**CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS**

**Respondent Profile**

Forty-six respondents, 38 men and 8 women, participated in the research. Four respondents were single, 14 were married, and 28 were married with children. Twenty-four earned a Master’s degree; 16 received a Bachelor’s degree; one achieved an Associate’s degree and three had no formal training (see Table 2).

Table 2. Gender, Educational Attainment, Marital Status Summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item # | Gender | # | % |
| 1a |  Men | 38 | 83 |
| 1b |  Women | 8 | 17 |
|  |  Total  | 46 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Ed Attainment |  |  |
| 2a |  Associates | 1 | 2 |
| 2b |  Bachelor’s | 16 | 35 |
| 2c |  Masters | 24 | 53 |
| 2d |  Doctorate | 2 | 4 |
| 2e |  No Formal  | 3 | 6 |
|  |  Total  | 46 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Marital Status  |  |  |
| 3a |  Single  | 4 | 9 |
| 3b |  Married  | 14 | 30 |
| 3c |  Married/Children | 28 | 61 |
|  |  Total  | 46 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |

Respondents estimated their level of language mastery at the beginning of their service and their current language mastery. Sixteen respondents rated themselves as beginners or novices at the beginning of their service; 11 rated themselves intermediate; 15 said they were advanced; two considered themselves expert; and two were natives. At the time of the study, 14 respondents rated themselves as intermediate in language mastery; 13 said they were advanced; nine thought they were expert; six remained beginners or novices; and four were natives (see Table 3).

Table 3. Language Mastery Summary

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Item # | Level | Beginning |
| # | % |
| 4a |  Beginner/Novice | 16 | 35 |
| 4b |  Intermediate | 11 | 24 |
| 4c |  Advanced | 15 | 33 |
| 4d |  Expert | 2 | 4 |
| 4e |  Native | 2 | 4 |
|  |  Total  | 46 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Current |
| Item # | Level  | # | % |
| 6a |  Beginner/Novice | 6 | 13 |
| 6b |  Intermediate | 14 | 30 |
| 6c |  Advanced | 13 | 28 |
| 6d |  Expert | 9 | 20 |
| 6e |  Native | 4 | 10 |
|  |  Total  | 46 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |

Six respondents operated their business 11 years or more; twenty had been operating six to 10 years; 11 had been in operation three to five years, and nine were in business for two years or less. When asked how many hours a business operator had communicated with a consultant or adviser during a year, three said they never communicated, 16 said one to 20 hours annually, 14 indicated 20 to 40 hours each year, and 13 said they communicated with a consultant or adviser 41 or more hours yearly (see Table 4).

When asked about the type of business that was operated, the following is a list of business types and the number of respondents who operated each type: Computer Software Development 10, Food Service Industry 7, Agricultural Production/Farming 7, Transportation, Distribution and Warehousing l, Manufacturing 7, Sales and Marketing 3, Education and Training 15, Financial and Banking Services 3, Retail 3, Health and Medical Services 3, and Clothing and Wearables 8. Some of the business operators had more than one business type (see Table 5).

Table 4. Years in Operation, Yearly Hours Communicating Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item # | Years Business in Operation  |
|  | Years  | # | % |
| 5a |  0-2 | 9 | 20 |
| 5b |  3-5 | 11 | 24 |
| 5c |  6-10 | 20 | 43 |
| 5d |  11+ | 6 | 13 |
|  |  Total  | 46 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Yearly Hours CommunicatingWith Consultant/Adviser |
|  | Hours  | # | % |
| 10a |  0 | 3 | 7 |
| 10b |  1-20 | 16 | 35 |
| 10c |  20-40 | 14 | 30 |
| 10d |  41+ | 13 | 28 |
|  |  Total  | 46 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 5. Industry Type Summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item # | Industry Type | # |
| 12a | Computer Software Development | 10 |
| 12b | Food Service Industry  | 7 |
| 12c | Agricultural Production/Farming | 7 |
| 12d | Transportation, Distribution & Warehousing | 1 |
| 12e | Manufacturing | 7 |
| 12f | Sales and Marketing  | 3 |
| 12g | Education and Training  | 15 |
| 12h | Financial & Banking Services  | 3 |
| 12i | Retail  | 3 |
| 12j | Health and Medical Services  | 3 |
| 12k | Clothing and Wearables | 8 |
|  |  Total  | 64 |
|  |  |  |

Business operators were asked to indicate their position or title. Eighteen were Chief Executive Officers, seven were President, six listed Executive Director, two said Vice-President, four were Managers, and nine had a position or title not in this list (see Table 6).

Table 6. Position or Title of the Business Operator

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Item # | Business Position/Title | # |
| 7a | President  | 7 |
| 7b | Chief Executive Officer | 18 |
| 7c | Chief Financial Officer  | -- |
| 7d | Executive Director  | 6 |
| 7e | Vice-President  | 2 |
| 7f | Manager  | 4 |
| 7g | Other  | 9 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |

Twenty respondents had a satellite, branch office, or franchise location that was different than their main office or headquarters. Twenty respondents stated that their company had a corporate or advisory board. Thirty-one businesses had an office, site, or location in a different country than the country in which the respondent had citizenship (see Table 7).

Table 7. Corporate/Advisory Board and Location Summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Item # | Inquiry | Yes | No |
| 8 | Satellite/Branch Office/Franchise? | 20 | 26 |
| 9 | Corporate or Advisory Board?  | 20 | 26 |
| 11 | Location in a Different Country?  | 31 | 15 |
|  |  |  |  |

The overwhelming majority of the businesses were for-profit. One business was non-profit, one was a hybrid or combination profit/non-profit, and 44 business were for- profit. Twenty-nine business were limited liability companies, five were partnerships, four were C Corporations, four were sole proprietorship, one was an

Table 8. Business Profiles Summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Item # | Profit/Non-Profit | # |
| 13a | Profit | 44 |
| 13b | Non-Profit | 1 |
| 13c | Hybrid/Combination | 1 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |
|  | Business Entity Type |  |
| 14a | C Corporation | 4 |
| 14b | S Corporation  | 1 |
| 14c | Limited Liability  | 29 |
| 14d | Low-Profit Limited Liability | 3 |
| 14e | Partnership | 5 |
| 14f | Sole Proprietorship  | 4 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |
|  | Percentage of Business Ownership |  |
| 16a | 0-10% | 5 |
| 16b | 11-25% | 4 |
| 16c | 26-40% | 3 |
| 16d | 41-60% | 7 |
| 16e | 61-99% | 3 |
| 16f | 100% | 24 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |
| Item # | 2018 Gross Sales  | # |
| 18a | Less than $10,000 | 5 |
| 18b | $10,001 to $100.000 | 17 |
| 18c | $100,001 to $500,000 | 8 |
| 18d | $500,001 to $1,000,000 | 6 |
| 18e | $1,000,000+ | 10 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |
|  | Ways Business Owner Compensated |  |
| 15a | Payroll  | 25 |
| 15b | Fringe Benefits  | 15 |
| 15c | Distributions  | 12 |
| 15d | Guaranteed Payments  | 3 |
| 15e | Dividends  | 8 |
| 15f | Capital Gains  | 6 |
| 15g | Charitable Donations  | 25 |
|  |  Total  | 94 |
|  |  |  |

S Corporation, and three were low-profit limited liability companies. Respondents in this research indicated the percentage of ownership they had in the business: five owned zero to 10% of the business, four owned 11 to 25%, three owned 26 to 60%, seven owned 61 to 99%, and 24 owned 100% of the business (see Table 8).

Five businesses had gross sales of less than $10,000 in 2018; 17 had between $10,001 and $100,000 in gross sales; eight businesses grossed between $100,001 and $500,000, six had sales of $500,001 to $1,000,000, and 10 businesses grossed more than $1,000,000. Respondents in this research were compensated in more than one way—46 respondents listed 94 ways in which they were compensated. Twenty-five were compensated on a payroll and twenty-five received charitable donations; 15 received fringe benefits, 12 received distributions, three received guaranteed payments, eight received dividends, and six received capital gains (see Table 8).

Thirteen businesses had between no local employees to five local employees; nine businesses had nine local employees; nine respondents reported having 11 to 20 local employees; four reported 21 to 40 local employees; and 11 respondents reported 41 or more local employees. Forty respondents reported having up to five expat employees; four reported six to 10; and two reported 11 to 20 expat employees. Respondents were asked how many hours per week that they communicated with employees either face-to-face, by telephone, or by email. Eight respondents reported up to nine hours each week; 18 reported communicating 10 to 19 hours weekly; 15 respondents reported between 20 and 39 hours weekly; four reported between 40 and 49; and one respondent reported communicating with employees 50 hour or more weekly. Twenty-four respondents indicated that up to 25% of their customers were from North America or Europe; three said 26 to 50% of customers were from North America or Europe; seven reported 51 to 75%; and twelve said 76 to 100% of customers were from North America or Europe (see Table 9).

Table 9. Employee and Customer Profiles and Communication Time

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Item # | Local Employees | # |
| 19a | 0-5 | 13 |
| 19b | 6-10 | 9 |
| 19c | 11-20 | 9 |
| 19d | 21-40 | 4 |
| 19e | 41+ | 11 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |
| Item # | Expat Employees | # |
| 20a | 0-5 | 40 |
| 20b | 6-10 | 4 |
| 20c | 11-20 | 2 |
| 20d | 21-40 | 0 |
| 20e | 41+ | 0 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |
| Item # | Weekly Hours CommunicatingWith Employees  |  # |
| 21a | 0-9 | 8 |
| 21b | 10-19 | 18 |
| 21c | 20-39 | 15 |
| 21d | 40-49 | 4 |
| 21e | 50+ | 1 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |
| Item # | North American/Europe Customers  | # |
| 22a | 0-25% | 24 |
| 22b | 26-50% | 3 |
| 22c | 51-75% | 7 |
| 22d | 76-100% | 12 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |

Respondents were asked about the percentage of suppliers that were located in the country in which their business was located. Ten respondents said up to 25% of suppliers were in country; four reported 26 to 50% of suppliers were in country; three said 51 to 75% were in country; 29 respondents reported that 76 to 100% of suppliers were in country. When asked how many hours each month did a respondent spend communicating with suppliers, including face-to-face, by telephone, and by email, 34 reported communicating up to 10 hours monthly, nine reported between 11 and 20 hours, three reported between 21 and 40 hours (see Table 10).

Table 10. Percentage of Suppliers in Country and Hours Communicating

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Item # | Suppliers in Country  | # |
| 24a | 0-25% | 10 |
| 24b | 25-50% | 4 |
| 24c | 50-75% | 3 |
| 24d | 75-100% | 29 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |
| Item # | Monthly Hours CommunicatingWith Suppliers | # |
| 25a | 0-10 | 34 |
| 25b | 11-20 | 9 |
| 25c | 21-40 | 3 |
| 25d | 41+ | 0 |
|  |  Total  | 46 |
|  |  |  |

Table 11. Business Networks Summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Item # | Business Networks | # |
| 26a | OPEN/B4T | 44 |
| 26b | Denominational  | 3 |
| 26c | Mission Agency  | 18 |
| 26d | Other Network  | 11 |
| 26E | No Network | 2 |
|  |  |  |

Most businesses that were reported in this research were associated with one or more Business Networks. Two respondents reported that their business was not associated with a network. Forty-four businesses were associated with the Business for Transformation Network (B4T), three were related to a denominational network, eighteen to a Mission Agency, and 11 to another network (see Table 11).

**Hypotheses Analysis**

**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.

The null hypothesis was rejected. Eight corollaries were developed in order to assess relationships (a) between Social Impact Conflict Management subscales and Cultural Intelligence high/low values and (b) between Cultural Intelligence subscale values and Social Impact subscale high/low values. A Mann-Whitney U procedure was applied to analyze the data. There were significant differences in three of eight corollaries including:

* a 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.
* a 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.
* 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.

In Corollary C (Co1c) the U’ was 465, the z-value 5.436, and the p-value was <.001; in Corollary G (Co1g) the U’ was 445, the z-value was 4.333, and the p-value was <.001; in Corollary H (Co1h) the U’ was 334.5, the z-value was 2.378, and the p-value was .017. (see Table 12).

Table 12. Hypothesis 1 Statistical Analysis Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Corollary # | MW U’ | z-Value | p-Value | Significant |
| Co1a | 311 | 1.059 | .29 |  |
| Co1b | 267.55 | .066 | .947 |  |
| Co1c | 465 | 5.436 | <.001 | Yes |
| Co1d | 292 | 1.383 | .167 |  |
| Co1e | 269.5 | .383 | .702 |  |
| Co1f | 236 | .07 | .944 |  |
| Co1g | 445 | 4.333 | <.001 | Yes |
| Co1h | 334.5 | 2.378 | .017 | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**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.

The null hypothesis was rejected. Eight corollaries were developed in order to assess relationships (a) between Social Impact Conflict Management subscales and Cultural Intelligence high/low values and (b) between Cultural Intelligence subscale values and Social Impact subscale high/low values. A Mann-Whitney U procedure was applied to analyze the data. There was a significant difference in one of eight corollaries and an observable though not significant difference in one corollary including:

* 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.
* an observable though not 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.

In Corollary G (Co2g) U’ was 387, z-value was 3.027, and p-value was .002. In Corollary H (Co2h) U’ was 348.5, z-value was 1.847, and the p-value was .065. (see Table 13)

Table 13. Hypotheses 2 Statistical Analysis Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Corollary # | MW U’ | z-Value | p-Value | Significant |
| Co2a | 288 | .551 | .581 |  |
| Co2b | 267.5 | .066 | .947 |  |
| Co2c | 274 | .484 | .628 |  |
| Co2d | 264.5 | -- | 1.0 |  |
| Co2e | 281.5 | .653 | .514 |  |
| Co2f | 271.5 | .154 | .877 |  |
| Co2g | 387 | 3.027 | .002 | Yes  |
| Co2h | 348.5 | 1.847 | .065 | Observable |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**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.

The null hypothesis was rejected. Eight corollaries were developed in order to assess relationships (a) between Social Impact Conflict Management subscales and Cultural Intelligence high/low values and (b) between Cultural Intelligence subscale values and Social Impact subscale high/low values. A Mann-Whitney U procedure was applied to analyze the data. There was a significant difference in two of eight corollaries including:

* 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 Behavioral subscale.
* a 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 subscale.

Table 14. Hypotheses 3 Statistical Analysis Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Corollary # | MW U’ | z-Value | p-Value | Significant |
| Co3a | 324 | 1.345 | .178 |  |
| Co3b | 302.5 | 1.125 | .26 |  |
| Co3c | 308 | 1.249 | .211 |  |
| Co3d | 302 | 1.114 | .265 |  |
| Co3e | 281.5 | .653 | .514 |  |
| Co3f | 270 | .394 | .693 |  |
| Co3g | 504 | 5.661 | <.001 | Yes |
| Co3h | 373 | 2.712 | .007 | Yes  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

In Corollary G (Co3g) U’ was 504, z-value was 5.661, and p-value was <.001. In Corollary H (Co3h) U’ was 373, z-value was 2.712, and p-value was .007. (see Table 14)

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.