at least some of the issues they identified.

Having established as far as can reasonably be determined that there has been no previous work along the line we are investigating, we will proceed to propose our research question.

3.   Research Question

For this examination of governance terminology in practitioner reference documents, we posed the following research question;

> *Does any inconsistency in governance terminology exist within or between management practitioner reference documents?*

4.   Approach

The approach adopted here is the antithesis of Wittgenstein's family resemblance concept which has pervaded much 20th century philosophy and has been carried forward by authors such as Haugaard (2010) in addressing power and Seidl (2007) in addressing strategy. McGrath (2018) analyzed this theory. He noted many inconsistencies in it and falsified it by developing an essential definition of the term 'game', which Wittgenstein had thought not possible and had used this to justify the concept. McGrath (2018, p. 87) also noted that "The family resemblance theory has simply reified the confusion that can result when the trap of defining by extension is fallen into". In accepting this contradiction of the 'family resemblance concept', this paper continues in what can be labeled a "path-(up)setting scholarship mode" (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2013, p. 148), stepping outside both the conscious and the subconscious influence of Wittgenstein.

Alvesson and Sandberg (2014, p. 982) also offer guidelines, one of which is to 'Try alternative vocabularies compared to the conventional one used in one's box". They further note that "box research tends to encourage *incremental* rather than frame-bending research" (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2014, p. 976).

We note that while 'frame-bending' is now required towards a definitional orientation, such focus on definition previously prevailed from the time of Socrates up to that of Mill (quoted above) who died only 16 years before Wittgenstein was born. So the approach we are adopting here is not new; it is rather re-discovered, albeit that the work of McGrath (2018) has now identified ten hitherto hidden sources of definitional error that have magnified, compounded and confounded the problem. This exemplifies "how fashions, elite support, and ideologies are critical elements in contemporary ways of addressing the subject matter" (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2014, p. 982).

Any agreed definition represents only an agreement and not anything absolute, but once having made an agreement, people come to depend upon it and it then becomes confusing to refer to it as denoting anything else. So, once a definition is agreed that presents no inconsistency to any other terminology, then maximum functionality is achieved by regarding it as being absolute, even though they are only words and have no physical existence - other than as a mental construct representing something. One could perhaps regard such agreement as a 'social contract', with fixity or determinism dependent upon there being more than one party to the 'contract'.

Relativism is not precluded by accepting the fixed meaning of words, albeit that it would be slightly constrained by doing so. But if we don't know what we are talking about in the first place, then we have a difficult time getting to a relativist approach anyway.

5.   Research Design

This research question calls for an analysis of various documents commonly referenced by general and project management practitioners to see how they deal with governance. The particular documents need to be selected and the evaluation method determined.

5.1   *Practitioner reference document selection*

We wished to select documents that have influenced a wide range of international practice by including sources from England Europe and the United States. To limit any possible divergence with general management practice, we selected two editions of a general management standard that has influenced general management internationally and one Australian standard that has influenced the national context where the authors conducted their research. We also included a document giving an ICT perspective. For project management documents specifically, an examination of generic project management documents that have some reference to the "whole of the project" governance was appropriate. This excluded those dealing with particular knowledge areas such as risk or environment.

Consequently, a total of thirteen documents were selected as follows for the reasons given below:

- AS8000-2003 Good Governance Principles, to give local Australian general management history/ context
- the OECD Principles of Corporate Governance 2004 and 2015 to give international general management history and currency
- the 2008 ISO/IEC 38500 IT Governance Standard to include an ICT perspective
- the PMI PMBOK, program and portfolio standards to include the American project management perspective
- PRINCE2, MSP, APM BOK and BS6079 (covering British project management terminology) to include the British project management perspective
- AS ISO 21500:2016 (Guidance on project management) and ISO 21505:2017 (Project, programme and portfolio management - Guidance on governance) to give international project management currency.

5.2   *Evaluation method/ Method of analysis*

A qualitative deductive approach was selected, as this requires only one document with differing definitions to demonstrate that contention of definition exists. However, the documents selected do cover a wide range of international practice and if there is no substantive difference or contention in definition among these, then any assertion to this effect could be considered by some to be inductively validated, even though full agreement from the sample would still not prove that no contention existed.

Answering the research question is then straightforward from the perspective that if all practitioner documents reviewed indicated the same understanding of the particular terminology, then confusion is not established and there is then no contest or disagreement identified among documents requiring resolution. However, if this is not the case, then disagreement over terminology can be considered established.

As mentioned above, the review of governance terminology in the academic literature by McGrath and Whitty (2013); McGrath and Whitty (2015) identified a range of issues. We, therefore, decided to examine the practitioner documents to see if these same issues were present and to see if any other issues arose. For the purposes of assessment, we distilled the

definitional problems they identified with governance terms in the academic literature into four categories as follows:

1. **Presumption of the joint-stock company model:** Cadbury (1992, p. 14) defined governance as "The system by which companies are directed and controlled". McGrath and Whitty (2015, p. 770) noted: "that this was actually his definition of corporate governance and he did not separately define governance itself". They also stated:

   > Corporate and organizational governance have been deliberately separated as corporations are one form of organization and government departments are another form, which also requires governance but are not corporations. Talk of corporate governance in government departments is, therefore, a misnomer unless it is referring specifically to the corporate level of the department, but this is narrow, mixes frameworks and is imprecise and confusing. The term "corporate" is too limiting for universal application (McGrath & Whitty, 2015, p. 765).

2. **The place of accountability:** They pointed out that the need to deal with the sharing of authority introduces the need for accountability, which "is meaningless for a machine or a despot… Any human organization where people share power will require some form of accountability mechanism to inform or satisfy the interests of participants" (McGrath & Whitty, 2015, p. 777). They found the concept of accountability necessary once the qualifier 'organizational' is added to the term governance. They noted, "accountability may be either included within the rules or not and is, therefore, an optional aspect of organizational governance arrangements, not an inherent aspect of governance itself" (McGrath & Whitty, 2015, p. 777). We note that optionality may be better expressed as 'degree of" accountability, which can vary anywhere between none for a dictatorship (in terms of accountability to all citizens) and a lot for democracies. We also note that sharing ownership is a means of sharing power, as occurs in the joint-stock company model.

3. **Unwarranted inclusions:** Items they found to be unwarranted inclusions were behavior, strategy, ethics and PR (Public Relations) as well as "leadership, decision making, rationalizing, relationships, coordinating" (McGrath & Whitty, 2015, p. 777). McGrath and Whitty (2013) also noted "a range of subjects (leadership, decision making, rationalizing, relationships, coordinating) that various authors have attempted to range under the banner of governance". They also mentioned other subjects including accountability framework, organizational structures, and processes as well as one reference that viewed it as "administration, coordinating, appraising, planning" (Sohal & Fitzpatrick, 2002). McGrath and Whitty (2015) were also careful to distinguish between governance and strategy and none of their definitions use that latter term.

4. **Means of accommodating warranted inclusions:** They produced separate definitions for various governance terms and noted that "some of these former inclusions (were) either excluded or relegated to organizational governance arrangements, thereby separating process from content" (McGrath & Whitty, 2015, p. 756).

These categories were therefore used as evaluation criteria in our analysis.

The definitions they derived were as follows:

- Govern = direct and control.

- Governance = the system by which an entity is directed and controlled.
- Government = an entity that controls a geographic area.
- Organizational governance = the system by which an organization is directed, controlled and held to account.
- Organisational governance arrangements = an entity's structure (component parts, inter-relationships), positions (roles, responsibilities, pay levels and numbers), rules (written and unwritten, including policies, procedures, codes, methodologies and conventions), decision making processes (including financial and other delegations, as well as approval processes) and reporting arrangements (annual, financial, progress, assurance, regulatory, stakeholder).
- Corporate governance = the organizational governance of a corporation = the system by which a corporation is directed and controlled and held to account.
- Project governance = the organizational governance of a project = the system by which a project is directed and controlled and held to account (McGrath & Whitty, 2015, p. 781).

McGrath and Whitty (2015, p. 783) also noted that "the term public governance has deliberately not been included in the terms defined above as it is an unnecessary product of the confusion resulting from failing to distinguish between the terms governance and corporate governance". However, considering both corporate and public governance as forms of organizational governance is nevertheless compatible with their approach.

These definitions were developed using a transparent method designed to identify, compare and resolve different usages across multiple fields and so will be used as a set of reference definitions.

6. Examination of practitioner documents

The examination is documented in Table 1, which lists the document and the definitions of governance terms it contains, enabling direct comparison between all documents examined. It also lists the assessment of each document against each of the four categories (criteria) listed above, together with a final category detailing any other difficulty identified.

The results of the analysis are presented in Table 1.

6.1 Comparison of all practitioner reference documents

Examination of the table indicates that there are issues with governance terminology in all of the practitioner documents considered, with no one document being issue free, as the absence of a blank row indicates, albeit that the OECD Principles and AS 6079 contained no governance definitions. Furthermore, all of the issues identified in the academic literature have translated to some of the practitioner documents examined, as the absence of a blank comment column in the table indicates. We will now draw compare between the documents analyzed.

Only four of the documents examined actually defined the base governance term. Of these, two (ISO/IEC 38500 and AS ISO 21500:2006) used modifications of the Cadbury definition, using the term organizational without including accountability. The other two (MSP and the APM BOK) defined it in terms of various organizational governance arrangements. One (AS8000) used a modified Cadbury definition as the definition of corporate governance. One other (PRINCE2) defined governance (corporate) but did not use the Cadbury definition, of

defining it instead as maintenance of management systems. The use of the Cadbury definition in defining both governance and corporate governance reflects Cadbury's failure to distinguish between the two.

Only three include project governance in any form. The PMBOK actually defines project governance as an alignment. AS ISO 21500:2016) states what is included, but was not limited to, before listing items of organizational governance arrangements. PRINCE2 defines governance (project) as the areas of corporate governance related to projects. None of these definitions capture the essence of the term and none are the same as the reference definition.

Other phrases defined are corporate governance of IT in ISO/IEC 38500, program governance in the PMI Standard for Program Management, governance decisions, governance recommendations and portfolio governance in the PMI Standard for Portfolio Management. It is notable that some of these terms were even considered to need separate definition and furthermore that some of the definitions within the latter document indicated an internal inconsistency between the implicit definition of the base governance terms, with one implying it is a process and another that it is a knowledge area.

The PMI Standard for Program Management mixes governance and management in defining governance management, which ISO/IEC 38500 states are quite distinct although it does not maintain that distinction throughout that document.

The PMI Portfolio Management definition of organizational governance is quite close to the reference definition above except for the inclusion of strategy.

Governance is described in the various practitioner documents as maintenance, alignment, function and knowledge area, none of which occur in the reference definition. However other definitions use the terms process, framework or set which are somewhat similar to the term system, which is used in the reference definition. We note that while Cadbury may have not distinguished between governance and corporate governance and that anything causing cross-field confusion cannot be accepted as generic, he was nevertheless a pioneer of the field and if there is no compelling reason to change a term he used, the difficulty of correcting subsequent usage is minimized if such previously selected uncontentious terms can remain. We, therefore, find no reason to alter the reference definition use of the term 'system' on this count.

One tendency we noticed in several documents is to either list what may be included and offer no definition (AS ISO 21500:2016) or to claim to define by listing what it may include (ISO/IEC 38500, PRINCE2, MSP, APM BOK – all ICT documents).

It is only the OECD document where the issues identified are unlikely to inadvertently cause confusion. While not defining governance at all may have facilitated this, that document does not conflict with the reference definitions. It deals with governance practices without introducing any inclusions that the evaluation method would deem unwarranted. It gives advice to national governments on the content of desirable practices and so contained the greatest amount of normative content of all the documents reviewed. Our review was concerned only with process and definition of terms and so we make no normative value judgments on what actual practices should be included within any particular organizational governance arrangement. We simply deal here with what the elements of those arrangements are, not with their actual content.

In summary, it is evident that the different documents have different understandings of governance terminology. This examination, therefore, indicates that the research question can

be answered affirmatively; inconsistency in governance terminology does exist within and between management practitioner reference documents

We will now report the separate analysis of each document, making observations as appropriate.

7.   Analysis of and observations on individual practitioner documents

7.1   AS8000-2003: Good Governance Principles

Section 1.5.1 of (Standards Australia, 2003) defines corporate governance as "The system by which entities are directed and controlled" and entity as "A company, government department, government body or not-for-profit organization". These definitions acknowledge the fact that governance applies to entities other than companies but inappropriately translate Cadbury's definition of corporate governance as "the system by which companies are directed and controlled" (Cadbury, 1992). A government department is not a company. Its head is a minister who directs what is to be done. This definition leaves the residual confusion of attempting to figure out where or how the governance of a government entity is corporate. Cadbury took a government concept (that of governing) and applied it to the corporate environment. This AS 8000 definition takes it back in an unnecessary, convoluted, double loop. It actually generically defines governance but inappropriately labels it as corporate governance. It even acknowledges an inconsistency in its own definition by including the following note:

> Corporate governance addresses the issues arising from the interrelationships between boards of directors, such as interaction with senior management, and relationships with the owners and others interested in the affairs of the entity, including regulators, auditors, creditors, debt financiers, and analysts.

> Definitions of corporate governance are many and varied. There is no one global applicable definition but some useful statements include… (Standards Australia, 2003)

The definition of corporate governance also omits accountability.

AS8000 needs to be changed to remove the error that has resulted in this internal inconsistency. Separate definitions of governance and corporate governance are necessary.

7.2   OECD Principles of Corporate Governance - 2004 and 2015

Neither version defines governance or corporate governance or contains a glossary of terms. Both state: "The Principles focus on publicly traded companies, both financial and non-financial. However, to the extent they are deemed applicable, they might also be a useful tool to improve corporate governance in…" with OECD (2004, p. 12) adding "non-traded companies, for example, privately held and state-owned enterprises" and OECD (2015, p. 9) adding "companies whose shares are not publicly traded". The later change makes it clear that its focus is on companies with shareholders. The 2004 edition acknowledged the work of Cadbury without specifically referencing him and so it appears that his definition of corporate governance was tacitly assumed and its deficiency regarding the presumption of the joint-stock company model, as noted above in the introduction and evaluation method section, has been incorporated.

The document specifies principles at a national government level regarding approaches and required behaviors rather than detailing the elements of organizational governance arrangements. It is concerned with content rather than detailed processes. Although it does not define governance, corporate governance or organizational governance, it nevertheless contains no inclusions that could be regarded by the above evaluation method as unwarranted.

7.3   ISO/IEC 38500: The IT Governance Standard - 2008

ISO/IEC 38500 states:

> The objective of this standard is to provide a framework of principles for Directors to use… it also allows that, in some (typically smaller) organizations, the members of the governing body may also occupy the key roles in management. In this way, it ensures that the standard is applicable for all organizations, from the smallest, to the largest, regardless of purpose, design and ownership structure (International Organization for Standardization, 2008, p. v).

It also states many times "Directors should". It is clearly designed for companies and maybe generic for all companies, but it appears to have either not envisaged the inclusion of government departments or has assumed loose similarity in the director role. Director positions in government organizations do not have the same obligations as directors of company boards and accountability in a government department rests with the head of that department, not with a board.

The International Organization for Standardization (2008, p. 3) defines Governance as "The system by which organizations are directed and controlled. (adapted from Cadbury 1992 and OECD 1999)". This mixes governance with organizational governance when compared to the reference definition which introduces accountability when the qualifier 'organizational' is added. This document also defines "Corporate governance of IT" as "The system by which the current and future use of IT is directed and controlled. Corporate governance of IT involves evaluating and directing the use of IT to support the organization and monitoring this use to achieve plans. It includes the strategy and policies for using IT within an organization" (International Organization for Standardization, 2008, p. 3). This contains a strategy which is mentioned above as an unwarranted inclusion.

ISO/IEC 38500 gives the six principles of IT governance as responsibility, strategy, acquisition, performance, conformance, and human behavior. Assigning responsibility for tasks is a normal general or project management activity. Strategy is a higher-level activity than governance as explained by McGrath and Whitty (2015). Acquisition is actually procurement. Performance is what basic project management monitors and involves standard risk management practices. Conformance at least comes close to being associated with organizational governance, insofar as it mentions satisfying "obligations (regulatory, legislation, common law, contractual), internal policies, standards and professional guidelines" and so can be taken to be a part of accountability. Human behavior is very general and should be "identified and appropriately considered" (International Organization for Standardization, 2008, p. 15). This would appear to overlap with stakeholder management, which is not mentioned explicitly, as well as with the project management knowledge area of human resources.

While none of these principles are undesirable or unnecessary, they relate more to good management than to governance. It is therefore evident that in spite of it its claim that

"Governance is distinct from management, and for the avoidance of confusion, the two concepts are clearly defined in the standard" (International Organization for Standardization, 2008, p. v), it actually completely mixes the two concepts. It achieves this in part by defining management as a system as well, rather than as the action of taking charge, namely "The system of controls and processes required to achieve the strategic objectives set by the organization's governing body" (International Organization for Standardization, 2008, p. 4). One can readily question how many separate, different, overlapping standards and frameworks can really be necessary to ensure good management. Just because governance happens to sound more important than management does not justify the development of additional frameworks and standards revolving around that particular word. The confusion in the definition of governance terms cannot have helped this situation and may have even resulted from it.

With respect to the inclusion of strategy, that is a higher-level activity that the system of governance is used to implement. It makes little sense to be including a higher-level activity under a lower level activity. Control over any system of governance is necessary to implement any strategy within it. The choice of what is to be done (strategy) is different to the processes by which it is done (management and governance). As McGrath and Whitty (2015, p. 774) noted, governance "is defined in terms of how we do whatever it is that we choose to do and not in terms of what we do or intend to do. What we intend to do is a strategy". It is perhaps unfortunate that the notion of the process of corporate governance has acquired a distorted connotation of importance that has overtaken both logic and the purpose it is there for.

These principles essentially duplicate selected elements of any respectable management approach or project management framework but contain so little that it is unlikely to confuse any corporate director who actually read it. If there is really an ongoing need for this standard, ISO/IEC 38500 would be more appropriately labeled for what it actually is, as 'IT strategy, management, and governance in corporations'.

Chapter 7 also contains the following statement:

> IT projects are not always delivered successfully. Authoritative research shows that the majority of projects fail to deliver the benefits that justified commencing the project and that, of those that do, the majority come in late and/or over budget.

> Organizations whose IT projects failed usually all deployed recognizable project management methodologies; the reasons for failure were invariably to do with failures of project governance rather than simply of operational management (Calder, 2008, p. Ch7).

This provides a salutary warning to all projects on the potential contribution of confusion in governance terminology to the establishment of inappropriate governance arrangements, as well as to ICT projects regarding the governance arrangements of their popular methodologies, and to non-ICT projects in taking up ICT based approaches.

Furthermore, if project failure is "invariably" linked with governance failure, continuing looseness of governance terminology cannot possibly assist in resolving this.

7.4   PMBOK - 2017

The only governance-related term defined in the glossary of PMI's 2017 PMBOK is project governance which is defined as "The framework, functions, and processes that guide project management activities in order to create a unique product, service or result to meet organizational, strategic and operational goals." This improved in the 2013 definition which defined it as an alignment, but it still defines by extension, which creates verbosity and tempts omission when the all-encompassing term 'system' could have been used. It is also restricted by unnecessarily including a purpose, desirable though that purpose may be for organizational projects. Nevertheless, while it may not be fully generic, it serves the purpose of organizational projects and does not conflict with the reference definition.

7.5   PMI Standard for Program Management -2013

Apart from the terms "governance board" and "program governance plan", Project Management Institute (2013b) defines the following two terms:

Governance Management. The program management function that provides a robust, repeatable, decision-making framework to control capital investments within an agency, organization, or corporation. This includes decision making which has been listed above as an unwarranted inclusion. It also defines governance as a function, restricts it to investment, places it under the program level and mixes it with management.

Program governance. Systems and methods by which a program is monitored, managed, and supported by its sponsoring organization. This omits accountability and includes methods that are not part of the reference definition and also mixes management and governance which White (1986, p. 188) and International Organization for Standardization (2008, p. v) (ISO/IEC 38500) maintain are two distinct things.

7.6   Standard for Portfolio Management - 2013

There are four governance-related terms defined in the glossary of Project Management Institute (2013a). Two are rather surprising, namely "governance decisions" and "governance recommendations", which would appear to have not needed definition if a definition of governance itself had been present, and definition of the former term appears to include governance and non-governance (management) decisions. There are other decisions such as strategic decisions that are not just mere matters of some regulatory type of process that happens to be called governance. This reinforces confusion resulting from failure to distinguish a process from its content. This may seem trivial until one considers that the existence of the project management field relies on distinguishing generic (project management) processes from its content (field of application). The other two definitions are as follows:

- Organizational governance which is defined as "The process by which an organization directs and controls its operational and strategic activities, and by which the organization responds to the legitimate rights, expectations, and desires of its stakeholders". This definition includes strategy. It also defines one type of governance as a process rather than as the system for directing and controlling.
- Portfolio governance which is defined as "A Knowledge Area that includes the processes to develop the portfolio management plan; define, optimize, and authorize the portfolio; and provide ongoing portfolio oversight". How can one form of governance be a process and another form be a knowledge area (Note that neither definition refers to it as a system)? Secondly, this definition includes management

processes - define, optimise, authorise and oversight, and thirdly it reflects the tendency identified in McGrath and Whitty (2013) and in McGrath and Whitty (2015) to make governance into something more than it actually is, allowing other things in and giving examples of some processes that are included.

Both of these terms also suffer from the absence of a definition of the base governance term

7.7 PRINCE2 - 2017

The only governance-related definitions in the AXELOS (2017) glossary are as follows:

- governance (corporate) is "the ongoing activity of maintaining a sound system of internal control by which directors and officers of an organization ensure that effective management systems, including financial monitoring and control systems, have been put in place to protect assets, earning capacity and the reputation of the organization". This mixes organizational and corporate governance, effectively defines corporate governance as maintenance rather than as a system for doing something, and does not mention accountability. It includes protection of assets, earning capacity and reputation which have more to do with management and public relations than with governance. It also includes financial monitoring as governance rather than having a system for them as part of organizational governance arrangements.
- governance (project) is "Those areas of corporate governance that are typically related to project activities". This is not very specific and includes no hint that governance of a project and its parent organization are not the same but have to mesh.

7.8 MSP - 2011

The glossary of Office of Government Commerce (OGC) (2011) contains a definition of governance as "The functions, responsibilities, processes, and procedures that define how a programme is set up, managed and controlled". This is not a definition of governance. It simply lists some of the items listed by McGrath and Whitty (2015) as comprising organizational governance arrangements. It includes programme setup and management as governance and also includes functions, responsibilities, processes, and procedures as part of governance rather than as organizational governance arrangements.

7.9 APM BoK Sixth Edition - 2012

The Association for Project Management (2012, p. 237) defines governance as "The set of policies, regulations, functions, processes, procedures, and responsibilities that define the establishment, management, and control of projects, programmes or portfolios".

This allows inclusions beyond governance, that is activities other than simply directing and controlling, as well as listing some of the items listed by McGrath and Whitty (2015) as comprising organizational governance arrangements. It also describes governance as a set rather than as a system.

7.10   BS 6079-2:2000

British Standards International (2002) on project management vocabulary contains no definition of governance or corporate governance.

7.11   AS ISO 21500:2016 = ISO 21500:2012

AS ISO 21500:2016 "is identical with and has been reproduced from ISO 21500:2012, Guidance on project management" Australian Standards (2016). Section 2 on terms and definitions does not define governance, however Section 3.6 states:

> Governance is the framework by which an organization is directed and controlled. Project governance includes, but is not limited to, those areas of organizational governance that are specifically related to project activities. Project governance may include subjects such as the following:
>
> — defining the management structure;
>
> — the policies, processes, and methodologies to be used;
>
> — limits of authority for decision-making;
>
> — stakeholder responsibilities and accountabilities;
>
> — interactions such as reporting and the escalation of issues or risks (Australian Standards, 2016).

This mixes governance and organizational governance. It specifies the sort of entity without qualifying the term as organizational governance and then does not mention organizational accountability which would have been unnecessary without its use of the term organization. It lists as governance many but not all of the items listed in the evaluation criteria as organizational governance arrangements. It also lists things project governance may include but does not actually define it. It defines governance as a framework rather than as a system.

7.12   ISO 21505:2017

International Organisation for Standardization (2017) defines governance as "principles, policies and frameworks by which an organization is directed and controlled".

This includes principles (which may lead to but don't define governance) and policies – one of the items listed in the reference definition as organizational governance arrangements. It also defines governance as frameworks rather than as a system. Frameworks may or may not be compatible with each other and their interactions and any incompatibilities will also form part of an organization's system of governance.

8.   Discussion

When McGrath and Whitty (2015) conducted their review of governance terminology, they found four principal difficulties. These were:

1. by not distinguishing between governance and corporate governance the joint-stock company model had been presumed
2. the place of accountability, which is meaningless for a machine or a despot but is necessary when authority is shared between people, was unclear
3. there were many unwarranted inclusions and
4. the means of dealing with warranted inclusions was inconsistent.

We then examined a range of practitioner documents to see if the same issues were present. Our review, summarised in Table 1, found that all of these same issues were indeed present. It even found a more extensive list of unwarranted inclusions, namely responsibility, strategy, acquisition, performance, human behavior, methods, management, management processes, asset protection, earning capacity, reputation and program setup and management)

Our review also identified some further difficulties as well, with several of the documents presenting definitions of governance as:

- an alignment
- a function
- a knowledge area
- a set
- a framework and
- maintenance.

All of this taken together clearly indicates that there is significant confusion in and disagreement about current governance terminology.

9.   Implications for the academic/ practitioner interface

This paper demonstrates that the way project management practitioners organize their methodologies and standards should be of academic concern.

Various of these documents are commercial products, and competition has not resulted in the resolution of inconsistencies between them. Practitioners are subject to performance pressure and time constraint, so are not in a position to reconcile these, resulting in ongoing confusion. The development of ISO21500 partly addressed this but was primarily concerned with keeping the field together, as noted by Crawford et al. (2007, p. 6) and there are key differences remaining in the content of various commercial products that are still marketed and used throughout the community. There is no world governing body of the field and so the practice can only converge through research and consensus, with the latter hopefully following the former.

Project management disasters are unlike engineering disasters in that they do not generally involve people getting killed through the collapse of some physical system or apparatus. Evaluation of project management disasters will therefore generally lack direct, observable, verifiable, attributable evidence other than a cost or time blowout or implementation failure. Such disasters become subject to a multitude of normative considerations i.e. blame will be strongly contested by those with a stake or interest. This makes sourcing any meaningful data very difficult. But if we don't want the field of project management to be governed by the values of the legal system, then it would seem to be a very good idea for some internal evaluation of practices to be done. Definitions provide a good place to start as they quickly identify differences in approach, enable normativity to be avoided, and facilitate an objective, independence stance, which surely is the key function of academia unconstrained by coercive funding pressures.

One further consideration in support of regarding practitioner matters as the legitimate subject of academic research and papers is to consider the following possible hypothetical sequence of events where a large part of a field develops a document without academic involvement and then adopts that as either its basis of practice or as a basis of practice for the whole field. If academics ignore it, the practitioners will continue using it unchallenged. If it

survives for a decade or two, it will have become so deeply entrenched in practice that the academics who were aware of its lack of theoretical basis will have been unable to do anything about it and newer academics may well be unaware there was any deficiency at all and accept it as 'fact' and 'true', and seek research funding that does not question it i.e. the system can become reified and resistant to question. The field and professional bodies will then drive enforcement and any problems resulting from unrecognized deficiencies in the document will then be masked and academic research will be relegated to investigating spurious 'factors' or developing contortions that build upon the initial deficiencies. McGrath and Whitty (2013); McGrath and Whitty (2015) document the latter having occurred in the field of governance and it is not inconceivable that the same may have been possible within the field of project management.

The possibility of this being the case is further suggested by the paucity of literature dealing with such an alternative approach within project management, and no amount of literature review into articles based upon currently accepted practice will inform any such investigation. Alvesson and Sandberg (2014) particularly note this in saying:

> The primary goal in box research is typically to anchor one's work in the existing literature within the box... The literature is often a narrow sub-set of a specific area... To transcend or innovatively challenge the existing body of knowledge becomes irrelevant – as this breaks with the add-to-the-literature logic within the box. As a result, box research tends to reinforce rather than challenge existing theories in the field through the naturalization of 'gap-spotting' studies… (and) it generates an *inward dynamics* of knowledge production, which in the long run is unhealthy for the advancement of knowledge… Boxed-in research tends to produce what Alvesson and Spicer (2012) refer to as functional stupidity… an orientation to carry out technically competent work within a narrow area combined with an *inability* to engage in critical and substantive reasoning and ask for justifications (e.g. asking why we do research in the way we do it, work with certain unquestioned assumptions and use a specific vocabulary) (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2014, p. 976).

10. Conclusion

Thirteen practitioner documents were reviewed and their handling of governance terminology was examined. The review concluded that these sources contain considerable differences in terminology and none demonstrate the internal consistency or comprehensiveness provided by the reference definitions from McGrath and Whitty (2015). The research question was therefore answered affirmatively; inconsistency in governance terminology does exist within and between the management practitioner reference documents considered.

Given the statement in ISO/IEC38500 that project failure is inevitably due to governance failure, there would appear to be a pressing need for adopting common international standard governance terminology.

The definitions developed by McGrath and Whitty (2015) can provide the means of achieving this as they were developed using a transparent and rigorous method that provides a basis for assessment of any contest over particular terms.

Most, if not all the documents reviewed here would then require updating accordingly.

Table 1

Issues identified in the definitions of governance terms in practitioner reference documents

Document Relevant Definitions	Types of issue identified
	Type 1: Presumption of the joint-stock company model **Type 2: The place of accountability** **Type 3: Unwarranted inclusions** **Type 4: Means of accommodating warranted inclusions** **Type 5: Other**
AS8000 (2003) • Corporate governance = The system by which entities are directed and controlled • Entity = A company, government department, government body or not-for-profit organization	Type 1: Presumes non-corporates have corporate governance Type 2: Accountability is missing from its definition of corporate governance Type 5: Self-contradicts its own precedence of entity and company
OECD Principles of Corporate Governance (2004 and 2015) No definition of governance or corporate governance and no glossary of terms given.	Type 1: The 2015 edition makes it clear that it applies to companies with shareholders Type 4: Specifies approaches and required behaviors at a national government level as principles rather than detailing the elements of organizational governance arrangements. Type 5: Does not define governance, corporate governance or organizational governance.
ISO/IEC 38500 (2008) • The Introduction states "The objective of this standard is to provide a framework of principles for Directors to use" and many times states "Directors should". • Governance = The system by which organizations are directed and controlled. (adapted from Cadbury 1992 and OECD 1999). • Corporate governance of IT = The system by which the current and future use of IT is directed and controlled. Corporate governance of IT involves evaluating and directing the use of IT to support the organization and monitoring this use to achieve plans. It includes the strategy and policies for using IT within an organization. • Six principles of governance; responsibility, strategy, acquisition, performance, conformance and human behavior.	Type 1: Presumes the joint-stock company organizational form Type 2: Omits accountability from corporate governance of IT Type 3: Includes strategy in corporate governance of IT Type 3: Five of the six principles; responsibility, strategy, acquisition, performance and human behavior overlap with other things and do not constitute governance or organizational governance arrangements as per the reference definitions. Type 4: Only the conformance principle corresponds with part of organizational governance arrangements. Type 5: Mixes governance with organizational governance
PMI PMBOK (2017) Project governance = the framework, functions, and processes that guide project management activities in order to create a unique product, service or result to meet organizational, strategic and operational goals".	Type 3: Includes a purpose Type 5: Defines by extension, creating verbosity as well as tempting omission and does not define the base governance term.

PMI Standard for Program Management (2013) • Governance Management = The program management function that provides a robust, repeatable, decision-making framework to control capital investments within an agency, organization, or corporation. • Program governance = Systems and methods by which a program is monitored, managed, and supported by its sponsoring organization.	Type 2: Omits accountability Type 3: Includes decision making; methods and management Type 5: Defines governance as a function, restricts it to investment, places it under the program level, mixes it with management and does not define the base governance term.
PMI Standard for Portfolio Management (2013) • Governance decisions = Portfolio governing body decisions based on portfolio performance, component proposals, and risks as well as capability and capacity of resources, funding allocations, and future investment requirements. • Governance recommendations = Portfolio governing body recommendations based on portfolio performance, component proposals, and risks as well as capability and capacity of resources, funding allocations, and future investment requirements. • Organizational governance = The process by which an organization directs and controls its operational and strategic activities, and by which the organization responds to the legitimate rights, expectations, and desires of its stakeholders. • Portfolio governance = A Knowledge Area that includes the processes to develop the portfolio management plan; define, optimize, and authorize the portfolio; and provide ongoing portfolio oversight.	Type 3: Includes strategy; management processes - define, optimize, authorize and oversight. Type 5: The need for a definition of the first two terms is unclear and both suffer from the absence of a definition of the base governance term + both definitions overlap with management. Type 5: Defines a particular type of governance (Organisational governance) as a process. Type 5: Defines a particular type of governance (Portfolio governance) as a knowledge area and says it is more than a process.
PRINCE2 (2017) The only governance-related definitions in the glossary are as follows: • governance (corporate) is "the ongoing activity of maintaining a sound system of internal control by which directors and officers of an organization ensure that effective management systems, including financial monitoring and control systems, have been put in place to protect assets, earning capacity and the reputation of the organization". • Governance (project) is "Those areas of corporate governance that are typically related to project activities".	Type 1: Mixes organizational and corporate governance. Type 2: Omits accountability. Type 3: Includes protection of assets, earning capacity and reputation. Type 4: Financial monitoring included as governance rather than organizational governance arrangements. Type 5: Effectively defines corporate governance as maintenance rather than as a system for doing something. This is not very specific and includes no hint that governance of a project and its parent organization are not the same but have to mesh.
MSP (2011) Governance = The functions, responsibilities, processes, and procedures that define how a programme is set up, managed and controlled".	Type 3: Includes programme setup and management Type 4: Includes functions, responsibilities, processes, and procedures as part of governance rather than as organizational governance arrangements.

APM BOK (2012) Governance = The set of policies, regulations, functions, processes, procedures, and responsibilities that define the establishment, management, and control of projects, programmes or portfolios	Type 4: Except for the term control, this defines organizational governance arrangements rather than governance itself. Type 5: Describes governance as a set rather than as a system.
BS6079 (2000) No definition of governance or corporate governance given	Type 5: Does not define governance, corporate governance or organizational governance.
AS ISO 21500:2016 = ISO 21500:2012 Section 2 on terms and definitions does not define governance; however the text in Section 3.6 states that: • Governance is the framework by which an organization is directed and controlled. Project governance includes, but is not limited to, those areas of organizational governance that are specifically related to project activities. • Project governance may include subjects such as the following: — defining the management structure; — the policies, processes governance-related and methodologies to be used; — limits of authority for decision-making; — stakeholder responsibilities and accountabilities; — interactions such as reporting and the escalation of issues or risks. **'ISO 21505:2017** Governance = principles, policies and frameworks by which an organization is directed and controlled	Type 2: Mixes governance and organizational governance. It specifies the sort of entity without qualifying the term as organizational governance and then does not mention organizational accountability which would have been unnecessary without its use of the term organization. Type 4: Lists as governance many, but not all of the items listed in the reference definition as organizational governance arrangements. Type 5: Defines governance as a framework rather than as a system. It also lists things project governance may include but does not actually define it. Type 3: Includes principles (which may lead to but don't define governance) Type 3: Includes policies, one of the items listed in the reference definition as organizational governance arrangements. Type 5: Defines governance as a framework rather than as a system.

References

Ahola, T., Ruuska, I., Artto, K., & Kujala, J. (2014). What is project governance and what are its origins? *International Journal of Project Management, 32*(8), 1321-1332. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.09.005

Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2013). Has Management Studies Lost Its Way? Ideas for More Imaginative and Innovative Research. *Journal of Management Studies, 50*(1), 128-152. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01070.x

Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2014). Habitat and Habitus: Boxed-in versus Box-Breaking Research. *Organization Studies, 35*(7), 967-987. doi:10.1177/0170840614530916

Association for Project Management, a. p. (2012). *APM body of knowledge* (Sixth edition. ed.).

Australian Standards. (2016). AS/ISO 21500:2016 guidance on project management. In. Sydney: SAI Global.

AXELOS. (2017). *Managing successful projects with PRINCE2*. In (pp. 430). Retrieved from http://ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/lib/usq/detail.action?docID=486 3041.

Biesenthal, C., & Wilden, R. (2014). Multi-level project governance: Trends and opportunities. *International Journal of Project Management, 32*(8), 1291-1308. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.06.005

British Standards International. (2002). BS6079-2:2000 project management - part 2: Vocabulary. In. London: BSI.

Cadbury, A. (1992). *Report of the committee on the financial aspects of corporate governance*. (ISBN 0 85258 913 1). London: Burgess Science Press.

Calder, A. (2008). *ISO/IEC 38500: The IT governance standard*. In. Retrieved from http://common.books24x7.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/toc.aspx?bookid=34447

Cepiku, D. (2013). Unraveling the concept of public governance: A literature review of different traditions. In A. H. Luca Gnan, Fabio Monteduro (Ed.), *Conceptualizing and Researching Governance in Public and Non-Profit Organizations* (pp. 3-32).

Crawford, L., Pollack, J., & England, D. (2007). How standard are standards: An examination of language emphasis in project management standards. *Project Management Journal, 38*(3), 6-21. doi:10.1002/pmj.20002

Foucault, M., Senellart, M., & Davidson, A. I. (2007). *Security, territory, population : lectures at the College de France, 1977-78*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haugaard, M. (2010). Power: A 'family resemblance' concept. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 13*(4), 419-438. doi:10.1177/1367549410377152

International Organisation for Standardization. (2017). ISO 21505: Project, programme and portfolio management -guidance on governance. In. Geneva, Switzerland: ISO.

International Organization for Standardization. (2008). ISO/IEC 38500:2008(e) corporate governance of information technology. In. Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization.

Joslin, R. (2017). Governance and project success. In R. Muller (Ed.), *Governance and Governmentality for Projects: Enablers, Practices, and Consequences* (pp. 159-172). New York: Routledge.

McGrath, S. K. (2018). *What is project governance? Disclosing the source of confusion and revealing the essence of governance*   (Ph.D. Thesis), University of Southern Queensland, Springfield.

McGrath, S. K., & Whitty, S. J. (2013). *Do steering committees and boards constitute good project governance?* Paper presented at the 10th Annual Project Management Australia Conference (PMOz 2013), Melbourne, Australia. http://eprints.usq.edu.au/23648/

McGrath, S. K., & Whitty, S. J. (2015). Redefining governance: From confusion to certainty and clarity. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 8*(4), 755-787. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-10-2014-0071

Mill, J. S. (1874). *A system of logic, ratiocinative and inductive* (Eighth ed.). New York: Harper & Brothers.

Millstein, I. M. (1998). *Corporate governance: Improving competitiveness and access to capital in global markets: A report to the OECD* (9264160566). Retrieved from Paris:

Muller, R. (2017a). *Governance and governmentality for projects: Enablers, practices, and consequences* (Vol. New York): Routledge.

Muller, R. (2017b). Organizational project governance. In R. Muller (Ed.), *Governance and Governmentality for Projects: Enablers, Practices, and Consequences* (pp. 11-24). New York: Routledge.

Muller, R. (2017c). Private sector practices. In R. Muller (Ed.), *Governance and Governmentality for Projects: Enablers, Practices, and Consequences* (pp. 107-128). New York: Routledge.

Muller, R., Andersen, E. S., Klakegg, O. J., & Volden, G. H. (2017). Governance institutions. In R. Muller (Ed.), *Governance and Governmentality for Projects: Enablers, Practices, and Consequences* (pp. 51-66). New York: Routledge.

OECD. (2004). *OECD principles of corporate governance*. Paris: OECD Publications.

OECD. (2015). *G20/OECD principles of corporate governance*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Office of Government Commerce (OGC). (2011). *Managing successful programmes*. Great Britain: The Stationery Office.

Pitsis, T. S., Sankaran, S., Gudergan, S., & Clegg, S. R. (2014). Governing projects under complexity: Theory and practice in project management. *International Journal of Project Management, 32*(8), 1285-1290. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.09.001

Project Management Institute. (2013a). *The standard for portfolio management*. In. Retrieved from http://common.books24x7.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/toc.aspx?bookid=51358

Project Management Institute. (2013b). *The standard for program management*. In. Retrieved from http://common.books24x7.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/toc.aspx?bookid=51357

Sadeanu, M., Candea, S., & Bodea, C. N. (2013). ISO 21500:2012 vs. Other project management standards. In N. Grau & C. N. Bodea (Eds.), *ISO 21500 Project Management Standard: Characteristics, Comparison and Implementation*. Aachen: SHAKER Verlag.

Seidl, D. (2007). General Strategy Concepts and the Ecology of Strategy Discourses: A Systemic-Discursive Perspective. *Organization Studies, 28*(2), 197-218. doi:10.1177/0170840606067994

Sohal, A. S., & Fitzpatrick, P. (2002). It governance and management in large australian organisations. *International Journal of Production Economics, 75*(1–2), 97-112. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273(01)00184-0

Standards Australia. (2003). AS 8000-2003 good governance principles. In. Sydney: Standards Australia.

Tricker, R. I. (1984). *Corporate governance: Practices, procedures and powers in british companies and their boards of directors*. Aldershot: Gower.

White, N. A. (1986). Review of corporate governance by r. I. Tricker. [Corporate Governance., R. I. Tricker]. *Strategic Management Journal, 7*(2), 187-188.

Wikipedia. (2017). Cadbury report. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cadbury_Report

Xue, R., Baron, C., Esteban, P., & Zheng , L. (2015). *Analysis and comparison of project management standards and guides.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the International Conference on Mechanics, Materials, Mechanical Engineering and Chemical Engineering (MMMCE 2015) Barcelona, Spain.

Zandhius, A., & Stellingwerf, R. (2013). *ISO 21500 guidance on project management: A pocket guide* Van Haren Publishing, Zaltbommel.

Authors

Dr. Stephen McGrath completed his Ph.D. at the University of Southern Queensland. He researched the cross-discipline impacts of 'generic' project, program and portfolio management methodology and terminology, particularly relating to governance, across civil infrastructure and IT. This led him to identify and propose various means of avoiding linguistic traps that generate unnecessary conflict in project management as well as in general management and daily life. He is a civil engineer and Fellow of both the Institution of Engineers Australia and the Australian Institute of Project Management. He has 40 years of experience in developing, planning and delivering civil infrastructure projects as well as strategy and business development projects across the roads, busways, rail, marine and aviation areas of transport. He also led the team that developed the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads 'OnQ' project management system that has been in operation since 2000 and has now been used in delivering more than $20B of civil infrastructure, business development, and IT projects.

Dr. Stephen Jonathan Whitty is Associate Professor of Project Management at the University of Southern Queensland, Australia. A particular focus of his research is to better understand the difference between how we actually experience project work and derive meaning from it and how we have culturally come to think about managing it, and how the disconnect between these may cause problems when we try to manage modern organizations. Jon has a principal interest in social and cultural evolutionary theory, and his research has helped reveal the 'humanism' in the complex behavior of organizations. He publishes in journals and textbooks, and collaborates with a flourishing group of doctoral researchers.