
THE FUTURE OF BAM IN THE ACADEMY: A RESPONSE TO RUNDLE AND QUATRO

R. Joseph Childs
Southeastern University

ABSTRACT

Business as Mission (BAM) is beginning to gain momentum in the academic community in such a way that it requires more organized venues for scholarly dialog and curriculum development. BAM is similar to and can draw from the more secular social enterprise (SE) literature, the difference being that BAM represents profit-making organizations that incorporate social *and* Christian spiritual goals. To this end, this article responds to contrasting views regarding the legitimacy of BAM as a practice worthy of being pursued by serious scholars and practitioners. The article concludes by suggesting specific proposals on how the Christian academy and interested scholars may choose to address curricular issues and contribute intellectually to BAM.

INTRODUCTION

This issue of *JBIB* provides an ideal opportunity to provide scholarly reflection on Business as Mission (BAM) as an emerging example of a hybrid organization. Typically, hybrid organizations blend the goals of a for-profit firm with either the social mission of a non-profit or the public mission of a governmental agency. It is generally agreed now that the purpose of a BAM organization is to create a sustainable, profit-making firm that has companion purposes to meet social and spiritual needs. The other-than-profit purposes of BAM are both *kerygmatic*—the proclamation of the gospel—and *missional*—the meeting of tangible social and material needs of a target market; hence, BAM qualifies as a hybrid organization. While examples of BAM-type organizations and practitioners can be identified throughout history, the organized BAM movement is relatively recent. Scholars and universities are beginning to take note.

The topic of the 2010 plenary session of the Christian Business Faculty Association (CBFA) meeting asked the question: *Should BAM as a concept be advanced in the Christian academy by inclusion into curriculum and embraced as serious scholarly inquiry?* Moderated by yours truly, the panel included presentations from Steve Rundle, Mark Russell, David Befus, C. Neal Johnson, and Robert Houlihan. Each was asked to respond to the session title: *Business as Mission: A Discipline Gaining Momentum*. The follow-on question-and-answer period with audience members was engaging and spilled over to additional discussions about establishing an academic journal focusing on BAM. Two of the outcomes from the 2010 and 2011 CBFA conferences were the papers by Steve Rundle and Scott Quatro that appear in this issue of *JBIB*.

In his article, economist Steve Rundle of Biola University provides a brief, but thorough review of the development of the movement. He

includes a historical review as well as theological reflection. His review pulls from the social entrepreneurship, economic development, and missions literature. By drawing from both his previous work and other notable BAM thought leaders such as David Befus, C. Neal Johnson, Mark Russell, and Mats Tunehag, Rundle offers a comprehensive definition of BAM. He concludes with suggestions for future research and advocates for the advancement of BAM in a more organized and collective effort, including the formation of an academic association that would organize meetings and conferences and potentially publish a scholarly journal.

As is characteristic of any vibrant academic discipline, not all scholars agree with the emerging or established paradigm. Scott Quatro's presentation at the 2011 CBFA Conference (and his paper revised for this journal) provides a polemic to Rundle's reflection of the BAM movement. Writing from a spirit of collegiality, Quatro observes that the BAM movement is theoretically flawed and is inconsistent in its theological claims regarding a spiritual hierarchy of work. His critique is grounded in the Reformed tradition and draws heavily from Abraham Kuyper's doctrine of sphere sovereignty. Quatro suggests that the BAM movement violates sphere sovereignty because it unnecessarily blurs the God-given norms and purposes of business with those of the church and charities. He argues that a hybrid organization, where for-profit purposes are co-opted for, or blended with, an evangelical purpose violates God's sovereign design for the institutions of business and the church.

For the remainder of this article I'll provide a more thorough critique of Rundle's and Quatro's perspectives. I will then offer concluding recommendations about how the Christian academy can address the emerging interest in BAM.

RESPONSE TO RUNDLE

One of the greatest contributions of Rundle's piece is his succinct literature review of the historical development of the scholarly work in

the BAM movement. He traces the emergence of BAM from the tentmaking movement of the mid-21st Century to its current state. His review references the theoretical contributions from his previous work (Rundle, 2003; Rundle & Steffen, 2003) and that of Hamilton (1987), Yamamori (1987), Befus (2005), Tunehag (2008), and Johnson (2009). He reviews the more recent empirical research by Lai (2003), Russell (2008), Bronkema and Brown (2008), and Christiansen (2008). Rundle also provides biblical support for BAM in evidence of how the Apostle Paul used his skills to not only generate income to support missionary journeys, but to encourage first-century Christ-followers to remain committed to their professions.

The key contribution of tentmaking to BAM theory was the conviction that one's professional vocational skills can be leveraged to advance God's Kingdom. This philosophy also created new opportunities for lay people to venture into ministry by using their vocations to both fund and provide access to the mission field. However, Rundle points out that one of the limitations of the tentmaking movement was its emphasis that the utility of one's profession was validated to the extent that it provided opportunities to engage in evangelism. This, he argues, reinforced the secular-sacred tension that prompted early BAM pioneers to distinguish their work from tentmaking by affirming the profit-making purpose of business. He concludes by stating the difference: "BAM was similar to early definitions of tentmaking in that it was self-supporting and laity-driven, but it was also different because of its exclusive focus on business and its embrace of a *more holistic understanding of mission* [emphasis added]."

Rundle also notes contributions to BAM from missiologists and theologians including Myers (1999), Kirk (2000), Novak (1996), and Stevens (1999). These works helped to dispel the dualistic secular-sacred divide between work and missions inherent in the early tentmaking movement. I might add that Grudem's work (2003) also

gives a theological voice to the intrinsic value of work and business. Another recent contribution includes Fettke (2010), who proposed a revival of Luther's concept of the priesthood of all believers by suggesting a theology of the laity where the professional clergy and professional lay-person serve a common and complementary service. In addition, recent contributions from missiologists such as Steffen & Barnett (2006), Harries (2008) and Houlihan (2010) provide additional support to making missional efforts more holistic. They include both social and economic development in their strategies.

Rundle brings the topic current by integrating work from the 2004 meeting of the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, as well as the contributions from his previous work (Rundle & Steffen, 2003; Johnson & Rundle, 2006), as well as Eldred (2005), Baer (2006) and Russell (2010). He then suggests a comprehensive definition of BAM as being a *self-funded, for-profit business that is laity-driven, with intentional missional impact, holistic by emphasizing multiple bottom-lines, and that targets economic underdeveloped markets in a cross-cultural context.*

Rundle does point out that there remain competing views on whether or not BAM organizations should be for-profit or non-profit entities. He suggests the social entrepreneurship model by Dees (1998) that accommodates a spectrum from pure charity to pure business, with the *hybrid* model in the balance. I agree with Rundle that Dees (1998) is a useful starting point for developing a taxonomy of BAM-defined organizations. The value of the Dees model is that it accommodates various degrees of emphasis on either profits or purposes. I might add that there are differences in opinion as to whether or not BAM organizations are defined primarily within a cross-cultural context. Bretsen (2010) places BAM within a broader framework that he calls a *faithful business* which can be either cross-cultural or domestic. While my readings of Johnson (2009) and Russell (2010) accommodate for BAM in both cross-cultural and familiar contexts, Run-

dle remains rather convinced that the definition is constrained to a cross-cultural context.

Governance and structure is another area of needed research identified by Rundle. The recent development of the Low-profit Limited Liability Company (L3C) is an attempt to create a legal entity from which hybrid and social enterprise organizations can operate and receive appropriate tax consideration. The L3C was created by Robert Lang (2011) and advanced through the Americans for Community Development (ACD). To qualify as a L3C the primary purpose of the organization must be charitable. Profit-generation is an essential, but secondary purpose. Future BAM entrepreneurs may find the L3C a more suitable legal entity than a traditional sole proprietorship, LLC, C- or S-Corporation. Yunus (2010) also suggests various legal entities appropriate for social enterprises, including the community interest company (CIC) being used in the United Kingdom, which is similar to the L3C.

Still, there is much to uncover about BAM. Recent scholarship from the social entrepreneurship field should be consulted. A volume edited by Kerlin (2009) and the seminal work by Sommerrock (2010) on research methodologies and priorities may prove useful for BAM theory-building. Work by Cacin, Dacin & Mater (2010) also provides a comprehensive review of the social entrepreneurship literature and demonstrates the value of cross-disciplinary contributions from established theories in forging new inquiry. Although still in its infancy, the social enterprise field has over 20 years of empirical work from which to draw more refined research questions and researchable hypotheses that can apply to BAM. As Rundle points out in the beginning of his piece, BAM researchers who familiarize themselves with this field will help to avoid the proverbial "reinvention of the wheel" syndrome. He concludes by speculating about the future of BAM scholarship by suggesting the benefit of a more formal, organized and interdisciplinary approach, perhaps through special sessions at existing associations, or through a new academic

association that publishes its own journal. He suggests priority be given to the pragmatic questions: What makes BAM effective? What best practices and effective strategies can be identified? What should be measured? What kinds of organizational structures should be considered?

Many would agree that Rundle's contributions over the past 10 years have been foundational to the BAM theory-building to date. He should be regarded as one of the key pioneers of scholarship in the field and I look forward to his wise council and thought leadership as the movement progresses.

RESPONSE TO QUATRO

While Rundle believes the theological questions have been adequately vetted and that there is little to add from this field, Quatro's piece provides fodder for additional dialog. Arguing from a Reformed position, he raises objections to the entire BAM movement on grounds that it violates the doctrine of sphere sovereignty and is inconsistent with God's design for business and business education. Based on Quatro's reasoning, this would be true of any kind of so-called hybrid business organization whose purpose was other than solely profit-making, or of a missions organization which incorporated market-based solutions to accomplish social or evangelistic goals. While I take issue with Quatro on several levels, it is noteworthy that he does raise important concerns. I'd like to briefly address each of the five fundamental flaws he raises regarding BAM.

Quatro's first two points are related, so I will address them together: *BAM is based on a dualistic foundation* and *BAM reinforces a dual-class citizenship*. He believes that BAM advocates claim that evangelism is the *primary* and hidden purpose of a BAM business; however, Quatro provides no references from academic BAM thought leaders to reinforce this assumption. There may be voices from the lay-practitioner or pastoral realms that posit that saving souls is the highest and most important purpose of BAM, but the existing literature with which I'm familiar

emphasizes a balanced, multiple-bottom-lines approach. Furthermore, the literature is replete and consistent in its opposition to the so-called sacred/secular dichotomy that Quatro claims is present. Rundle (2003), Tunehag (2004), Johnson (2009), and Russell (2010) spend considerable space on this point. Often referenced in the literature are the works of Stevens (1999; 2006) and Ryken (1986) which also provide strong theological arguments against a hierarchical distinction. My review of Rundle's piece above includes additional references to this point. Thus, a general reading of BAM literature will show that Quatro is mistaken on this point.

However, he does raise an important caution. It is possible to becoming overly zealous to the point that proponents overhype BAM as a more sanctified business model for Christians. If so, this would likely relegate to the basement the more traditional and functional business vocations such as accounting or marketing. This is especially pronounced if the ultimate purpose of BAM is evangelism or discipleship, and it is hyped as the *normative* course of study for Christian students over the single-purpose, for-profit "Business as Businesses" disciplines.

It must be remembered that BAM is simply one type of hybridized organization and is ideally suited for those who are seeking a business model that includes multiple bottom lines as its purpose. BAM supporters and business schools need to carefully avoid the trap of assuming that non-BAM business models and those who own and manage them are second-class Christians. In this respect, I agree with Quatro that non-BAM vocations, or business-as-business vocations should always be viewed as callings in which its participants enjoy being "co-creators with Him." Furthermore, this concept is not unique to the Reformed tradition. Tunehag (2004) summarized the thinking from the Lausanne BAM paper, in which over 70 people from across the globe and from different theological traditions, agreed.

God established the institution and practice of business as a means of fulfilling

His creation mandate to steward and care for all creation.... Business people are being challenged to look anew at their business activities as an expression of their calling and service to God. They are being affirmed in their vocation as business people and used as instruments for extending God's Kingdom (p. 2).

In his third point, Quatro invokes Kuyper's concept of sphere sovereignty and suggests that *BAM violates God's sovereign intent for his creation*. Sphere sovereignty is a concept popular in both neo-Calvinist and Catholic social teaching circles. It asserts that God's design and purpose in various earthly institutions are distinctive from those of the Church. The Church was established to conduct sacerdotal services, the state for civic affairs, and business for economic activities. Under this doctrine the state has no sovereignty over the church, nor should the Church seek to enact civil justice. This doctrine is a useful safeguard, particularly where there are those who suggest that Sharia Law should replace business and civil laws. It also protects an institution from performing a societal role for which it is not best suited to address. For instance, an argument can be made that tax dollars are more efficiently spent by local authorities who have better insight into the problems and solutions than a distant federal bureaucrat. Or that poverty can be better resolved when private enterprise is generally free to create jobs which provide a more dignified source of family income than state- or Church-sponsored handouts.

There are two comments I wish to make here. First, if his point is that God's design for business is equally as good as the design for the Church, then there really is no disagreement. I also accept his argument that business-as-business serves to extend common grace. Johnson (2009) sums this up when he quotes Smith:

The call to business is not a call to second class ministry in God's view. And we don't have to be doing overt evangelism, closing

our chick stores on Sundays, or giving big money to 'real ministries' for God to be pleased with a business that is providing valuable goods for society (p. 49).

Second, if Quatro is using the sphere sovereignty concept to suggest that business and ministry must necessarily remain distinct and siloed institutions, then I would object (provided the two are appropriately integrated). As Christian scholars continue their inquiry, they will be wise to shape BAM theory through a cross-disciplinary lens. This will help ensure that the competencies of business and ministry can be appropriately blended. BAM is at risk if it becomes neither grounded in, nor informed by sound theology, missiology, sociology, economics, management, etc. We don't need a movement that is built on proof-texting and unexamined assumptions. Nor do we need our theologians who may not understand the moral virtues of capitalism to object on the grounds that BAM embraces market-based solutions to resolve social problems.

Quatro's fourth point is that *BAM undermines profit* because it distorts the normal market mechanisms and threatens sustainability. Properly understood, BAM is simply one of many business models. Yes, BAM does channel some profits to social and spiritual causes which otherwise would inure to private shareholders to do as they see fit. However, most BAM practitioners and scholars believe that BAM organizations must be profit-oriented. The social enterprise literature also contributes to this debate by distinguishing the degree to which an organization is oriented more toward profits or more toward non-profit causes (Dees, 1998; Yunus, 2010; and Sommerrock, 2010). In fact, Sommerrock, (2010) and Bretsen (2011) present evidence that suggests that an organization's social cause can become a source of competitive advantage and thereby increase its profit-making potential. Finally, I have no quibble with Milton Friedman's idea or Quatro's point that the moral purpose of a business-as-business is to make profits; however, I also believe university curriculum should be of-

ferred to equip faith-based social entrepreneurs to build sustainable organizations that create goods and services in which profits are used to fulfill social and spiritual purposes.

Quatro's fifth argument suggests that *BAM is inauthentic* when its motives are disguised from its customers and stakeholders. I agree. While there are likely many missionaries and tentmakers who are using business as a cover for ministry, a full reading of the BAM literature will show that this issue has been addressed. As pointed out by Rundle, BAM has evolved to a point where it need not have hidden motives, but rather holistic purposes, including the goal of advancing God's Kingdom through the sharing of one's faith in the marketplace. As Quatro points out, businesses should embrace the concept of extending shalom to their stakeholders. This is expressed by being truthful in all transactions, but for BAM organizations, this is especially true when it comes to governance and legal structures. Authentic BAM organizations must be transparent to their stakeholders regarding their purposes.

Finally, I commend Quatro for his paper and encourage further dialog. While he has developed his position from a Reformed perspective, my critique isn't with Reformed theology, but primarily with his misreading of the mainstream BAM literature. He makes some useful critiques, which provide the opportunity to refine, reflect and engage in new ideas. Although there will never be agreement on all points, my hope is that scholars at Christian universities can agree to disagree with collegiality, grace and humility. I anticipate there may be unique contributions to BAM from other traditions. For instance, are there Pentecostal, Wesleyan-Arminian, Dispensational, Orthodox, or Catholic perspectives on BAM? Will BAM develop its own biblical hermeneutic? What types of research questions will dissertations and other veins of BAM scholarship address in the coming years? These are all exciting opportunities that can be aired in conferences, journals and books.

REFLECTIONS ON BAM IN THE ACADEMY

It was on a return flight from a corporate business trip to Moscow in 1990 when I began to reflect seriously on the missional purpose of business. I had just completed meeting with the Minister of Communication on a project to install 100 privately-managed satellite TV receive-only systems throughout the USSR. The systems would provide access to broadcast media from Western European satellite feeds. The initiative was part of Mikhail Gorbachev's *glasnost* initiative of more open government and wider dissemination of news and information. The Silicon Valley-based company I was working for at the time was a key vendor and systems integrator. It was a *hybrid* project in that it was intended to be a profitable venture with positive social benefits. By the time the fifth system was delivered, the Soviet Empire fell and the project team was disbanded. In retrospect, I regard this opportunity as one of my most memorable professional experiences. However, it also stirred in me a desire to give greater consideration to God's purpose for my career.

In the former USSR I observed an insatiable appetite and yearning for economic freedom mixed with a curiosity about the American experiment. I had discovered that many young adults who grew up behind the Iron Curtain had the assumption that the American capitalist success was due in part to its Judeo-Christian values. I saw the opportunity to share my understanding of basic American business principles within the context of a Judeo-Christian value system. I shared with some friends *that Eastern Europe would be a great location for those who had a mind for business and a heart for missions to invest their lives*. Those words eventually boomeranged back to me and began my journey of experimenting with blending entrepreneurial profit-making activities with a distinctively Christian missional intent.

By summer of 1991, I moved with my young family to Romania to teach market economics

at the University of Oradea in Oradea. I told my friends and supporters that I would be a *business missionary*. There were those who admonished me with great unction that the two were mutually exclusive. Others asked if I was going to be tentmaking in a restricted access country. I didn't necessarily think of my paid job from the university as tentmaking (using a profession to fund a mission effort), nor was I thinking that the joint venture I formed to conduct business in Romania was a clandestine cover for a stealth evangelism operation in a (formerly) communist country.

My goals were simply to teach what I knew about managing and leading businesses within a free market system, to learn how to operate a successful business in Romania for personal profit-gaining motives, and to share my Christian faith and values with those who wanted to know about them. What opened the door for the latter was my response to the often asked questions, "How is it possible to have freedom to run a business? Won't business people just cheat their customers?" My response was to explain that economic freedom works more efficiently when society expects individuals to exercise moral self-restraint in their economic decisions. "Historically, the USA economic system has been fortunate to have moral values informed by Judeo-Christian culture, such as the Golden Rule and looking out for one's neighbor. Let me share with you more about my culture..." would begin my opening.

While I had little guidance and certainly no education or theories to direct my efforts, I somehow managed to feel I made a difference. Twenty years have now past. After a recent trip back to Romania, I had the pleasure of seeing the fruit, which helped to validate my feelings a little more. But I wonder how much more effective could I have been 20 years ago if there was a body of BAM scholarship and literature from which to draw?

In my current position as a business Dean, I am tasked primarily with two things: 1) to ensure that our curriculum is rigorous, innovative, and sufficiently relevant; and 2) to ensure that our faculty members are sufficiently qualified and

adequately resourced to teach in the classroom, to serve within the academy and community, and to contribute intellectually to their disciplines. One of the most important data points for me is the anecdotal stories and seemingly serendipitous conversations I have with students. I often ask students to share with me their understanding of the *divine design* for their lives and vocations. Call it selective listening, but what shouts out to me are the numerous narratives I hear that sound like this: "*I want to learn about business so I can use my entrepreneurial skills to help empower those less fortunate and thus, show them the love of Christ.*" While the 18-to-22-year-old generation has been characterized as entitled and coddled, there are many who have a deeply sincere devotion to Christ that is expressed in acts of service. These students have missional intent, or, as Hirsch (2006) described, an *mDNA* or the *missional-incarnational impulse*. Rundle points this out in his article as well by referencing the Middleton (2009) article from the *Wall Street Journal*.

While avoiding the trap of idolizing capitalistic impulses, many students have discovered that for-profit businesses are essential institutions key to creating and sustaining standards of living that affirm the dignity of humanity. In addition, I am finding that many students at the distinctively Christ-centered university where I serve are also expecting guidance on how to live out their missional impulses to share the gospel with, and express Christian charity to, the less fortunate.

Some colleagues have caught on. They are now exploring ways to shape curriculum to create meaningful learning experiences for students interested in BAM. These efforts begin as concepts are embedded within a course, then stand-alone courses are developed, and then, as demand and institutional mission guides, certificates and full-fledged BAM degree programs are created. As of yet, there are no known BAM degree programs (Tripp, Childs, Kilpatrick, 2010). A handful of schools and seminaries have courses in BAM, such as Rundle's course at Biola, David

Befus's course on BAM (but called Economic Development) at Denver Seminary and C. Neal Johnson's work at Hope International University. Eastern University also has had a tradition of offering economic development programs and MDiv/MBA programs. One promising trend was uncovered by Lucas (2010). He reviewed the course offerings from 109 Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) affiliated schools and discovered that 17 offered some variations of social entrepreneurship courses or curriculum with concentrations, including three with undergraduate degree programs and three with either graduate certificates or a master's degree. My own institution, Southeastern University, launched in the 2011-12 academic year an 18-credit undergraduate minor program in Business as Mission, which includes basic business classes, an assortment of missions courses and a capstone Business as Mission course. A week-long field experience is included as an elective.

For these curricular efforts to become sufficiently rigorous to warrant college credit, they must integrate theoretically sound business practices with the essential components of holistic mission practices. Moreover, to avoid heterodoxy, theoretical and theological development of the field must be informed by the historic faith. For instance, drawing on the work of practical theologians such as Kelly (2008) can inform how universities shape innovative missional-oriented curricula. Hence, Christian universities, particularly those affiliated with the CCCU, would be the likely source for such programs to develop. While essential Christian themes would expect to remain consistent from one institution to the next, variations and emphases would vary according to the theological traditions of the institution. Faculty members should also be resourced to do empirical research that undergirds curriculum. But there must be legitimate outlets to do so.

As Quatro correctly points out, there is a moral purpose of business-as-business as an end in itself. Business schools should affirm this in their curricula and continue to offer traditional

programs in accounting, finance, marketing, etc. Students who pursue such vocations should neither sense guilt, nor be subjected to mixed messages that these are secular disciplines not in keeping with being a serious Christian. But there is also a legitimate place within business schools to explore, develop and shape scholarship and curriculum that embraces the hybrid-type business model called BAM. There are already secular expressions of this. For instance, the top-tier university Johns Hopkins recently designed its new full-time Global MBA program to incorporate a social-enterprise experience in which all students participate in a semester-long project within a developing community.

CONCLUSION

Datar, Garvin & Cullen (2010) have called on all business schools to rethink their curricula and ensure that graduates not only possess the technical skills to manage in a global economy, but also the ability to critically evaluate their own values, attitudes, and belief systems that inform the way they will address needs of the organizations they will lead. Christian schools should do the same. Some will conclude that their mission will drive them to give serious consideration to those students who feel called to serve in holistic ministries and BAM-type organizations. This can be done effectively only to the extent that faculty can draw from a body of scholarship based on empirical inquiry, sound theory and theology consistent with the historic faith. Healthy scholarship gives voice to novel ideas, dissenting views and challenges to existing paradigms.

Thus, I embrace Rundle's call for the formation of an academic society that will attract scholars from across multiple disciplines devoted to the discovery and explanation of the practice of Business as Mission. Let's call it the Association for Business as Mission (ABAM). ABAM could elect officers, recruit members and begin by meeting in conjunction with another established organization, such as CBFA and/or the Evangelical Mission Society (EMS), until such time there

was sufficient justification to hold stand-alone meetings. ABAM would eventually publish its own journal. Let's call it the Journal of Business as Mission (JBAM).

The Journal of Business as Mission would become an international, interdenominational, interdisciplinary journal focused on the theoretical development and practice of Business as Mission. It would provide a peer-reviewed outlet for those engaged in the empirical study and practice of business as mission, faith-based social entrepreneurship, micro-finance/enterprise, holistic missions, economic development, theology of the laity, marketplace missions, etc. Pedagogic topics such as curriculum development, innovative teaching methods, program assessment, case studies, and faculty development relating to Business as Mission would be welcomed. The journal would target professors, scholars, administrators, missionaries, practitioners, and scholarly societies throughout the world involved in the research, development, and practice of BAM.

The future of BAM in the academy is now. Those faculty members and administrators who are innovators and early adopters to embrace BAM will position themselves to reap the benefits of the hundreds or perhaps thousands of prospective students who sense a call to BAM and are seeking academic programs that will help prepare them to be effective. Along with adopting curriculum, universities should direct resources enabling faculty to engage intellectually with BAM. This is of particular importance as BAM will likely be in a pre-paradigmatic state for years. For BAM to mature as a discipline, it will need to be informed by scholars who will devote substantial portions of their careers to do the necessary empirical work to formulate theories and define best practices.

REFERENCES

Befus, D. R. (2005). *Kingdom principles for where there are no jobs*. Miami, FL: LAM.

Baer, M. R. (2006). *Business as mission: The power of business in the kingdom of God*. Seattle, WA: YWAM Publishing.

Bretsen, S. N. (2011). In competition with godless hordes: Are some strategic approaches more appropriate for a faithful business? *The journal of biblical integration in business*, 13, 110-127.

Bronkema, D. & Brown, C. M. (2009). Business as mission through the lens of development. *Transformation*, 26(2), 82-88.

Christiansen, L. (2008). *Faith-based social entrepreneurship: Business as mission*. Unpublished master's thesis. Copenhagen Business School, Copenhagen, Denmark. Retrieved from http://studenttheses.cbs.dk/bitstream/handle/10417/681/linda_christiansen.pdf?sequence=1

Dacin, P.A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of management perspectives*, 24(3), 37-57.

Datar, S. M., Garvin, D. A., & Cullen, P. G. (2010). *Rethinking the MBA: Business education at a crossroads*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Dees, J. G. (1998). Enterprising nonprofits. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(1), 54-67.

Eldred, K. (2005). *God is at work: Transforming people and nations through business*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books.

Grudem, W. A. (2003). *Business for the glory of God: The Bible's teaching on the moral goodness of business*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.

Hamilton, D. 1987. *Tentmakers speak: practical advice from over 400 missionary tentmakers*. Duarte, CA: TMQ Research.

Harries, J. (2008). 'Material provision' or preaching the gospel: reconsidering 'holistic' (integral) mission. *Evangelical Review of Theology*, 32(3), 257-270.

Houlihan, R. (2010). *Missional hope: Holistically transforming a nation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Minneapolis, MN.

Johnson, C. N. (2009). *Business as mission: A comprehensive guide to theory and practice*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic.

Kelly, B. (2008). The Christian university as messianic community in missional engagement with church and the word. In *Transformational Leadership: A Tribute to Dr. Mark Rutland*, Lakeland, FL: Small Dogma Publishing.

Johnson, C. N., & Rundle, S. (2006). The distinctives and challenges of business as mission. In T. Steffen & M. Barnett (Eds.), *Business as mission: From impoverished to empowered* (pp. 19-36). Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Kerlin, J. A. (Ed.). (2009). *Social enterprise: A global comparison*. Lebanon, NH: Tufts University Press.

Kirk, A. (2000). *What is mission? Theological explorations*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Lai, P. (2003). *Problems and solutions for enhancing the effectiveness of tentmakers doing church planting in the 10/40 window*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Asia Graduate School of Theology, Quezon City, Philippines.

Lang, R. (2011). *The concept of the L3C*. Retrieved from <http://americansforcommunitydevelopment.org/concept.php>

Middleton, D. (2009). MBAs seek social change. *The Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 15), p. B7.

Myers, B. (1999). *Walking with the poor: Principles and practices of transformational development*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Novak, M. (1996). *Business as a calling: Work and the examined life*. New York: The Free Press.

Nicholls, A. (2006). *Social entrepreneurship new models of sustainable social change*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rundle, Steven. 2003. Preparing the next generation of kingdom entrepreneurs in T. Yamamori & K. Eldred (Eds.), *On kingdom business: Transforming world mission through kingdom entrepreneurs* (pp. 225-244). Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.

Rundle, S. & Steffen, T. (2003). *Great commission companies: The emerging role of business in missions*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Russell, M. L. (2008). *The use of business in missions in Chiang Mai, Thailand*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky.

Russell, M. L. (2010). *The Missional entrepreneur: Principles and practices for business as mission*. Birmingham, AL: New Hope Publishers.

Ryken, L. (1986). *Worldly saints: The puritans as they really were*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Sommerrock, K. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship business models: Incentive strategies to catalyze public goods provision*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Steffen, T., & Barnett, M. (Eds.) (2006). *Business as mission: From impoverished to empowered*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Stevens, R. P. (1999). *The other six days: Vocation, work, and ministry in biblical perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans.

Stevens, R. P. (2006). *Doing God's business: Meaning and motivation for the marketplace*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans.

Tripp, C. L., Childs, R. J. & Kilpatrick, J. W. (2010). *An examination of the integration of 'business as mission' curriculum in the b-schools of Christian universities*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Christian Business Faculty Association. Lakeland, FL.

Tunehag, M., McGee, W. & Plummer, J. (Eds.) (2004). *Business as mission: Lausanne occasional paper #59*. Accessed from: http://www.lausanne.org/documents/2004forum/LOP59_IG30.pdf

Yamamori, T. (1987). *God's new envoys: A bold strategy for penetrating "closed countries."* Portland, OR: Multnomah Press.

Yunus, M. (2010). *Building social business: The new kind of capitalism that serves humanity's most pressing needs*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Dr. R. Joseph Childs is currently the Dean of the College of Business and Legal Studies at Southeastern University in Lakeland, FL. Along with his administrative and teaching responsibilities, he maintains a consulting practice. In the early 1990s he worked with mission organizations, NGOs and governments in the former Soviet Union, Romania, Hungary, and Poland to advise on transitioning to market economies.