

American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research (AJHSSR)

e-ISSN :2378-703X

Volume-07, Issue-12, pp-48-59

www.ajhssr.com

Research Paper

Open Access

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN THE NIGER DELTA

Ebitimi Collins ADIKOKO, Kimiebi Imomotimi EBIENFA

¹Special Adviser on Political and Community Affairs, Office of the Secretary to the State Government, Bayelsa State, Nigeria

²Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Abuja, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT: This paper analyzes the nexus between corporate social responsibility and community development in Niger Delta, using the case of the Nigerian Agip Oil Company and community development in selected host communities in Bayelsa State. The paper revealed that, the oil companies score conspicuously low in the discharge of Corporate Social Responsibility activities in tandem with the huge profit they make from the area. This is because the living standard of the local people is still low and in pitiable conditions. Again, whereas, there are memoranda of understanding signed between the oil companies and the host communities, the oil companies more often than not fail to implement such agreement which negate the promotion of community development. More so, MOU's programmes do not reflect the priority needs of the people, which make such projects subject to abuse and misuse. The paper therefore recommends that the laws governing the Nigerian oil industry must be reviewed to compel oil companies to carry out social responsibility activities. Moreso, the MOU's must be respected, implemented and fully driven by the spirit of popular participation to give the oil bearing communities a sense of belonging, if that is done, it will help to close the curtain of strained relationship between oil companies and their host communities.

KEYWORDS: Oil, Development, Corporate Social Responsibility, Multinational Corporations.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nigeria is a petrodollar state. But despite the huge revenue from oil, Nigeria sits comfortably among the community of poorest countries in the world. The Niger Delta is the focal point of oil and gas production in Nigeria. Whereas, the wealth generated from the ethnic minorities populated region which is the heart of the Nigerian economy, the region paradoxically is not an exception in terms of poverty and underdevelopment that characterize most parts of the country. There is no denying the fact that oil exploration and exploitation activities have adversely affected or impacted in areas like agriculture and natural resources, livestock and forest etc. Oil spills degrade most agricultural lands and reduce the availability of fish products, cause pollution of sun fall and ground water resources, disruption of arable lands and the subsistence economy of the people etc. (Ugwu 2009, Inoni et al 2006, Alexs 2006, Molles 2005).

The concept of "Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)" mandated corporations not to pay attention only to economic profits but also the social problems within their environment. The amount has ethical underpinnings, the reason being that, it involves changing motives of human welfare and emphasizes a concern with social dimension of business activities that have to do with improving the quality of lives of the community.

There is an increasing consciousness of exploitation and backwardness in the Niger Delta, inspite of the wealth produced in the region to benefit the Nigerian state and oil companies, there is equally an increase in corporate social responsibility demands by host communities in oil companies operating in their domains. Whereas, the oil companies have doubled corporate social responsibility efforts in recent times, agitations for such programme and initiatives have continued unabated. Therefore, the fundamental question that begs for answer is, why is the Niger Delta conflict profile underscored by community resent rant of oil company operations escalating at the same time that these companies are intensifying efforts through corporate social responsibility gestures to host communities? Seeking answers to these very crucial questions shall be the core of the paper.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

As the title aptly suggest, we shall proceed to review the concept “Community Development” and “Corporate Social Responsibility”.

III. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Before delving into what community development represents, it is imperative to first and foremost explain the term “Community”. According to Ismail (2009) a “community” basically refers to a group of people sharing a common purpose who are inter dependent for the Fulfillment of certain Needs, who live in close proximity and interact, on a regular basis. That is a group who live in a particular area or who are alike in some way. This implies that, members of a community share similar characteristics in terms of occupation, social status, culture, and lives in a defined location as the case may be. Communities are marked by deep, familiar and cooperative ties between people that often involve a high degree of personal intimacy, moral commitment, social cohesion and commitment in life. More so, they are committed to a clearly defined set of values that guide their behavior through allied and social norms. That is the rules and regulations that guide their conduct and relationships.

“Community Development” which is fast becoming popular in development studies has different meanings and interpretation. Most practitioners think of community development, as a result –physical, social and economic improvement in a community, while most scholars’ think of community development as a process, the ability of communities to act collectively and enhancing the ability to do so (Phillips and Pitman, 2009). It is obvious from the above that community development has to do with the conscious involvement of member of a giving community to improve the socio-economic well being of their community. However, Wilkinson (1991) posits thus, “Community development can be seen as an action that is purposely dissected towards altering local conditions in positive way. This means, community development is actually the process of consciously improving the living standard of condition of a given community. It is also conceived as a process whereby those who are marginalized and excluded are enabled to gain in self confidence, to join with others and to participate in actions to change their situation and tackle problems that face their community, (Todaro and Smith, 2003). Hackett (2004) also collaborate the above submission when he opined that “community development is a process that allows community resident to come together to plan, generate solutions and take actions, developing the evolutions of social, economic, environmental and cultural aspect of the community. The above opinion stresses the importance of people who share a common purpose, which are inter- dependent but yet could pull their resources together and foster a common goal of improving on all aspect of life in their community. To Kuponigi (2008) Community Development emphasizes the importance of participation as a means of strengthening local communities. The idea is that, it builds peoples skills for community-based issues; hence, it is vital to the survival of local communities. Community development is also seen as the process of building social capital for collective benefits; it uses skill and knowledge and essential strategies in their practices.

It is evident from the above that community development is basically a concerted effort that harnesses the programmes, the processes and strategies to make a people’s life sustainable or dependable. Community development therefore embraces all aspects of life aimed at improving the local people. Again, it is a process of challenging the undesirable and unacceptable disparity of conditions and infrastructures that negatively affects the quality of life in a place, where people live and work (Community Development, 2009).

To a very large extent, the key values in community development are, equality and anti-discrimination, social justice, collective action, learning and working together etc. Thus, community development entails participation in decision making and collective action, leading to an agenda of social change regarding equality, social inclusion and amelioration of poverty.

IV. CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Corporate Social Responsibility is fast becoming very popular, though it has been in existence for a long time. It may be referred to in various contexts as social performance (excluding micro finance) or corporate citizenship, corporate ethics, sustainable development, and sustainability of social enterprise etc. among others. Contemporary exigencies due to globalization, the end of the cold war, the information technology revolution and the bifurcation of world polities have all necessitated the re-evolution of business-society relationship and facilitate the emergence of innovative business social responsibility practices.

Finding a definitional construct of CSR has been a major challenge across disciplines. The inability has led to proliferation of definitions and multifarious methods of measuring CSR, leading to the inability to compare corporate social responsibility strategy and performance across borders and industries. It has been observed that scholars, lawyers, consultants and even nongovernmental organizations and other interest groups all have separate definitions for the concept. Quite apart from different definitional construct, it is also important to note that, some institutions and individuals equally change their definition cum interpretations of the concept over time.

To authenticate the above position, Blowfield and Frynas (2005) cited the example of the World Business Council for Sustained Development (WBCSD) which defined the concept in 1998 as “the continuing commitment by business to behave ethically and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the work force and their families, as well as of the lead community and society at large. However, it is interesting to note that in 2002, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development changed its definition to: the commitment of business to contribute to sustainable economic development, working with the employee, families, the whole community and society at large to improve the quality of life. This means that, CSR encompasses a broad range of activities that corporations may engage in with varying degree of enthusiasm, to demonstrate that, they are addressing important human right, environmental and labour issues – many of them have been brought to their attention by activist groups. The European Commission (2001) CSR as, essentially a concept whereby, companies decide voluntarily to contribute to a better society and to cleaner environment. That is, companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations on voluntary bases. It is evident that CSR is about capacity building for sustainable livelihood. It is simply about business giving back to the society (environment).

CSR therefore connotes a paradigm shift from the traditionally held belief that the soul of a business enterprise is only to use its resource to engage in activities designed to increase its profit (Friedman, 1998). The above elucidate the fact that, CSR is not about increasing the profit margin of companies but making host communities feel the impact of their presence. If a company gives a certain percentage of their earnings back to society, it will be evident that such society’s socio-economic status will be elevated. We wish to assert that, the new tendency of expecting Business Corporation to be mindful of the feeling of and preference of other is an attempt by modern capitalism to avoid self annihilation. The argument is that CSR is an effort to curtail the extremism of the capitalism system, which was hitherto focused primarily on profit maximization.

V. CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

There is no denying the fact that CSR has the capacity to foster community development, but as experienced in the Niger Delta, CSR is driven not so much by altruistic consideration as the profit – maximizing calculations of business (Aaron, 2008).

In a highly insightful study, Christian Aid (2004) identified six factors behind the corporate enthusiasm for corporate social responsibility. The first is defending public image. According to the study, the first corporate social responsibility initiatives were a response to public pressure and media expose or poor company behavior. The second factor identified by the study is attracting investors as well as burgeoning ethical investment sector are increasingly paying attention to environmental and social practices of corporations as a basis for investing their stocks. The third factor identified is making good public relations. That is, CSR has the capacity to deflect people’s attention away from bad to good corporate behavior. The fourth factor identified by the study is, the issue of engaging campaigners. The interpretation is that, a company may engage in CSR as a response to nongovernmental organizations (NGO) campaigns against its practices. The fifth factors is a permission to operate in conflict prone areas like the Niger Delta, a corporations good works may earn it the social license to operate. And finally, against the background of calls for the imperatives for regulating the conduct of corporations, voluntary good conduct by a corporation may be used to obviate the need for regulation.

From the foregoing, it is obvious that CSR, from whatever angle it is looked at, is meant primarily to serve the interest of corporations and not the communities in which they operate. The fact remains that, the community development programs of the oil companies in the Niger Delta were until recently hinged on philanthropy rather than a conscious strategy of corporate governance that accepted responsibilities to community development. It is important to state that, the bulk of literature on corporate social responsibility performance and community development in the Niger Delta conclude that oil corporations failed to deliver on their promises, either through inefficiently provided for or projects that have no direct bearing with the needs of the people (Ibeanu 1996, HRW 1999, Clark 1999, Frynas, 2005, Akpan 2005, and Christian Aid 2004).

Due to the inherent contradictions in the Nigerian oil industry, it has been observed that the multinational oil companies were entrusted often without the peoples consent with the natural and environmental resources of the host communities. We must emphasis that ideally, while producing oil and gas, the multinational corporations are expected to manage exploitation responsibly, sensitively and effectively to promote development in the host communities. Moreso, the management of operations and exploitations of the natural resources was expected to be so effectively managed in such ways that positive externalities and socio-economic development of the region (Ikelegbe, 2008). But that unfortunately is far from the reality in the oil-rich Niger Delta. Pitiablely, the multinational corporations have neglected the life chances of the oil producing communities in which they operate (Lubeck, Watts and Lipschits, 2007).

The fact remains that, due to the weak, dependent and rent seeking character of the Nigerian state, the oil companies take advantage of the naivety, lack of political will and corruption of the Nigerian state to breach with impunity most Memoranda of Understanding signed with oil bearing communities. The memorandum of understanding is basically designed to create participatory development processes to better address the needs of the host communities. In addition, it is aimed at instilling tranquility, stability and reducing conflict between the oil-bearing communities and oil companies. Be that as it may, most conflicts between oil companies and host communities are attributed to failures on the part of oil companies to adhere to MOUs signed with their host communities.

There is no denying the fact that, CSR can promote community development if the practitioners are sincere and committed to realize sustainable results. Moreso, observations in the Niger Delta gives credence to the fact that, oil companies have good infrastructural facilities in their operational bases despite how remote such locations might be. According to Samson (2010), the operational bases of the oil companies are equipped with health facilities, good communication network, pipe borne water, roads, etc. but that is not the case with host communities located few meters away. To Ujor (2010), the politicization of CSR projects has been the bane of community development in oil bearing communities. The argument is that, if the oil multinationals extend the facilities they provide and enjoy in their operational base to the host communities, it will invariably go a long way to promote development in such areas.

Poverty reduction is good strategy of community development. But in the host communities of the Niger Delta, poverty has become a way of life due to the economic stagnation, agricultural under development from soil infertility, unemployment, poor quality of life due to shortage of essential goods, unhealthy environmental spreading diseases and malnutrition (UNDP, 2006). The answer is that most oil companies are not sincere and thus playing double standard with CSR activities in their host communities. For instance, commenting on CSR projects in Umuechem, Christian Aid (2004) posits that, there are taps that are dry, the town of 10,000 people also has a hospital that has never treated a patient, a secondary school where no lesson has been taught, a post office that has never handled a letter and a women's centre that has never held a meeting. Though, this may sound exaggerated but, no doubt, it is the undeniable reality. Be that as it may, this does not mean that CSR has not produced positive outcomes.

Previous studies on Corporate Social Responsibility and Community Development give reasons to the fact that CSR is still at a very low degree in terms of implementation and effectiveness. Another reason advanced to buttress this position include; low-level of commitment to CSR initiatives and cosmetic projects that don't stand the test of time (Osuntokun 2008, Owolabi and Olu-owolobi 2009), pessimism, abysmal and ambivalent responses to CSR (Okodudu 2008, Frynas 2005 and Akpan 2006), corruption and faulty implementation (Watts; 2005) and negative impacts of the process of delivering CSR programme (Watts 2004, Newell 2005, Eweje 2007 and Tuodolo 2007). It is also observed that most CSR programmes do not involve the local people in the initiation, planning and implementation process, and that has fostered a dependency mentality on the part of the host communities. Schemes introduced in this way cannot remain functional without the continued support of outsiders, which contravenes a basic principle of development.

VI. CSR AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN BAYELSA STATE

Bayelsa state is situated at the centre of the fan-shaped oil-rich Niger Delta. The state contributes over 40% of oil and gas production in Nigeria. There are different multinational oil companies operating in Bayelsa state in the Niger Delta. These includes: Shell Development Company of Nigeria (SPDC), Chevron, Nigeria AGIP oil company (NAOC), ELF, MOBIL, etc among others. Our focus however is on CSR activities of the Nigeria AGIP Oil Company, in selected communities. The names of the communities are: Ikebiri I, Ikebiri ii, Korokorosei, Ondewari and Olugbobiri in Southern Ijaw local government area of Bayelsa State. AGIP as the company is popularly known has been operating in the communities for over five decades, but the communities

are still in the shackles of excruciating poverty, teeming unemployment, environmental degradation and gross underdevelopment. With the growing popularity of CSR demands by host communities and the hostile relationship between oil multinationals and local communities, oil companies have adopted the practice of signing Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) to guide their engagements with oil producing host communities. The MOUs basically refers to a document showing agreement between the multinational oil companies and oil producing host communities, as regards community development projects that will be executed by the oil multinationals in the host communities.

It is important to note that, though, there are MOUs signed between the Nigerian Agip Oil Company and the selected host communities, it was discovered that whereas, some of the MOUs expired years ago (because every MOU has a time span of operation), they are simply ignored and are yet to be renewed. More so, the MOUs in existence, more often than not do not reflect the priority needs of the host communities. Again, most CSR projects implemented or executed under the framework of the MOU's are not functional (Paki and Ebienna, 2010).

There are different projects earmarked for execution by the oil companies in the MOU's entered into with the host communities. A collation of projects meant for execution under a given time frame in the selected host communities is captured in the tables below.

TABLE 1 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) PROJECTS SIGNED BETWEEN NAOC AND IKEBIRI I COMMUNITY IN 2009

S/NO	NAME OF PROJECT	YEAR OF EXECUTION	CURRENT STATUS OF PROJECT
1	Site clearing and sand filling for multi-purpose civic centre	2010	Abandoned half way
2	Supply and installation of 500km Caterpillars Generator set	2010	Completed
3	Construction of 10 Classroom block, Guest House, with tennis court in the multi civic centre	2011	Yet to be constructed
4	Construction of modern town Hall	2012	Yet to be constructed
5	Construction of badminton Hall	2012	Yet to be constructed
6	Construction of valley ball Pitch	2012	Yet to be constructed

Source: Compiled from 2009 Memorandum of Understanding signed between Ikebiri I and Nigerian Agip Oil Company (NAOC)

From the table above, it is only the purchase, supply and installation of the 500KVA Caterpillar Generator set that has been executed while the other projects are either simply abandoned or still under construction at a very low pace. The MOU signed between Ikebiri I community and the Nigerian AGIP Oil Company runs between 2011 and 2014, and other projects earmarked for execution in the MOU include, construction of modern library (2013), construction of mini gym (2013) and the fencing of the multi-purpose civic centre in 2014. The grim reality is that with the nonchalant attitude on the part of Nigerian AGIP Oil Company as regards the execution of social responsibility projects in the communities, there is general anger in the community and fear that, the MOU projects will not be executed. According to Patmore (2011), most of the oil companies operating in the oil-rich Niger Delta have failed woefully in the area of corporate social responsibility. Despite the fact that MOU's are signed with fanfare and high hopes of speedy execution on the part of the host communities, the oil multinationals despite the huge profit they reap from the local government, more often than not totally disregard the execution of the MOU project which is unreliably a criminal minded mentality. The reason been that whereas, some oil companies adopt international best practices in their engagement with host communities in the developed world, the reverse is the case in the Niger Delta. The above clearly outlines the true picture of what is going on in the host communities.

TABLE 2 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING PROJECTS SIGNED BETWEEN NAOC AND IKEBIRI II COMMUNITY IN 2009

NO	NAME OF PROJECTS	YEAR OF EXECUTION	CURRENT STATUS OF PROJECTS
1	Construction of Concrete Landing Jetty with Waiting Shed	2010	Completed but below standard

2	Supply and installation of 320KVA Caterpillar Generator set	2010	Not supplied
3	Construction of six classroom block	2011	Abandoned
4	Construction of 3 blocks of teachers quarters	2011	Abandoned
5	Construction of 2 blocks of lock-up shops contain 40 numbers of stalls	2012	Yet to be constructed
6	Construction of 2 blocks of Open Shops, containing 4 stalls.	2012	Yet to be constructed

Source: Compiled from 2009 Memorandum of Understanding between Ikebiri ii and Nigerian AGIP oil company (NAOC)

The table above clearly shows that, of all the projects earmarked for execution in the MOU, which has a life span of four years (2010-2014) only one project out of the 6 (six) projects earmarked for execution between 2010-2014 has been duly completed. Responses from the participants of our focus group discussions also gives credence to the fact that, even the concrete landing jetty at the water front that has been executed was done with sub-standard materials and hence of a very low quality. As Timiweripre (2012) rightly observed, the landing jetty was not constructed with quality materials and expertise; therefore, instead of serving a good purpose in the community, it is fast becoming a death trap with the caving in of the sides. Hence something urgent must be done to give the people sense of belonging.

More so, as regards the supply and construction of the six classroom blocks, teacher's quarters and market shops, the contractors are not even known to the local people, and the oil company on the other hand is equally not doing anything tangible to address the issue. The undeniable reality is that, the MOU signed between Ikebiri ii and NAOC is not respected and implemented according to the letters of the agreement, which is a negation of CSR concerns in the host communities.

Other projects earmarked for execution in the MOUs duly signed between NAOC and the host community includes sand filling and flooring of the market sites in 2013, and the construction of 4 meters width of 1km concrete road with drainage.

TABLE 3 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING: PROJECTS SIGNED BETWEEN NAOC AND KOROKOROSEI COMMUNITY IN 2007

NO	NAME OF PROJECT	YEAR OF EXECUTION	CURRENT STATUS OF PROJECTS
1.	Provision of two speed boats with double 75 horse power engine	2007	Supplied but no longer in use. There was a conflict between the CDC chairman and youths as regards management of proceeds.
2	Installation of one 320 KVA generator set	2007	Supplied but not functional. It is still under epileptic test run
3	Construction of Generator Power house with 10,000 wire capacity diesel tank	2007	Completed but not according to specification
4	Construction of a low voltage net work with street light within the built Areas of the community.	2007	Completed but not in use
5	Construction of a NAOC standard health care centre with quarters for medical personnel	2008	Abandoned
6	Drilling of borehole reticulation with 70 fetching points	2009	Completed but not in use/functional
7	Construction of an overhead 52,000 gallon Braithwaite water tank.	2009	Completed but not in accordance with specification and neither in use
8	Provision of 25 or 27 KVA generating set and the construction/fencing of generator house. Chain link Fencing of Water	2009	Not supplied

	Scheme location.		
9	Construction of science block with lab laboratories for physics, chemistry, biology and introductory technology	2010	Abandoned

Source: Compiled from 2007 Memorandum of Understanding between Korokorosei community and Nigeria AGIP Oil Company (NAOC).

The table above indicates that whereas some projects were executed, they are characterized by low standards and specification, others have been abandoned or completed but not functional and in used by the community. For instance, due to the direct effect of oil exploration and exploitation on the environment, the river and lakes serves as means of drinking water, thus pipe borne water projects are very crucial in reducing the sufferings of the people. Be that as it may, responses from our focused group discussions show that, there are water tanks and fetching points spread around the community but paradoxically there is no clean water to drink due to the prevalence of dry tanks and empty taps.

TABLE 4 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING PROJECTS SIGNED BETWEEN NAOC AND ONDEWARI COMMUNITY IN 2007

NO	NAME OF PROJECTS	YEAR OF EXECUTION	CURRENT STATUS OF PROJECT
1	Provision of two speed boats	2007	Supplied but not in use with 75 horse power engines
2	Construction of a 2.56km road with an average fill of 0.6cm, and a width of 4m within the community	2008	Yet to be completed and not even according to specifications
3	Supply and installation of one (1) 320KVA generator set	2008	Supplied and installed.
4	Construction of a low voltage network with street lights within the community	2008	Completed but with inferior materials, so not in use
5	Construction of a Generator Power House with 7.500 liters capacity Diesel Tank	2008	Completed
6	Construction of standard health centre with quarters for medical personnel	2009	Ongoing
7	Construction of six classroom block and provision of furniture for the classrooms	2010	uncompleted

Source: Compiled from 2007 Memorandum of Understanding between Ondewari community and Nigeria Agip Oil Company (NAOC)

From the table above, majority of the projects earmarked for execution in the stipulated years are either uncompleted or simply abandoned and that is totally unacceptable and negative development on the side of the host communities. According to Clifford (2012), the attitude of disregarding the spirit of the MOU's with impunity by the oil companies is one major cause of conflict between such oil companies and their host communities. Most of the projects agreed for execution are small scale projects that can be easily executed within few months, but oil multinationals wickedly prefer to abandon them because to them the host communities simply do not matter.

TABLE 5 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING PROJECTS SIGNED BETWEEN NAOC AND OLUGBOBIRI COMMUNITY IN 2009

NO	NAME OF PROJECT	YEAR OF EXECUTION	CURRENT STATUS OF THE PROJECT
1	Electrification of the community	2010	Completed
2	Provision of 75 Horse Power Double engine boat	2010	Supplied but no longer in use
3	Construction of 2.8km internal road with 4 meters width and drainage system	2010	Abandoned by four different contractors
4	Construction of 2.8km internal road with drainage system	2011	Ongoing but without drainage
5	Construction of cottage hospital	2011	Completed but not in use

6	Construction of landing jetty with waiting shed	2012	Yet to be executed.
7	Embark on river water treatment scheme	2012	Yet to be executed.

Source: Compiled from 2009 Memorandum of Understanding between Olugbobiri and Nigerian Agip Oil Company.

As shown in the table above, most of the MOU projects earmarked for execution in Olugbobiri are yet to be completed. For instance, 2.8km of road was supposed to be constructed every year for a scale of three years, totaling over 8km but, nothing tangible has been done so far. Our focus group discussions about the subject matters revealed that, the road construction contract has been awarded to five different contractors and the previous four contractor (DCC, Fakpo, General Africa and General Joshua respectively), simply abandoned the projects but when confronted, they all accused NAOC of breaching part of their contract agreement paling way for upward review considering the huge leap in prices of construction materials. It is worrisome that General Africa and General Joshua are both ex-militant leaders and natives of Olugbobiri community. The road contract according to our focus group discussions was awarded to them to pacify their agitation, but rather than executing it for the benefit of the community, they both choose to abandon it, though on their part too, they blame insincerity of NAOC.

Employment is a major issue in the relationship between oil companies and their host communities. Our study reveals that, whereas the employment of indigenes of host communities is stated in the various Memoranda of Understanding signed between the oil companies and the host communities respectively, the number of persons employed is grossly inadequate and totally unacceptable. Despite the fact that the Nigerian Agip Oil Company has been operating in the selected communities for many decades, the number of persons employed from all the communities is pitifully not even up to 10 (ten) persons.

TABLE 6 NUMBERS OF PERSONS EMPLOYED BY NAOC IN THE SELECTED HOST COMMUNITIES.

NO	NAME OF COMMUNITY	NO OF PERSONS EMPLOYED
1	Ikebiri i	2
2	Ikebiri ii	1
3	Korokorosei	3
4	Olugbobiri	5
5	Ondewari	1

Source: Nigerian Agip Oil Company (NAOC)

From the above, Olugbobiri community which is relatively bigger than the other communities has 5 persons employed, which is followed by Korokorosei with 3 persons, then Ikebiri I has only 2 persons while that of Ikebiri ii and Ondewari can only boast of 1 (one) person each employed from their communities respectively. Only recently, indigenes were spoiling for showdown with Nigeria Agip Oil Company, over what they describe as the refusal of the latter to provide their youths with employment. They noted with sadness that, though the company has been operating for about 26 years in their communities, the indigenes are not satisfactorily employed despite having employable credentials. The community which decried the attitude of the oil company, noted that the two Memoranda of Understanding (MOUE's) signed with the company in recent times where the employment of indigenes was one of their demands, had not been implemented by NAOC (Oyedia, 2012).

Another issue stated in the MOU's is the award of scholarship to secondary and tertiary students, but the oil company has equally not done much in that regard as presented in the table below.

TABLE 7 NO OF SCHOLARSHIPS AWARDED TO HOST COMMUNITIES

NO	NAME OF COMMUNITY	UNIVERSITY	SECONDARY
1	Olugbobiri	9	86
2	Ondewari	1	10
3	Korokorosei	2	3
4	Ikebiri i	3	21
5	Ikebiri ii	4	13
	Total	19	133

Source: Nigerian AGIP Oil Company (NAOC 2012).

The table above shows that, only 19 University scholarships have been awarded so far to the five selected communities combined together and it is not a good development, juxtaposing with the teaming number of scholarships deserving university students from the communities. The number of scholarships awarded to secondary school students is 133 but the fact to note is that, the process of awarding such scholarship is highly politicized; hence the children of the poor local people are more often than not excluded from benefiting from such gestures. That is, it is only children of influential Community Development Community members and those of Chiefs council members that enjoy these scholarships.

Another fact observed in the award of scholarship is that the amount of money given to beneficiaries is too small. For instance, the monetary value of secondary school scholarship is Thirty Thousand Naira (N30, 000), while that of university is one hundred thousand naira (N100, 000) per session. This implies that awardees of the scholarship cannot use such funds to adequately sponsor themselves in good schools. The argument is that, the standard of education in Nigeria, especially in the public schools is very poor. And that in the private schools, where things are far much better, the prescribed fees are very exorbitant. It is therefore factual to state that the monetary value of the scholarship awards is not enough for beneficiaries to attend good private secondary schools that charge hundreds of thousand per student for a session and that of university that charge an average of 300 to 500 Thousand Naira per-students. The practice of 30,000 and 100,000 Naira respectively for scholarship beneficiaries is therefore not acceptable and there is urgent need to review the amount upward. As stated earlier, there is a sharp disparity between the social amenities that exist or made available in the operational bases of the oil company and those in the host communities. Dissatisfied with the above abnormalities, there was a working agreement between the youths of the selected communities and NAOC, mandating the later to supply diesel to power the generating sets owned by the respective communities to provide electricity at night. This is borne out of the fact that, the selected communities fall within the most potent enclave of militancy in Bayelsa State, therefore the Nigerian AGIP Oil Company agreed to their terms in a very peaceful manner. The table below captures reality of how these diesel supplies is distributed in these selected host communities.

TABLE 8 SUPPLY OF DIESEL TO SELECTED COMMUNITIES BY NIGERIAN AGIP OIL COMPANY (NAOC).

NO	NAME OF COMMUNITY	LITRES PER MONTHS
1	Ikebiri i	24,000 liters
2	Ikebiri ii	12,000 liters
3	Korokorosei	12,000 liters
4	Ondewari	6,400 liters
5	Olugbobiri	40,000 liters
	Total	94,400 liters

Source: Nigerian AGIP Oil Company and field work (2013).

From the above table, about 94,400 liters of diesel is supplied to the selected communities monthly. However, a cross section of persons interviewed opined that the supply is not regular for over a year now and the worst of all complaints is that the contractors are not known to the communities. The implication is that, the communities get electricity only when diesel is been supplied and grope in darkness if diesel is not available. Another major flaw identified in all the MOU's signed between the selected communities and NAOC is the issue of suspension of the MOU's agreements by the oil company. There is a provision in all the MOU's that "any disruption of NAOC operations by the community or its citizens may automatically result in the suspension of the implementation of this agreement. This then means that, for the community to benefit from the oil companies' social responsibility projects, it must not attempt to or disrupt the operations of the NAOC despite their oppressive and exploitative agenda.

The MOU's, thus technically favour the NAOC and to the detriment of the helpless local people. For instance, protest for the non-implementation of MOU agreement can easily be classified as disruption of operations by the NAOC and the subsequent suspension of the MOU agreement.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study has shown that, oil is a very important natural resource with great potential for promoting development if well utilized, but can equally be a source of conflict and underdevelopment when entangled with greed, corruption and mismanagement. It is quite obvious that the implementers do misappropriate funds meant for development, for their self aggrandizement thereby increasing underdevelopment in the selected host communities. Nigeria no doubt is a petro-dollar state, and the oil that sustains the Nigerian economy is

produced in the ethnic minority populated Niger Delta region of southern Nigeria. Bayelsa state is one of the richest oil producing states in the Niger Delta and Southern Ijaw Local Government Area has the greatest number of oil wells and flow stations in the state. But despite the wealth produced in the region, the area paradoxically remains one of the least developed parts of the country. There is gross development deficit in the oil-bearing communities in the Niger Delta; in spite of the wealth, they contribute to sustain the nation's economy. This is evidence in the absence of basic social amenities, public infrastructures, high rate of unemployment, environmental degradation, endemic poverty, destruction of the local economy of the local people, among others. The grim reality is that the multinational oil companies operating in the area has not done much to develop the area.

The study therefore concludes that, the current NAOC corporate social responsibility practices, policies and projects fall below expectation and are not commensurate with the level of profit that they reap from the region. The oil companies must wake from their slumber and be proactive in addressing the needs of the host communities effectively and efficiently. In order to close the curtain on strain relationship between oil companies and host communities, and for CSR programmes and policies to foster development, the paper advances the following recommendations. First and foremost, Government should review the laws that govern the Nigeria oil industry and legally compel all oil companies to engage in community development activities in their host communities. Secondly, oil companies should stop politicizing CSR programmes and policies, and demonstrate the political will to develop and better the living conditions of the communities that they operate. Thirdly, MOU's must be signed between the oil companies and their host communities and such agreements must be fully adhered to by both parties.

More so, the MOU's projects must reflect the priority need of the host communities, hence popular participation is developed and as such with these documents become very necessary to both parties. It is also very crucial to state penalties for the oil companies if they fail to implement the signed MOU's to the later. This is important because, the-quo in vogue in oil companies withdrawing of failing to abide with the letter of the MOU's as it pleases them, without any legal means of enforcement by the host communities to call them to order. The oil companies must adopt international best practices in their operations, and evolve modalities to clean-up and protect the environment they operate from further degradation and pollution. Again, there must be increase in scholarships awards to deserving students in the host communities and the youths must equally be employed into the mainstream of the oil companies to give them a sense of belonging, and not mere casual workers which happens to be the trend in vogue. If the aforementioned recommendations are implemented, it will go a long way to creating peaceful and cordial relationship between the oil companies and host communities, and equally promote development in the local communities that bear the burden of oil and gas production. The time to act is now.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aaron, K. (2008) "The Failure of Corporate Social Responsibility in the Niger Delta, Towards a Re-intergradations", A paper presented at the International Conference on the Nigerian State. Oil industry and the Niger Delta organized by the Department of Political Science, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island.
- [2] Akpan, W (2005) "Between Responsibility and Rhetoric: Some Consequences of CSR Practices in Nigeria's Oil Province Development" *Southern Africa*, Volume 23, No. 2 pp 223 – 240.
- [3] Blowfield, M and Frynas, J. (2005) Setting New Agendas: Critical Perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility in the Developing World, *International Affairs*, 81, pp 499-513
- [4] Christian Aid (2004) Behind the Mask: The Real Face of Corporate Social Responsibility,
- [5] Clark, A, et al (1999) Oil for Nothing: Multinational Corporations, Environmental Destruction, Death and Impurity in the Niger Delta, A US Non-governmental Delegation Trip report, 6-20 September, Accessed online at www.essentialaction.org/shell/financial.report/pdf. on 30 June 2011
- [6] Human Right Watch (1999) Environment and Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Niger Delta, *Environmental Survey*, Environmental Resources Managers
- [7] European Commission (2001) *Promoting a European Framework for Corporate Social Responsibility*, Green paper, Luxemburg; Office for Official Publication of the European Communities
- [8] Eweje, G. (2007) The Role of Multinational Corporations in Community Development Initiatives in Developing countries: Corporate Social Responsibility at work in Nigeria and South Africa, *Business and Society*, 45, 2 June, pp.93-129
- [9] Friedman, M. (1998) "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Profits" in Hartman (ed) *Perspectives in Business Ethics*, Glasgow: Ormandy Publishers, pp. 242-251.

- [10] Frynas, F (2005) Corporate and Social Responsibility and State Responses to Anti-Oil Protest in the Niger Delta, *African Affairs*, Volume 10, 27-54.
- [11] Hackett, H (2004) Community Capacity Building; Paper Presented at the Conference of Social Assistance Professionals in the Provincial and Municipal Sectors, *Review* 29.
- [12] Human Rights Watch (1999) *The Price of Oil; Corporate Responsibility and Human Rights Violation in Nigeria's Oil Producing Communities*, New York: Human Rights Watch.
- [13] Ibeanu, O (1997), *Oil Conflict and Security in Rural Nigeria; Issues in the Ogoni Crisis, Occasional Paper Series 1:2* Harare, Zimbabwe, African Association of Political Science.
- [14] Ibeanu, O. (1996) Ogoni, Oil Pollution Resource Flow, and Conflicts in Rural Nigeria, *Paper Presented at the 1996 Joint Congress of the International Union of Anthropological Services (IUAES) and the International Geographical Union (IGU) on Livelihood from resource flow*, Available at www.liuselternallivelihoods.com
- [15] Ikelegbe, A. (2008) "Interrogating the Crisis of Corporate Governance and the Interface with Conflict: The case of Multinational Oil Companies and the Conflict in the Niger Delta". *Conference Proceedings, International Conference on the Nigerian State, Oil and the Niger Delta, Organized by the Department of Political Science, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, March 11-13*
- [16] Inoni, P. (2006) Citizenship, Accountability and Community: The Limits of the CSR Agenda, *International Affairs*, 88, 541-55.7
- [17] Ismail, M. (2009) CSR and its Role in Community Development: An International Perspective, *Journal of International Social Research*, Volume 2/9 Fall
- [18] Kuponigi, F. (2008) "Community Power Structure; The Role of Local Leaders in Community Development Decision Making in Ajaawa, Oyo State, Nigeria", *The Anthropologist*, 10(4) 239-243
- [19] Lubeck, P. Watts, M and Lipschits, R. (2007) "Convergent Interest: United States Energy Security and their Securing of Nigerian Democracy" *International Policy Report*, Centre for International Policy, Washington, pp. 5.
- [20] Molles, M. (2005) *Ecology: Concept and Applications*, 3rd Edition, New York: MacMillan Co. Incorporated
- [21] NOAC and Ikebiri I (2009) *Memorandum of Understanding signed between NAOC and Ikebiri I Community*, MOU Document
- [22] NOAC and Ikebiri II (2009) *Memorandum of Understanding signed between NAOC and Ikebiri II Community*, MOU Document
- [23] NOAC and Korokorosei (2007) *Memorandum of Understanding signed between NAOC and Korokorosei Community*, MOU Document
- [24] NOAC and Olugbobiri (2009) *Memorandum of Understanding signed between NAOC and Olugbobiri Community*, MOU Document
- [25] NOAC and Ondewari (2007) *Memorandum of Understanding signed between NAOC and Ondewari Community*, MOU Document
- [26] Okodudu, S. (2006) Corporate Social Responsibility Policy and Crisis in the Niger Delta, An Appraisal of SPDC Global Memorandum of Understanding, Emerald Centre for Petroleum Economics, Policy and Strategic Studies, *Institute For Petroleum Studies Monograph No. 6*
- [27] Osuntokun, A. (2008) *Environmental Problems of the Niger Delta*, Lagos: Friedrich Publishers
- [28] Oweilayefa, P. (2012) Oil is a Curse in Southern Ijaw Local Government Area, *Creeks Times*, Volume 4, No. 3
- [29] Owolabi, A and Olu-owolabi, F (2009) Corporate Social Responsibility and the Crisis of Development in Africa, *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, Volume 10, No. 4
- [30] Oyedia, S. (2012) Community Threatens AGIP over Non-implementation of MOU's, *Nigerian Compass*, 18 April
- [31] Paki, F. and Ebienu, K. (2010) Oil, Corporate Social Responsibility and the Millennium Development Goals in the Niger Delta, *Nigerian Journal of Energy and Environmental Economics*, Volume 5, No.1
- [32] Patmore, S. (2011) Oil Multinationals and CSR in the Niger Delta, *International Journal of Oil Economics*, Volume 6, No. 4
- [33] Phillips, E and Pitman R. (eds) (2009) *An Introduction to Community Development*, Oxford: Routledge Press
- [34] Frynas, J. (2005) Oil in Nigeria: Conflict and Litigation between Oil Companies and Village Communities, *International Affairs*, 81, 3, pp 581-598
- [35] Samson, S. (2010) Oil Companies and CSR Lies, *Banner News*, Volume 4, No. 3.
- [36] Todaro, P. and Smith, C. (2003) *Economic Development*, 8th Edition, Pearson Education, Asia. 16-17
- [37] Tuodolo F. (2007) CSR, Local Communities and TNCS in the Oil and Gas Sector of Nigeria, PhD Thesis, University of Liverpool

- [38] Ujor, P. (2010) Host Communities and Multinationals Debacle in the Oil Niger Delta, *Journal of Development Research*, Volume 6, No. 4
- [39] UNDP (2006) Niger Delta Human Development Report, United Nations Development Programme, Abuja
- [40] Ugwu, D (2009) Effects of Oil exploitation on Agriculture and Natural Resources in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria, *Sustainable Human Development Review*, Volume 11, pp 117-130
- [41] Watts, M. (2004) *Antinomies of Community: Some Thoughts of Geography, Responses and Empire Transactions*, Institute of British Geographers; 29, 2
- [42] Wilkinson, A. (1991) *The Community in Rural America*, New York: Greenwood Press