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# Problem Statement

Did the cultural intelligence of Business as Mission and Business for Transformation practitioners affect their social impact, defined as conflict level, relationship building, and effective business exchange, among employees, customers, and suppliers?

# Purpose Statement

This research was designed to investigate how Business as Mission practitioner’s cultural intelligence affects social impact defined as conflict management, building relationships, and effective business exchange with employees, customers and suppliers.

# Background of the Problem (1-2 pages)

Describe the problem in the context of extant literature…

# Significance

This study will contribute to the gap in research of…by identifying….

# Research Questions

**Hypothesis 1**

H01: There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Conflict Management subscale.

**Corollaries.**

Corollary A (Co1a): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Conflict Management subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale.

Corollary B (Co1b): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Conflict Management subscale.

Corollary C (Co1c): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Conflict Management subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Cognitive subscale.

Corollary D (Co1d): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Cognitive values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Conflict Management subscale.

Corollary E (Co1e): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Conflict Management subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale.

Corollary F (Co1f): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Conflict Management subscale.

Corollary G (Co1g): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Conflict Management subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale.

Corollary H (Co1h): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Conflict Management subscale.

**Hypothesis 2**

H02: There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Relationship Building subscale.

**Corollaries**.

Corollary A (Co2a): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Relationship Building subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale.

Corollary B (Co2b): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Relationship Building subscale.

Corollary C (Co2c): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Relationship Building subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Cognitive subscale.

Corollary D (Co2d): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Cognitive subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Relationship Building subscale.

Corollary E (Co2e): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Relationship Building subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale.

Corollary F (Co2f): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Relationship Building subscale.

Corollary G (Co2g): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Relationship Building subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale.

Corollary H (Co2h): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Relationship Building subscale.

**Hypothesis 3**

H03: There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the on Effective Business Exchange subscale.

**Corollaries.**

Corollary A (Co3a): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale.

Corollary B (Co3b): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale.

Corollary C (Co3c): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Cognitive subscale.

Corollary D (Co3d): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Cognitive subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale.

Corollary E (Co3e): There was a statistically significant difference in Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale.

Corollary F (Co3f): There was a statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale.

Corollary G (Co3g): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale.

Corollary H (Co3h): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Effective Business Exchange.

# Research Methodology

This study will utilize a quasi-experimental quantitative methodology because hypotheses derived from research questions will be tested using statistical analysis.

# Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

This study is framed by \_\_\_\_\_\_ theory because… (cite).

# Instrumentation

Three instruments were applied in the research, the 20-item Cultural Intelligence Scale, the 22-item Social Impact Self-Report, and the 26-item Demographic survey. The three instruments were combined into one instrument and made available to the OPEN/Business for Transformation participants, as either a paper survey or an electronic gathering program.

**Cultural Intelligence Scale.**

The Cultural Intelligence Scale was developed by Ang, Van Dyne, Koh, Ng, Templer, Tay, and Chandrasekar (2007). The 20-item instrument was developed from Cultural Intelligence research. The instrument included four subscales: Metacognitive, Cognitive, Motivational, and Behavioral. The Metacognitive subscale assessed individual cultural consciousness and awareness during interactions with those from different cultural backgrounds (Van Dyne, Ang & Koh, 2008). The Cognitive subscale measured individual cultural knowledge of norms, practices, and conventions in different cultural settings. The Motivational subscale assessed individual capability to direct attention and energy toward cultural differences. The Behavioral subscale evaluated individual capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions, when interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds. The scale was tested cross-culturally multiple times with both self-report and observer-report during scale development for generalizability across samples, times, countries, and methods, and for discriminant, incremental, and predictive validity. Permission was granted to use the instrument and make it available in a paper and electronic form.

**Social Impact Self-Report.**

The Social Impact Self-Report was developed to assess social impact that focused conflict management, relationship building, and effective business exchange among employees, customers, and suppliers of Business as Mission and Business for Transformation practitioners. A five-point Likert-type scale was developed (1-strongly agree to 5-strongly disagree) to rate social impact items in the Social Impact Self-Report. Lawshe’s Content Validity Ratio table (Ayre & Scally, 2014) was consulted to determine the number of experts needed to assess items of relevance in the survey. A five-step process was applied in the development of the Social Impact Self-Report.

First, from a literature search, items for three subscales were developed. For the assessment of Conflict Management 21-items were developed; for Relationship Building 25-items were developed; and for Effective Business Exchange 20-items were developed.

Second, the three sets of items were submitted to a panel of experts to be rated as essential or nonessential. The panel of experts included nineteen, mostly college professors; of the nineteen, nine responded by rating the three sets of items, as essential or non-essential. Non-essential was rated 0 and essential was rated 1. In the Conflict Management subscale there were seven 9s, three 8s, a mean of 6.9 and a standard deviation of 0.042 essential ratings; in the Relationship Building subscale there was one 9, ten 8s, a mean of 6.84, and a standard deviation of 0.043; and in the Effective Business Exchange subscale there was two 9s, four 8s, a mean rating of 6.64, and a standard deviation of 0.047.

Third, based upon the rating of the expert panel eight Conflict Management items were selected and randomized, eight Relationship Building items were selected and randomized; and six Effective Business Exchange items were selected and randomized.

Fourth, the 22 selected/randomized items were submitted to practitioners, who attended two Open/Business for Transformation Network Conferences, one during October 2018 in Kansas City, MO and one during March 2019 in Houston, TX. Twenty-two conference practitioner participants responded in the pilot study. The sum of the item variance was 13.22083, the average of the sums of the responses was 34.9375, and the Cronbach alpha was 0.651186.

Fifth, the instrument was evaluated for reliability by a split-half analysis. The odd items were compared to the even items in the Social Impact Self-Report. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation was applied to assess the reliability. A total of 16 cases were compared. The mean for the odd items was 17.0625; the mean for the even items was 17.8750. The Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient was 0.6467; the t-value was 3.171989 with 14 degrees of freedom; and the p-value was .007. A low p-value implied that the slope did not equal zero.

The assessment of essential and non-essential items by the expert panel established the validity of the Social Impact Self-Report. The pilot studies and the split-half analysis established the reliability of the instrument.

**Demographic Data.**

An instrument with 26-items was developed to gain a profile of the 46 respondents who completed either a paper survey or the electronic survey. The paper survey was made available to OPEN/Business for Transformation Network participants by an administrator of the network.

# Research Design

Quasi-Experimental: compare differences in a continuous dependent variable between groups split on one or more independent variables from a validated instrument (quantitative, deductive)

This quantitative study will utilize a quasi-experimental design because it will examine \_\_\_\_\_ scores between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_ for statistically significant differences among \_\_\_\_\_.

# Population and Sampling

The population was (a) Business for Transformation network (OPEN/B4T) practitioners from Western developed countries, who used the Business as Mission model to open for-profit businesses, and (b) Business for Transformation network practitioners who ran non-profit organizations in developing countries in the 10/40 window.

The self-selected sample was from Business for Transformation practitioners in the Business for Transformation network (OPEN/B4T), who worked in developing countries in the 10/40 window.

# Hypotheses (Quantitative Only)

Quasi-Experimental:

**Hypothesis 1**

H01: There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Conflict Management subscale.

Corollaries.

Corollary A (Co1a): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Conflict Management subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale.

Corollary B (Co1b): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Conflict Management subscale.

Corollary C (Co1c): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Conflict Management subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Cognitive subscale.

Corollary D (Co1d): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Cognitive values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Conflict Management subscale.

Corollary E (Co1e): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Conflict Management subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale.

Corollary F (Co1f): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Conflict Management subscale.

Corollary G (Co1g): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Conflict Management subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale.

Corollary H (Co1h): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Conflict Management subscale.

**Hypothesis 2**

H02: There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Relationship Building subscale.

Corollaries.

Corollary A (Co2a): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Relationship Building subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale.

Corollary B (Co2b): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Relationship Building subscale.

Corollary C (Co2c): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Relationship Building subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Cognitive subscale.

Corollary D (Co2d): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Cognitive subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Relationship Building subscale.

Corollary E (Co2e): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Relationship Building subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale.

Corollary F (Co2f): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Relationship Building subscale.

Corollary G (Co2g): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Relationship Building subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale.

Corollary H (Co2h): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Relationship Building subscale.

**Hypothesis 3**

H03: There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the on Effective Business Exchange subscale.

Corollaries.

Corollary A (Co3a): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale.

Corollary B (Co3b): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Metacognitive subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale.

Corollary C (Co3c): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Cognitive subscale.

Corollary D (Co3d): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Cognitive subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale.

Corollary E (Co3e): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Motivational subscale.

Corollary F (Co3f): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Motivational CQ subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale.

Corollary G (Co3g): There was no statistically significant difference in Social Impact Effective Business Exchange subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Cultural Intelligence Behavioral subscale.

Corollary H (Co3h): There was no statistically significant difference in Cultural Intelligence Behavioral CQ subscale values between respondents with high values and respondents with low values on the Social Impact Effective Business Exchange.

# Data Analysis Plan

Quantitative:

Four procedures were applied in the data analysis, including: Frequencies Analysis, Mann-Whitney Two-Sample Test, Cronbach’s alpha, and a Correlation Analysis. The descriptive data was organized and analyzed with the aid of the Frequencies Analysis procedure. The hypotheses were analyzed through the application of the Mann-Whitney Two-Sample Test. A Correlation Analysis was applied to analyze or establish the reliability of the Split Half Data. The Cronbach alpha was applied to establish reliability of the Social Impact Self-Test in the Pilot Study.

The Frequencies Analysis counted the occurrence of data values for a variable and displays that data in a table. Things were counted and data consisted of totals or frequencies for a category, which was sometimes referenced as categorical data.

The Mann-Whitney Two-Sample Test was an independent group analysis in that observations were taken from groups in which respondents in one group did not appear in another group. The observations within as well as between groups were independent of one another. In the Mann-Whitney test there was no assumption about normality or equality of variances. The data analysis involved the calculation of a p-value that was applied to determine statically significant differences. A p-value of .05 or less was evidence of a statistically significant difference and a p-value above .05 was evidence of no statistically significant difference.

Correlation Analysis was a measure of the strength of the linear relationship between two variables. A scatterplot would show a pattern that falls along a straight line. Correlation assumed that both variables were independent—neither was dependent on, caused or influenced the other. Values close to -1 or 1 indicated a strong relationship between two variables. Values close to zero indicated a weak or non-existent relationship. Negative value indicated an inverse relationship—as one variable increases, the other decreases. A positive value showed a direct relationship—as one variable increased, the other increased.

Cronbach’s alpha was a coefficient of reliability or a measure of internal consistency. The procedure assessed how closely related a set of items were as a group; it was considered a measure of scale reliability.