

Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Community Development in Bayelsa State

ANITA EYERINEBI-EBI ORUAZE DICKSON, MAY NWOYE, CROSS OGOHI DANIEL

Department of Business Administration,
Nile University of Nigeria,
Cadastral Zone C-OO, Research & Institution Area, Airport Rd, Jabi 900001, Abuja,
NIGERIA

Abstract: – The main essence of Corporate Social Responsibility is to improve the welfare of the members of the society. The proper implementation of CSR initiatives entail that organizations are not just driven by the quest for economic gain or a good reputation, but that they are deliberate with positively affecting the lives of the members of their host communities. The main objective of the study is to determine the impact of corporate social responsibility on host community development in Bayelsa state, Nigeria. The work adopts a survey design method and a structured questionnaire was used to collect data from respondents. The population of the study was three thousand four hundred and sixty-two (3,462) youth leaders from oil producing communities in the state. The questionnaires were distributed to four hundred and fifteen (415) respondents out of which three hundred and sixty-seven were duly returned. The data were analysed with SPSS v.23. The results indicated that the economic, social and environmental CSR provided by IOCs have no positive effect on community development. Therefore, there is the need for a re-evaluation of IOCs' CSR projects to be in line with the core development challenges of the host communities.

Key-words: Community Development, Corporate Social Responsibility, International Oil Company, Host Community, socially-oriented, environmentally-oriented.

Received: April 28, 2022. Revised: September 16, 2022. Accepted: October 19, 2022. Available online: November 10, 2022.

1 Introduction

The concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is not a new phenomenon. While the idea itself may have burgeoned in management and corporate relations literature in the last few decades, its application and practice have spanned more than two centuries, [1], [2]. Thus, the concept has received prodigious attention among researchers, entrepreneurs, managers, and policymakers. Apart from being a long-standing practice, the imperative for CSR lies in the fact that it affords the organization the legitimacy to function in an environment so that they can continue to receive the resource inputs with which to expedite their operations and remain afloat, [3], [4], [5].

The concept of CSR suggests that companies are not meant to be aloof, careless, or insensitive about their activities as they relate to other persons not directly involved in the running of the firm. The negative consequences of the operations of many organizations have drawn the attention of stakeholders and calls have been made for firms to become responsible for members of the communities that host their functions,

[3]. In [6] the CSR is also referred to as corporate citizenship; ensure that firms remain aware of the effect of their activities on every aspect of societal living including the social, environmental, and economic dimensions.

In [7] the CSR is conceptualized as the business model adopted by organizations that enables them to conduct their operations in such a way that adds value to their environment rather than harms it. In [8] we have a business strategy that ensures that firms are not only self-regulated but are also accountable to their stakeholders – customers/clients, employees, shareholders, suppliers, middlemen/distributors, the host community, and the general public. While various studies have examined CSR as a uni-dimensional construct, recent works have investigated its multidimensionality including the complex interconnections that exist among them, [9], [10], [11]. Hence, CSR can be classified as economic CSR, social CSR, environmental CSR, and generic CSR, [12].

In [13] the authors delineated five main dimensions which are the stakeholder dimension, social

dimension, economic dimension, voluntariness dimension, and environmental dimension. With these dimensions, the organization has more capacity to remain proactive and specific as they strive for sustainability in their social responsibilities towards society. The main rationale for engaging in CSR programs is that organizations believe that CSR should be a vital component of their corporate image ([14]) because there is the view that customers are more likely to patronize brands that are perceived to adhere to ethical practices in their activities.

Specifically, Sustainability entails that the firm is expected to imbibe stewardship of the community and the environment where it operates. They are expected to conduct their activities in such a way that they satisfy present needs without obfuscating the chances that future needs would also be met, [15].

This study is anchored on three main dimensions of CSR which are the economic, social, and environmental dimensions. The economic dimension suggests that CSR initiatives should be imbibed by firms as an investment that has an expected rate of return through the firm's product safety, sustainable relationships with suppliers, and socially responsible supply chain management, [16], [17].

The social dimension entails the integration of social concerns of the society in the operations of the business and the consideration of the full effect or impact of their activities on the lives of the people in the society, [18]. The environmental dimension dwells on the notion that every organization has a responsibility to preserve its natural environment by ensuring that the impact of its activity on the surroundings is not harmful to people or the ecosystem, [19], [23]. It is basically the consideration of environmental sustainability and management while formulating and implementing the strategic goals of the organization. Aside from the business objectives of these corporate goals, business organizations also place a certain degree of concern on the development of the operational environment.

Community development involves the coming together of a group of people in a community planning and acting together to bring about the satisfaction of their needs with a view to achieving desired change in the lives of the people through their cooperative efforts and by actively taking part in measures designed to improve their conditions of living, [20]. The community development process provides the opportunity of involving and motivating people in the community to define, identify, analyze and solve

problems that they feel are important. It, therefore, involves strengthening the capacity of individuals within the community to accomplish the community's set goals.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The main essence of CSR is the improvement of the welfare of the members of society as well as the fostering of environmental sustainability. The proper implementation of CSR initiatives entails that organizations are not just driven by the quest for economic gain or a good reputation, but that they are deliberate in positively affecting the lives of the members of the host community, [18]. Apart from investing in charities, firms are expected to allocate resources to infrastructure, basic amenities, cultural activities, and social cohesion in their host communities. This is done by involving community stakeholders who would help the firm to identify those areas or aspects of the society that requires urgent interventions. Such interventions would be reflected in the economic status of individuals and families as a result of increased income, [21].

Unfortunately, in Nigeria, multinationals in the Niger Delta region have a reputation for flagrantly disregarding their environments. Despite calls for more responsibility and accountability from stakeholders, their exploitation of the region continues to deepen. CSR activities are only implemented to the extent that the firm feels obligated to or believes that they would benefit from it too, and most of the infrastructural and socio-economic projects purportedly designed to impact the community are uncompleted for years. Those projects are façades that portray CSR in the media but fall short of anything worthwhile in reality.

The degradation of land, pollution of water (which is the main means of livelihood for people in the region), and the contamination of air have worsened the quality of the health of the people as well as the sustainability of the natural ecosystem. Regrettably, this is fostered by some corrupt members of the community who secretly receive backhanders from these multinationals so as to silence any activist moves that may raise awareness. Multinationals scarcely adhere to environmental, public health, or human rights standards in their relationships with host communities. They continue to distort development by setting communities against each other instead of fostering collective development and peaceful coexistence using their resources and network, [22].

If this continues in Nigeria, the non-implementation of CSR initiatives would lead to a threat to the livelihood of communities due to a lack of environmental sustainability. People would not be able to meet their basic needs of food and water through farming and fishing because oil-induced environmental pollution would make it difficult to do so. Other socioeconomic issues such as poverty, property losses, price inflation, irresponsible parenting, vandalization, and prostitution would worsen. Despite the large oil deposits in Bayelsa, for instance, there are still low socioeconomic developments, especially in those communities believed to be hosting this oil multinationals.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to determine the impact of corporate social responsibility on host community development in Bayelsa state, Nigeria. Specifically, the study seeks to:

- i. To establish the main effect of economic-oriented CSR on development of host communities in Bayelsa State.
- ii. To determine the main effect of socially-oriented CSR on development of host communities in Bayelsa State.
- iii. To ascertain the main effect of environmentally-oriented CSR on development of host

2 Reviews of Related Literatures

The Concept of Corporate Social Responsibility

There are varied conceptualizations of corporate social responsibility and scholars are yet to agree on an acceptable definition of the term. This invariably affects its practical application as well, that is, the lack of a consensus definition of the term may lead to different understandings of the subject and thus mar the quality of engagements that are supposed to occur among stakeholders. If stakeholders do not view CSR the same way, then there may be no agreed yardstick with which to measure the impact of corporate-community relations [18].

Apparently, business and society are now intricately interwoven, to the extent that the activities of organizations affect various sectors of the economy, whether or not the firm realizes it. If this is so, then businesses should have social responsibilities towards those sectors that are been impacted by their operations. Although these responsibilities may vary

depending on the firm, industry, or country, CSR still remains corporate social responsibility everywhere and is aptly defined as “the continuing commitment by business to behave ethically and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the workforce and their families as well as of the local community and society at large”, [23].

2.1 Community Development

Community development is the combined processes, programs, strategies, and activities that make a community sustainable as compared to economic development, [22].

There are two dimensions of community development (1) basic development and (2) collective development. The former entails the improvement experienced by an individual in meeting his basic needs that is the immediate needs that guarantee the survival of the individual in society [18]. This means that they are needs that the individual cannot do without this, basic development is said to have occurred when these needs are been met by the individual. For instance, the provision and availability of food, clothing, and shelter epitomize basic or primary development. These need to an extent form part of the bedrock of societal development. They determine the economic and social status of the people. Thus, in facilitating social CSR activities such as the provision of scholarships, beneficiaries who are usually excluded in poor communities would be able to save more money to afford better food and water. [22], found that social CSR would improve both the functional and social values of the community members because it is not influenced by the economic and environmental dimensions of CSR.

On the other hand, collective development is societal-focused. It occurs when the individuals in a community look beyond their basic needs to collectively pool resources together to meet the demands of society, [23].

This means that every individual is to embrace the responsibility of providing for the whole and the complexity of society requires him to acquire a certain degree of competence and skills to meet up this collective demand. There will be no collective development without the collaborative efforts of these competencies and skills. This is because it is their unified efforts that will birth collective development, [19]. In Bayelsa State, as corporate citizens, IOCs are also directly or indirectly involved in this collective process.

2.2 Dimension of CSR

This study is anchored on three dimensions of CSR that are visible in the relationship between IOCs and their host communities in Bayelsa State. They include the economic, social and environmental dimensions, [21].

Economic Dimension

The economic dimension suggests that CSR initiatives should be imbibed by firms as an investment that has an expected rate of return through the firm's product safety, sustainable relationships with suppliers, and socially responsible supply chain management, [14], [21]. The idea here is that every resource that is invested in CSR has the potential to return to the company in economic terms whether in the short run or in the long run. Basically, most CSR activities carried out in host communities by IOCs are geared towards creating a business-friendly environment that will positively impact their profitability in the long run. Managers and organizations that view CSR as an economic investment also believe that whatever resources are committed to social programs would also translate to the economic development of society, [22].

Social Dimension

The social dimension of CSR focuses on the ability of firms to engage in activities aimed at fostering social linkages, cultural unity, and human development in the host communities. As corporate citizens, business organizations are seen as an integral part of a larger community. This entails that their operations transcend the business motive such that they concern themselves with the needs of society. It is, therefore, the integration of social concerns of the society in the operations of the business and the consideration of the full effect or impact of their activities on the lives of the people in the society, [7], [20]. This aspect of CSR encompasses community issues, social justice, workplace safety, education and job training, public health, and equal opportunities which are been provided by business organizations [13].

Social CSR can be attained by developing social capital that transcends the socially driven initiatives that usually emanate from the firm's relationships with the community. In other words, beyond just meeting the needs of the community, firms should focus on building relationships that would sustain

whatever social initiatives they implement in the community.

Environmental Dimension

The environmental dimension is based on the notion that every organization has a responsibility to preserve its natural environment by ensuring that the impact of its activity on the surroundings is not harmful to people or the ecosystem, [14], [15]. It is basically the consideration of environmental sustainability and management while formulating and implementing the strategic goals of the organization. Environmental CSR is implemented through consistent focus on the improvement of the environment through environmentally driven policies, procedures, and programs, employing training, processes, measurements, and targets which are founded on a system of environmental management. Thus, firms that intend to foster environmental CSR need to establish a system that ensures that environmental issues are not ignored as the organization goes about its normal business operations.

2.3 Theoretical Framework: The Legitimacy Theory

This study adopted four main theories which are legitimacy theory, institutional theory, relational view theory, and stakeholder theory. The legitimacy theory constitutes the anchor theory of the study and is explained as the idea that organizations that intend to function effectively and receive approval from actors in an environment should ensure that their activities portray those social values and beliefs that align with that of the society. This means that the firm must disclose its CSR activities to society in the most transparent manner, [13]. Thus, the legitimacy theory is more advantageous than the other three theories used in this study in explaining CSR because it helps organizations to adopt disclosing strategies that would legitimize their operations in the community and improve their performance. However, not all organizations want to practice full disclosures because they may reveal certain patterns that may boomerang on the firm, [16]. For instance, if community members discover that the percentage of the firm's profits invested in CSR does not at least account for the resources obtained from the environment, there may be vituperations from the community towards the firm.

Institutions are necessary for delineating the social values and norms within which CSR initiatives should

be implemented. But these values and norms are constantly evolving, and aligning the firm's operations with these changing values may be irksome. Also, the institutional theory does not take into cognizance those internal structures and dynamics that are required for organizational change, and it also ignores the inevitable role of self-interests and power play within the host community as well as the organization, [22]. While the relational view theory is crucial for harnessing vital resources and generating economic rents for the firm, it may stifle competition. By the way, not every organization within the networks may provide shared resources and thus there may be imbalances in resource distribution within the networks which may pitch one organization at an advantage over the other. [24], Finally, the stakeholder theory is one of the foremost theories that help to explain CSR in organizations and how they can fully exert themselves in their host communities by ensuring that their activities and performance have no negative implications for their stakeholders. It proposes that this should be done concurrently and without any trade-offs. But this is hardly the case as firm resources are limited and the needs of the various stakeholders of the firm may vary over time, [25]. Implementing CSR with a stakeholder perspective may entail trade-offs, especially in contexts where stakeholder demands may oscillate at various peaks and lows; and the firm is expected to concentrate on meeting those stakeholder demands at their peaks, [26].

3 Methodology

The population comprised 3462 community leaders in areas where International Oil Companies (IOCs) are situated in Bayelsa state Nigeria. This number was provided by the office of the Niger Delta Development Commission (NDDC), as the strength of attendance during the last stakeholder's engagement event held at Yenegoa in December 2019, [27]. As a result of the finite nature of the population, the study applied the, [28], formula which is widely accepted for broad finite sample determination.

The formula is stated as thus;

$$n = \frac{NZ^2pq}{d^2(N-1)+Z^2pq} \quad (1)$$

Where n = sample size

z= Standard Error of the mean (usually 95%, corresponding to 1.96 in the distribution table;

p= Proportion of the population likely to be included in the sample (50% or 0.5 is assumed.

q=proportion of the population that is unlikely to be included in the sample (50% or 0.5 is assumed

e = Tolerable Error Margin (5% or 0.05)

N = Population Size

To apply this formula,

$$n = \frac{3462 \times 1.96^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5}{0.05^2 (3462 - 1) + (1.96^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5)}$$

$$= \frac{3462 \times 3.8416 \times 0.25}{0.0025 (3461) + (3.8416 \times 0.25)}$$

$$n = \frac{3324.9048}{8.6525 + 0.9604} = \frac{3324.9048}{9.6129} = 345.879$$

≈ 346

However, it was necessary to allow space for attritions (i.e. 20% attrition rate).

$$n = 346 + (20\% \text{ of } 346)$$

$$= 346 + 69$$

$$= \mathbf{415 \text{ community leaders}}$$

The regression analysis technique was used to test the hypothesized model. The confidence level was specified at 95%. The decision rule on the statistical significance of the results obtained was based on the probability values of the t-statistic. The decision rule is to accept the alternate hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis if the P-value is less than the level of significance (0.05) or to accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternate hypothesis if the P-value is greater than 0.05. The software used for the analyses was Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) v. 23 and Analysis of Moments Structures (AMOS).

Table 1. Results of Hypotheses with Basic Development as an outcome (dependent) variable

	Basic Development					
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Constant:						
C	14.02***	11.49** *	9.35***	4.12***	6.54***	16.14** *
Controls:						
Gender	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.008
Literacy	-0.54***	-0.42**	-0.80***	-0.799**	-0.619***	- 0.511** *
Age	0.15**	0.33**	0.24*	0.54**	0.44**	0.54**
Main Effects:						
Economic CSR(eCSR)		0.46**	0.146*			
Social CSR(sCSR)		0.342*		0.773***		
Environmental CSR(envCSR)		0.843** *			0.116*	
Economic status(fES)		0.08	0.093	0.092	0.041	0.031
Interaction Effects:						
eCSR x fES			0.133*			
sCSR x fES				0.549**		
envCSR x fES					0.211*	
	R=0.451 R ² =0.203 F(3,363)=5 84.8;p<0.05	R= 0.343; R ² = 0.118 F(8,358) =501.7; P<0.05	R=0.345 ; R ² =0.11 9 F(6,360) =480; P < 0.05	R=0.348; R ² =0.121 F(6,360)=5 75.7; P < 0.05	R=0.327; R ² =0.107 F(6,360)= 575.4; P < 0.05	R=0.328 ; R ² =0.10 8 F(6,360) =553.11; P < 0.05

*= p<0.05; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001

Table 2. Results of Hypotheses with Collective Development as an outcome(dependent) variable

	Collective Development					
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Constant:						
C	7.07***	5.24***	8.17***	7.17***	9.09***	5.17***
Controls:						
Gender	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.014	0.04	0.017
Literacy	-0.04	0.009	-0.014	0.058	-0.48**	-0.010
Age	0.03	0.54**	0.017	0.087	0.12*	0.019
Main Effects:						
Economic CSR(eCSR)		0.071	0.011			
Social CSR(sCSR)		0.013		0.079		
Environmental CSR(envCSR)		0.019			0.095	
Economic status(fES)		0.037	0.027	0.007	0.014	0.018
Interaction Effects:						
eCSR x fES			0.007			
sCSR x fES				0.004		
envCSR x fES					0.033	
	R=0.117 R ² =0.013 7 F(3,363)= 379.05; p<0.05	R= 0.114; R ² = 0.013 F(8,358)= 342.11; P<0.05	R=0.108 ; R ² =0.01 2 F(6,360) =374; P < 0.05	R=0.101 ; R ² =0.01 0 F(6,360) =279.4; P < 0.05	R=0.119 ; R ² =0.01 4 F(6,360) =388.7; P < 0.05	R=0.104; R ² =0.011 F(6,360)=3 11.8; P < 0.05

*= p<0.05; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001

3.1 Model Specification

Tables 1 and 2 simply show the results of the hypothesis test using the simultaneous entry moderated regression method proposed by Hayes⁷.

Model 1 depicts the effect of control variables (gender, literacy, and age) on the outcome variables (basic and collective development). Model 2 shows the effect of control variables combined with the predictor or independent variables (eCSR, sCSR, and

envCSR and the moderating variable (fES) on the outcome variables. Model 3 shows the combined effect of the control variables, the first predictor (eCSR), moderating variable (fES), and the interaction variable (eCSR x fES) on the outcome variables. Model 4 shows the combined effect of the control variables, the second predictor (sCSR), moderating variable (fES), and the interaction variable (sCSR x fES) on the outcome variables. Model 5 shows the combined effect of the control variables, the third predictor (envCSR), moderating variable (fES), and the interaction variable (envCSR x fES) on the outcome variables.

4 Results

Test of Hypotheses

The results in Tables 1 and 2 were used to test the hypotheses of the study.

H1_{a1}: There is a statistically significant main effect of economic-oriented CSR on the basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $BD\beta_{eCSR} = 0.461, p < 0.05, n = 367$

H1_{a0}: There is no statistically significant main effect of economic-oriented CSR on the basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H1_{b1}: There is a statistically significant main effect of economic-oriented CSR on the collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H1_{b0}: There is no statistically significant main effect of economic-oriented CSR on the collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $CD\beta_{eCSR} = 0.071, p > 0.05, n = 367$

Result Summary: An increase in economic-oriented CSR leads to a corresponding increase in basic development, but NOT collective development.

H2_{a1}: There is a statistically significant main effect of socially-oriented CSR on the basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $BD\beta_{sCSR} = 0.342, p < 0.05, n = 367$

H2_{a0}: There is no statistically significant main effect of socially-oriented CSR on the basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H2_{b1}: There is a statistically significant main effect of socially-oriented CSR on the collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H2_{b0}: There is no statistically significant main effect of socially-oriented CSR on the collective

development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $CD\beta_{sCSR} = 0.013, p > 0.05, n = 367$

Result Summary: An increase in socially-oriented CSR leads to a corresponding increase in basic development, but NOT collective development.

H3_{a1}: There is a statistically significant main effect of environmentally-oriented CSR on the basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $BD\beta_{envCSR} = 0.843, p < 0.05, n = 367$

H3_{a0}: There is no statistically significant main effect of environmentally-oriented CSR on the basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H3_{b1}: There is a statistically significant main effect of environmentally-oriented CSR on collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H3_{b0}: There is no statistically significant main effect of environmentally-oriented CSR on collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $CD\beta_{envCSR} = 0.019, p > 0.05, n = 367$

Result Summary: An increase in environmentally-oriented CSR leads to a corresponding increase in basic development, but NOT collective development.

H4_{i a1}: There is a statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect economic-oriented CSR has on basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $BD\beta_{eCSRfES} = 0.133, p < 0.05, n = 367$

H4_{i a0}: There is no statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect economic-oriented CSR has on basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H4_{i b1}: There is a statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect of economic-oriented CSR has on collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H4_{i b0}: There is no statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect economic-oriented CSR has on the collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $CD\beta_{eCSRfES} = 0.007, p > 0.05, n = 367$

Result Summary: Higher economic status of a community combined with economic-oriented CSR improves basic development, but not collective development.

H4ii_{a1}: There is a statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect socially-oriented CSR has on the basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $BD\beta_{sCSRfES} = 0.549, p < 0.05, n = 367$

H4ii_{a0}: There is no statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect socially-oriented CSR has on the basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H4ii_{b1}: There is a statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect socially-oriented CSR has on the collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H4ii_{b0}: There is a statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect socially-oriented CSR has on the collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $CD\beta_{sCSRfES} = 0.004, p > 0.05; n = 367$.

Result Summary: Higher economic status of a community combined with socially-oriented CSR improves basic development, but not collective development.

H4iii_{a1}: There is a statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect environmentally-oriented CSR has on the basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $BD\beta_{envCSRfES} = 0.211, p < 0.05, n = 367$

H4iii_{a0}: There is no statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect environmentally-oriented CSR has on the basic development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H4iii_{b1}: There is a statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect environmentally-oriented CSR has on the collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Rejected)

H4iii_{b0}: There is no statistically significant interaction effect of economic status on the effect environmentally-oriented CSR has on collective development of host communities in Bayelsa State. (Accepted)- $CD\beta_{envCSRfES} = 0.033, p > 0.05, n = 367$

Result Summary: Higher economic status of a community combined with environmentally-oriented CSR improves basic development, but not collective development.

Discussion of Findings

The result from the test of the hypotheses was based on the data in Table 2. The summative values of corporate social responsibility were used as predictive values of community development. The result of the first hypothesis tested shows that the alternate or main hypotheses were rejected while the null hypotheses were accepted. This is because there was no statistically significant effect of economic CSR on collective development ($CD\beta_{eCSR} = 0.017, p > 0.05, n = 367$). This means that there is a need for more collaborative work by all stakeholders to make economic investments by organizations within the community play a meaningful role.

For the second hypothesis, the summative values of social CSR were used as predictive values of community development. Results showed that there was no statistically positive effect of social CSR on community development given that: $CD\beta_{sCSR} = 0.013, p > 0.05; n = 367$. This means that collective development requires a more aggregate investment outlook beyond just the implementation of social CSR initiatives by organizations operating in a community. The results from the analysis of the third hypothesis show that there was no statistically significant effect of environmental CSR on collective development as indicated by the summative values of environmental CSR: $CD\beta_{envCSR} = 0.019, p > 0.05, n = 367$. It is important to note that most environmental-oriented CSR projects have long-term effects rather than immediate benefits. This means that the effect of environmental CSR on community development would be felt in the long term rather than the short term.

The final hypothesis was centered on establishing the moderating role of family economic status on the effect of CSR on community development. The findings revealed that there was a statistically significant positive moderating effect of family economic status on community development given that: ($CD\beta_{eCSRfES} = 0.007, p > 0.05, n = 367$), ($CD\beta_{sCSRfES} = 0.004, p > 0.05; n = 367$), and ($CD\beta_{envCSRfES} = 0.033, p > 0.05, n = 367$). This result is influenced by two factors (1) the level of a family's income and (2) the willingness of the family to contribute to community development. This entails that the meagre the family income, the little it contributes to community development. On the other hand, the lack of collaborative spirit also turns into negative community development results.

5 Conclusion

The focus of this study was to investigate the impact of CSR on the community development of the host community in Bayelsa state, Nigeria. The main effects of the CSR dimensions on community development showed no statistically significant relationship. On the interaction effects, family economic status interacted with economic CSR, social CSR, and environmental CSR to influence community development, but the interaction showed no positive effect on community development due to certain factors. These findings were tested and confirmed with statistical tools and existing works of literature. The study concludes that unless collective development strides are perceived to benefit individuals, they may not be involved in it irrespective of the CSR incentives of host communities to do so.

6 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are given:

1. It is recommended that economic CSR programs by organizations should be focused on making a definite impact on the way that members of the community live their lives. The tangibility of such strides should translate to improved standards of living and alleviation of poverty, rather than 'white elephant' projects that have no impact on people's lives.
2. Since social CSR affects basic development but not collective development, it is recommended that social programs of the organization are channeled towards empowering the community members with the skills, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors to improve the status of their family.
3. It is recommended that organizations should conduct their businesses in such a way that the safety, health, and sustenance of the community are not jeopardized. It is only by greening their operations that the community's health, as well as their reputation, would be preserved.
4. Since family economic status influences basic development and not collective development, it means that improvement of living standards constitutes a major problem in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. CSR programs of firms should be reflected in the quality of lives of community members in terms of income. More community members should be employed and more offered benefits that would allow

them to set up various income sources using the natural resources at their disposal and also develop a strong sense of collaborative spirit.

References:

- [1] Adedokun, M., Adeyemo, W.C and Olorunsola E. O. (2010). The Impact of Communication on Community Development. *Journal of Communication* 1(2),101-102. DOI: 10.1080/0976691X.2010.11884775.Retrievefrom <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268419953>.
- [2] Dragu, I., & Tiron-tudor, A. (2014). Integrating best reporting practices for enhancing corporate. In *Corporate Social Responsibility in the Global Business World* (pp. 27–47). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-37620-7> accessed on 2/4/2022
- [3] Prasetio, J. E., Sabihaini, Bintarto, B., Susanto, A. A., Rahmanda, G. A., Rusdiyanto, Rochman, A. S. ur, & Kalbuana, N. (2021). Corporate social responsibility, community development and empowerment program in Indonesia. *Journal of Management Information and Decision Sciences*, 24(1), 1–11.
- [4] Yuan, Y., Lu, L. Y., Tian, G., & Yu, Y. (2020). Business strategy and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 162(2), 359–377. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3952-9>
- [5] Nie, P. yan, Wang, C., & Meng, Y. (2019). An analysis of environmental corporate social responsibility. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 40(4), 384–393. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mde.3009>
- [6] Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: An analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.132>
- [7] Currás-Pérez, R., Dolz-Dolz, C., Miquel-Romero, M. J., & Sánchez-García, I. (2018). How social, environmental, and economic CSR affects consumer-perceived value: Does perceived consumer effectiveness make a difference? *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 25(5), 733–747. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1490>
- [8] Guenther, E., Hoppe, H., & Poser, C. (2007). Environmental corporate social responsibility of

- firms in the mining and oil and gas industries: Current status quo of reporting following GRI guidelines. *Greener Management International*, 53, 7–25.
- [9] Da Silva, P. G. D. (2021). Powering corporate citizenship: assessing corporate social responsibility of hydroelectric companies in Canada. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 39(2), 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2021.1893927>
- [10] Cavaco, S., & Crifo, P. (2014). CSR and financial performance: complementarity between environmental, social and business behaviours. *Applied Economics*, 46(27), 3323–3338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2014.927572>
- [11] Eisingerich, A. B., Rubera, G., Seifert, M., & Bhardwaj, G. (2011). Doing good and doing better despite negative information?: The role of corporate social responsibility in consumer resistance to negative information. *Journal of Service Research*, 14(1), 60–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670510389164>
- [12] Stekelorum, R., Laguir, I., & Elbaz, J. (2020). Cooperation with international NGOs and supplier assessment: Investigating the multiple mediating role of CSR activities in SMEs. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 84(August 2018), 50–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.04.001>
- [13] Jamali, D., Toufie, M. and Hiba, B. (2006), Corporate Social Responsibility and the Challenge of Triple Bottom Line Integration: Insight from the Lebanese Context, *International Journal of Environment and Sustainable Development*, 5(4), 395-414.
- [14] Kamran, H. W., Pantamee, A. A., Patwary, A. K., Ghauri, T. A., Long, P. D., & Nga, D. Q. (2021). Measuring the association of environmental, corporate, financial, and social CSR: evidence from fuzzy TOPSIS nexus in emerging economies. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28(9), 10749–10762. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-11336-4>.
- [15] Nie, P. yan, Wang, C., & Meng, Y. (2019). An analysis of environmental corporate social responsibility. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 40(4), 384–393. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mde.3009>
- [16] McLennan, S., & Banks, G. (2019). Reversing the lens: Why corporate social responsibility is not community development. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 26(1), 117–126. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1664> on 23/3/2022.
- [17] Porter, & Kramer. (2006). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 1–13. www.fsg-impact.org
- [18] European Commission (2011). Communication from the commission to the European parliament, the council, the European economic and social committee and the committee of the regions: A renewed EU strategy 2011–14 for corporate social responsibility.
- [19] Ansari, N. Y., Farrukh, M., & Raza, A. (2021). Green human resource management and employees pro-environmental behaviours: Examining the underlying mechanism. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 28(1), 229–238. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2044>
- [20] Dragu, I., & Tiron-tudor, A. (2014). Integrating best reporting practices for enhancing corporate. In *Corporate Social Responsibility in the Global Business World* (pp. 27–47). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-37620-7> accessed on 2/4/2022
- [21] Peet, R., & Hartwick, E. (2009). *Theories of development: Contentions, arguments, alternatives* (Second). The Guilford Press. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.46-6931>
- [22] Robertson, D. C. (2009). Corporate social responsibility and different stages of economic development: Singapore, Turkey, and Ethiopia. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(SUPPL. 4), 617–633. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0311-x>
- [23] Watts, P. and Holme, R. (1999). Corporate Social Responsibility: Meeting Changing Expectations. WBCSD: Geneva. p3.
- [24] Benabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2010). Individual and corporate social responsibility. *Economica*, 77(305), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0335.2009.00843>.
- [25] Zhang D., Kambhampati, U. and Morse, S. (2017). Overview of Corporate Social Responsibility. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336327454>. on 6/4/2022. DOI: 10.4324/9781315749495-2.
- [26] Suddaby, R. and Foster, W.M (2017). History

and Organizational Change, *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 19-38

- [27] The Guardian (2022). Niger Delta stakeholders demand board for NDDC. <https://guardian.ng/news/niger-delta-stakeholders-demand-board-for-nddc/>
- [28] Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 30(3), 607-610. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001316447003000308>

Conflict of Interests

The Authors have no conflict of interests to declare.

Contribution of Individual Authors to the Creation of a Scientific Article (Ghostwriting Policy)

- Anita Eyerinebi-Ebi Oruaze Dickson carried out the conceptualization and the manuscript preparation.
- Cross Ogohi Daniel supervised the entire study.
- May Nwoye was responsible for the Statistics.

Sources of Funding for Research Presented in a Scientific Article or Scientific Article Itself

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or non-for-profit organisations.

Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (Attribution 4.0 International, CC BY 4.0)

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en_US