CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Practitioners of Business as Mission (BAM) and Business for Transformation (B4T) needed tools to measure the social impact of the endeavors to glorify God through holistically reaching others with the gospel of Jesus Christ. The goal of holistic impact required instruments that took into account the impact that Business practitioners were having on advancement of God’s kingdom. The measurements must account for spiritual, economic, social, and ecological impact for the benefit of practitioners, sending agencies, investors, lenders, shareholders and other stakeholders. This research investigated a small piece of the puzzle related to the social impact of Business as Mission. Chapter 1 provided the reader with the Problem, the Background to the Problem, the Setting of the Research, the Thesis Statement, and a list of the Research Hypotheses and Corollaries. The chapter included the Scope of the Research, Research Assumptions, and Significance of the Research.

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.

Problem Background

Business as Mission was a subset of the larger movement known as Social Entrepreneurship that grew from 1980s to 2022 as a result of several concurrent phenomena known as: globalization, technological advancements, worldwide financial expansion, and worldwide financial mismanagement. Opportunities and challenges arose from rapid economic, social, religious, technological, ecological, and political changes experienced by people from many nations. The seismic changes led to benefits and challenges to which populations had to react. Many welcomed the openness of borders and the benefits from which they were able to take advantage, while they ignored or downplayed the challenges that began to accrue in the background. At the beginning, few voices warned of the dangers; concerns were sidelined as misinformed, speculative, provincially, or ideologically driven. When the challenges of population migrations, employment instability, unrestrained spending, largescale financial debt, and cultural conflict became overwhelmingly evident, many began to question the wisdom of the global system. Movements espousing nationalism, religious, cultural, or ethnic identity came forward as alternatives to the international economic and political system, which led to reactionary policy from nation-states to greater restrictions about those who could enter their borders, how they could enter, and for how long. The restrictions challenged the work of missionaries, students, and non-profit and migrant workers. Visitors had to prove the value of their presence to the host countries they sought to inhabit. In this context, Business as Mission has developed as a way to do missions that holistically benefitted people: spiritually, socially, economically, and ecologically.

The phenomena coupled with a paradigm shift in business practices from a single bottom-line perspective, where business practitioners only responsibility was to increase value to their shareholders to a more holistic view, birthed social entrepreneurship and Business as Mission. A multiple bottom-line perspective was a catalyst for business practitioners to realize that their normal profit-making activities including providing employment, job training, product innovation, and investment in research and development were more than merely profit-making activities. Normal profit-making activities were a way to (a) benefit many people both locally and abroad, (b) provide social stability, and (c) develop solutions to ecological problems, which business practitioners had contributed to in the past. Capitalism coupled with responsible business practices was shown historically to be a better way to distribute resources than an economy run by central government control. Due to neo-liberal economic ideology, many investors and theorists questioned the wisdom of the new paradigm and so a quest was begun to develop assessments to prove the value of Business as Mission and meet the diverse needs of a variety of businesses and information users.

The research was conducted in collaboration with the OPEN/Business for Transformation network, whose practitioners were part of the larger Business as Mission movement. The networks and practitioners were growing in number every year. Practitioners were people motivated by the Christian faith to interact cross-culturally with nationals within the borders of countries in the 10/40 window, either through for-profit businesses or non-profit agencies. The practitioner’s goals were to effect spiritual, economic, social, and ecological transformation in the lives of those with whom they interacted. Many practitioners worked under the oversight and guidance from either a board, a mission agency, consultants, or networks of practitioners. The practitioners in the Business as Mission and Business for Transformation networks were mostly from Western countries in North America and Europe. Most received education and training from universities and educational institutions in the West. Their missiological methods, economic and social philosophies, and views of individuality and community were derived from western traditions.

The OPEN/Business for Transformation network was the group of practitioners studied. It was founded and until recently continued under the guidance of its founder, Patrick Lai. This network functions under a modified philosophy of Business as Mission. Lai’s tentmaker philosophy also incorporated non-profit groups acting in developing nations in the 10/40 window. The tentmaker conceptualization of success entailed three constructs: evangelization, discipleship, and church planting. If these did not take place, then the practitioner’s efforts could not be said to be successful. Conversely, if these were achieved, but the business side of the practitioner’s efforts failed, it would still be considered a success. The definition of success for Business as Mission was broader and included business, spiritual, social, ecological outcomes. The constructs would be included in a Business as Mission concept of success, but it would also entail success in business as well as in social and ecological outcomes. For Business as Mission constructs: spiritual, economic, social, and ecological, all must be achieved to declare a practitioner’s efforts successful.

Thesis 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.

Research Hypothesis

**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.