

About the Stakeholders Dissertation – Concept Paper

Joseph Mallon

2016

About the Stakeholders Dissertation – Concept Paper

The dissertation, *Stakeholders Disengaging to the Disadvantage of all Stakeholders: A Qualitative Case Study*, is a unique dissertation and consistently remained successful through years. The dissertation is filled with good quality work. Doctoral standards were met and exceeded with the study of this dissertation. An advanced study went into making the dissertation more than passable and went into enabling successful completion of the doctoral program.

Stakeholders Dissertation

Situation Supposed to be Positive and Not the Opposite

Meritorious people are supposed to be treated right. Any party involved with a business area is a stakeholder accordingly to the degree of involvement or interests (Freeman, 2004). Proper rewards and honors have to be provided to who should receive them and in a due time. The completed study shows that past inaccuracies need correcting and mending back to positive standards so that the situation can be fair and successful for any stakeholder.

A major condition exhibits as involved with the circumstances through years. Strongly suggested is that the issues involved be addressed and worked out without needing more than wise expressions. Any mentioned problems caused by stakeholders excessively disengaging cannot be let to continue (Bowden, 2009; Iacovou & Dexter, 2005; Waddock & McIntosh, 2009). Good faith effort continues in directions the completed study recommends.

Dissertation Components and Intents

The dissertation topic is stakeholder disengagement. Stakeholders disengaging could cause severe business impediments, so such a practice or tendency needs reversing (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Hintz & Milan, 2009). The research method is qualitative. The research design is a case study. The research question asks what are the best actions to take to commence improvement concerning informed American and Christian stakeholders excessively disengaging in contrast to other stakeholders. The research question asks how to reverse stakeholders from disengaging. Questioned with the research is what to do about stakeholders disengaging burdensomely to other stakeholders.

The main theory is stakeholder theory. The problem statement is that informed American and Christian stakeholders excessively disengaged from responsibilities of providing rewarding opportunities, which caused many difficulties, including substantial business and financial losses, and left other stakeholders without benefits, rewards, honors, or opportunities. A fair, mutual, or successful situation was not enabled like that (Charron, 2007; Chilosi & Damiani, 2007). Excessive time went by with this situation and without adequate work done to improve the situation. The dissertation was done, and its study included, for purposes such as improving the stakeholder disengagement situation and to promote an increase of benefits, rewards, honors, and opportunities to worthy stakeholders.

Conclusion

The worthy work meritorious people do is supposed to be adequately honored, which results in a positive situation rather than an opposite type of situation. The stakeholder disengagement situation has gone on for years and cannot be let to continue as it has been.

Addressing the relevant issues and working them out correctly is necessary and continues in directions the study recommends. Stakeholder disengagement is the dissertation's topic and is a serious topic that needs to somehow be reversed. Disengaging stakeholders can cause a difficult and an unfair situation that can continue for a long time, so the dissertation aims to improve the condition by providing guidance to increase benefits, rewards, honors and opportunities worthy stakeholders receive.

References

- Bowden, J. (2009). The process of customer engagement: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice*, 17(1), 63-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679170105>
- Charron, D. C. (2007). Stockholders and stakeholders: The battle for control of the corporation. *Cato Journal*, 27(1), 1-22. Retrieved from <http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2007/1/cj27n1-1.pdf>
- Chilosi, A., & Damiani, M. (2007). Stakeholders vs. shareholders in corporate governance. *Journal of Corporate Governance*, 6(4), 7-45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.975293>
- Freeman, R. E. (2004). The stakeholder approach revisited. *Zeitschrift fuer Wirtschafts - und Unternehmensethik [Magazine for Economic and Business Ethics]*, 5(3), 228-241. Retrieved from <http://www.zfwu.de/>
- Hintz, A., & Milan, S. (2009). At the margins of Internet governance: grassroots tech groups and communication policy. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 5(1-2), 23-38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1386/macp.5.1-2.23_1
- Iacovou, C. L., & Dexter, A. S. (2005). Surviving IT project cancellations. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(4), 83-86. doi: 10.1145/1053291.1053292
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). Engaged in engagement: We are delighted we did it. *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 76-83. doi: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.00016.x

Waddock, S., & McIntosh, M. (2009). Beyond corporate responsibility: Implications for management development. *Business & Society Review*, 114(3), 295-325.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8594.2009.00344.x>