

Performance Rating of Selected IOCs on Corporate Social Responsibility to their Host Communities in Rivers state, Nigeria

^{*}Wobo, Austin Nyema, ^{*}Elenwo, E. I., ^{*}Deekor, T.N.

^{*}*Department of Geography and Environmental Management. Faculty of Social Sciences,
University of Port Harcourt, P.M.B.5323 Choba, Rivers State Nigeria*

Abstract: Corporate Social Responsibility is the mandate of organizations to contribute to sustainable development in their area of operations working with employee, the local community and society at large to improve the quality of life their host communities. Study examined the performance rating of SPDC, Total E&P Ltd and AGIP on Corporate Social Responsibility to their host communities in Rivers State. Cross sectional survey method was deployed in this study. Sample population was the host communities of SPDC and AGIP in Obio/Akpor and of Total E & P Ltd in Ogba/ Egbema/Ndoni Local government. Taro Yamane formula was deployed to get the sample size. Primary and Secondary sources of data was utilized. About (519) copies of questionnaire leaflets were administered, designed for closed and open ended questions. Analytical technique was ANNOVA and Spearman Correlation Coefficient. Questionnaire information was collated by means of rank order statistics like scale and simple percentages. Overall performance rating showed the companies provision of infrastructural facilities as low, but that TOTAL E&P Ltd was rated high by (70) respondents (41%), followed by SPDC (50) respondents (27%) and AGIP with (46) respondents (27%). However, the weighted mean of 3.70 shows that Total E&P Ltd has stronger relationship with their host community. More so, the weighted mean of 3.74 shows that Total E&P Ltd has provided or assisted to develop the host community they operate by provisions of more social amenities. Study also found that the relationship between the companies and their host communities may be good but not mutual or cordial, because the community lack the trust on the management of the companies to deliver on the core mandate of Corporate Social Responsibilities. Study suggests the gaining back of lost trust on company by host communities as well as host community's representatives avoiding corruption and greed. Strengthening policies of government on Corporate Social Responsibility through legislations which are weak and obsolete. Study recommends the ways to improve good relationship with host communities and the companies, as community involvement in company's decision making process; Company's transparency in the carrying out of their operational activities in the communities.

Keywords: Performance, Rating, IOCs, CSR, Rivers State.

1. Introduction

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) demonstrates that companies should be responsible to the society and the stakeholders within the environment in which they operate (Osemeke, et al, 2016). As a result, corporations have come to realize that they cannot operate in isolation of the community, and that a responsible corporation will go beyond maximizing shareholder's value but at the same time demonstrate responsibility to other stakeholders, including employees, customers, suppliers, government, the environment and the community. Hopkins (2003) is quite specific about the relationship between CSR and stakeholder management when he defined CSR as 'treating the stakeholders of the firm ethically or in a responsible manner'. Similarly, Smith (2003) stated that CSR is 'obligations of the firm to society, or more specifically, the firm's stakeholders—those affected by corporate policies and practices'. Smith related CSR to paternalistic capitalism and listed three characteristics of CSR which are (i) it is not a new concept, (ii) firms' motivation may be a mix between self-interest and desire to do good and (iii) the nature and scope of the actual responsibilities are not at all clear. This has made the issue of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) a veritable tool for fostering human development worldwide Centre for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia (CSR DG, 2007). Corporate Social Responsibility is the ability of a corporation to relate its operations and policies to the needs of the environment and the workforce to the benefit of the organization and the host communities. CSR involves management of an organization, working and relating with host communities and own labour force to ensure that the company or organization is responsible and responsive to corporate governance. It involves the participation of the company in such vital area as environmental protection, training of its workforce and welfare package and employment, provision of social amenities within plant location such as water, electricity, bridges, roads, schools, scholarship programmes and youth development. Over the years, the activities of International Oil Companies (IOCs) have posed severe threats to the environment in many developing countries, especially in the Niger Delta region Nigeria and these have invariably led to increased concerns among various stakeholders. A contributory factor is that the institutions and laws in developing countries are weak and less

stringent both in enactment, enforcement and application (Baylis, & Smith, (2005). As a result, IOCs are able to engage in corporate social irresponsible practices, with limited consequences. This has led to sharp criticisms of IOCs and intense public attention paid to their operations in developing countries, especially in the Niger Delta Nigeria, where environmental damages are common due to oil exploration by IOCs. This article examined the role of the selected IOCs in Rivers State towards the development of their business environment through the CRS policy and the perceptions or rating of the Host communities in the implementation of the CSR policies in Rivers State.

The article would be guided by the following hypotheses Statements as follows;

Ho_i: There is no significant relationship between selected IOCs and the host community.

Ho_{ii}: There is no significant relationship between performances of the selected IOCs on Corporate Social Responsibility in the host community.

Ho_{iii}: There is no significant difference between the selected IOCs provision of infrastructural facilities to the host community.

2. Method of Study

The study adopted a cross sectional survey research method. The sources of data for this study were primary and secondary sources. Questionnaire approach was deployed as an outline or a scheme that served as a useful guide to the researcher in his efforts to generate data for the study to bring into scope the issues about corporate social responsibility by the (IOCs) in Rivers state. Respondents were drawn from the host communities, staff of the IOCs, government agencies and NGOs on their perception of the (IOCs) execution of CSR in the oil bearing communities in the State.

Table 1: Details of Inclusive/ Exclusive Criteria for the Selection Communities

S/N	Inclusive Criteria	Exclusive Criteria
1	Oil producing community	Non-oil Producing
2	Presence of Pipeline networks	No presence of pipeline network
3	Presence of flow stations	No flow stations
4	Presence of Gas stations	No gas station
5	Oil-well head location	No oil well head location
6	Presence of operations office	No presence of operations office

3. Population Sampling and Sample Size

The total population of Rivers State from National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) 2010 census figure was 5,198,176 and about 5 persons per house hold size, which gives a total of 1,037,080 households in the state. The study population comprises of a purposively selected local government /communities located around the operational base of the selected (IOCs) in the State such as Shell Petroleum Company Ltd, Total (E&P) Nigeria Limited and Agip (ENI Ltd) by means of inclusive /exclusive criteria. Two local governments were purposively selected in the state for the purpose of this study; Obio/Akpor local government with an estimated population of 462,350 persons and Ogba –Egbema Ndoni local government with an estimated population of 283,294 persons, which gives a total of (754,644) population sample. The Taro Yamane formula was used to get a sample size of 400 head of households, for each community. The study instrument (questionnaires) was administered to heads of households who are knowledgeable about oil and gas industry and activities in the state and the communities. Taro Yamane (1967) provides a simplified formula to calculate sample size where N is population size and e is the level of precision.

The formula for Taro Yamane;

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where n = sample size

1 = constant

N = Population size = 754,644

e = Error margin, 5% = 0.05

There is a need for the sample size to be at least 30% to make-up for inadequate and incomplete responses. Based on this, the sample size was moderated as follow:

Final Sample Size

$$399(0.3) + 399$$

$$119.7 + 399$$

$$518.7$$

≈ 519 Sample size.

Hence, the number of respondents sampled was 519. Simple random sampling technique was also used to randomly select the communities where participants were drawn for the study because it gives an equal and non-zero opportunity for sample to be selected (Oyegun, 2003). About sixteen (16) communities were randomly selected by inclusive/exclusive criteria because of the oil/gas activities engaged in the area, which formed the sampling frame as shown in table 2 below. Systematic sampling technique was used to select the communities in the local government areas where copies of questionnaires were administered. This was done by listing and numbering the households in the communities at the local government area. The lottery method (Oyegun, 2003) was also used to randomly select the first element, subsequently; the sampling interval was added to the serial number of the chosen element as well as other elements until the desired elements were selected. This technique was utilized because it is quite representative of the total population. Afterward, simple random sampling technique was used to randomly select households for questionnaire administration. Furthermore, for the Key informant survey, a total of thirty copies of questionnaire were purposively administered to the selected IOCs for the exercise.

Table 2: Sampled Population in Selected Communities

S/N	Communities	Estimated House Hold Size	Sample size base on Taro Yamane Computation	IOCs Ownership
1	Akabuka	812	30	Total E& P
2	Obite	1014	25	„
3	Ogboburu	702	28	„
4	Obienye	694	25	„
5	Obagi	1081	22	„
6	Ede	712	37	„
7	Iwofe	1045	35	NAOC
8	Mgbuosimini	884	37	„
9	Rumueme	1061	30	„
10	Nkpor Village	900	35	„
11	Mgbuodioha	954	30	„
12	Rumuokwurusi	1061	35	SPDC
13	Rumuola	1050	30	„
14	Rumuobiokani	1032	35	„
15	Eneka	1008	40	„
16	Rumuomasi	1023	45	„
	Total	15,033	519	

4. Methods of Data Analysis

In line with the objectives of this study, descriptive statistics such as simple percentages, cross tabulations was used to explain the results of the analyses. Furthermore, the information filled in the questionnaires was collated and analysed by the use of mean and rank order statistics for research objectives 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The Likert scale as follows: Strongly Agree (SA) -5 points, Agree (A) - 4 points, Disagree (DA)- 3 points, Strongly Disagree(SD)-2points, Undecided (UD)- 1 point. **Weighted Mean:** This was calculated by multiplying the frequency of each point in the scale with its quantifier for all points and dividing by the total number of respondents. The criterion mean is the average of all the quantifiers, i.e $\frac{5+4+3+2+1}{5} = 3.0$

Hypothesis one and two was analysed using the Pearson's Rank Correlation Coefficient, while t-test was used to test the level of significance of the hypothesis

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d_i^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

Where;

P = Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient

d_i = Difference between the two ranks of each observation

n = number of observations.

The t- test for level of significance is presented thus.

$$t = \frac{r\sqrt{n-2}}{\sqrt{1-r^2}}$$

Where

t- Calculated value

n- Number of samples

r- Correlation coefficient

The Hypothesis three was analysed by the use of ANNOVA

ANOVA Equation:

$$\sum X^2 - \left(\frac{\sum X^2}{N} \right)^2 \dots\dots\dots (\quad -$$

TSS =

$$BSS = \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{n_1} + \frac{(\sum X_2)^2}{n_2} + \frac{(\sum X_3)^2}{n_3} + \frac{(\sum X_4)^2}{n_4} + \frac{(\sum X_5)^2}{n_{51}} + \frac{(\sum X_6)^2}{n_6} - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}$$

WSS = TSS – BSS

Where TSS = Total Sum of squares

BSS = between sample sum of squares

WSS= within sample sum of squares

5. Results

Table 3: Knowledge of Company's Co-operate Responsibility Laws by Host Communities

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	212	40.8
Agree	207	39.8
Disagree	60	11.5
Strongly Disagree	40	7.7
Total	519	100.0

The table 3 above shows that about 212 respondents strongly agreed that there are available Company's Co-operate Responsibility Laws in the Country corresponding to 40.8%, while 207 respondents strongly affirms the assertion corresponding to 39.8%, about 60 respondents were in disagreement with 11.5%, while 40 respondents strongly disagreed that there existed any law on Corporate Social Responsibility which corresponds to 7.7% respectively of the total respondents.

Table 4: Rating of Company's Corporate Responsibility Performance by Community Members

	SPDC (Frequency)	AGIP (Eni Group) (Frequency)	TOTAL E&P NIG. LTD (Frequency)	Frequency Total	Percentage
Low	85	61	41	187	36.0
Average	40	49	46	135	26.0
High	50	46	70	161	31.9
Neutral	10	11	10	31	5.9
Total	185	167	167	519	100

The table 4 above shows the rating of the selected IOCs in their different communities of operations. The analysis showed that about 187 respondents was of the opinion that the company's social responsibility performance was low corresponding to 36.0%, while 135 respondents rated their performance average with 26.0%. Furthermore about 161 respondents were of the opinion that the company's corporate social responsibility performance was very high corresponding to 31.9%, while about 31 respondents were neutral in

their assertion in this regard. More so, from the same table it is observed that TOTAL E&P LTD was rated high by (70) respondents (41%), followed by SPDC (50) respondents (27%) respondents and AGIP with (46) respondents (27%).

Table 5: Provisions of Infrastructure by selected IOCs in their Host Communities

	SPDC (Frequency)	AGIP (Frequency)	TOTAL E&P NIG. LTD (Frequency)	Total	Percentage
Water supply	35	34	40	109	21.0
Health Care	41	31	29	101	19.5
Electricity	24	25	20	69	13.2
Roads	20	22	20	62	12.0
Town Halls	31	25	25	81	15.6
Skills Acquisition Center	34	30	33	97	18.6
Total	185	167	167	519	100

The table 5: above shows that 109 respondents agrees that water supply was provided by the IOC companies in their host communities corresponding to 21.0%, while 101 respondents attested that Health care facilities were equally provided corresponding to 19.5%. Also, about 69 respondents agree that the companies provided electricity, while about 62 respondents says that the companies provided roads. Similarly about 81 respondents agrees that the IOC companies provided town halls for their host communities and about 97 agrees that the companies also trained the indigenes especially the youths on skills acquisition and built skills acquisition centers for their host communities. These shows that the host communities have benefited from the selected IOCs Corporate Social Responsibility in Rivers State.

Table 6: Weighted mean showing the Relationship between selected IOCs and Host Community

No	Interrogating Questions	SPDC (n= 185)		AGIP (n=167)		TOTAL E&P LTD. (n=167)		(Total N= 519)		Decision
		Weight ed Mean	Std. Dev.	Weighte d Mean	Std. Dev.	Weigh ted Mean	Std. Dev.	Weight ed Mean	Std. Dev.	
15	My community is in good relationship with SPDC/ AGIP /TOTAL E&P Nig. Ltd	3.54	1.44	2.54	1.40	3.41	1.23	3.2	1.35	Significant
16	Invite my community representatives for (MOU) Agreement SPD/AGIP/TOTALE&P Nig.Ltd	2.57	1.42	2.45	1.47	3.36	1.16	2.79	1.35	Not Significant
17	Implement decisions reached at MOU with your community.	2.60	1.44	2.50	1.53	3.70	1.22	2.73	1.39	Not Significant
18	Who determines the type of projects or services to be done in your community?	3.09	1.50	2.50	1.48	3.48	1.01	3.02	1.33	Significant
19	My community has organized protest and demonstration against SPDC/Agip and Total E&P Nig. Ltd.	2.70	1.45	2.45	1.48	3.49	1.16	2.88	1.36	Not Significant

The table 6 above shows the means of the respondents on the relationship that exists between the company and the host community. The respondents were interrogated to some questions on item 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 with total mean of 3.2, 2.79, 2.73 and 3.02 and 2.88 respectively. Some means were less than the criterion mean of 3.0. The aggregate mean of 3.2 showed that there is a relatively good relationship between the companies and their host communities. However, the weighted mean of 3.70 shows that Total E&P Ltd has stronger relationship with their host community. More so, the weighted mean of 3.54 showed also that SPDC has a relatively strong relationship with their host community, but the weighted mean of 2.54 shows that AGIP Company has not such strong relationship with her host community when compared with the other two IOC Company according to the data analysed.

Table 7: Performance Rating of the IOCs on their Corporate Social Responsibility to their host communities

Question No.	Interrogating Questions	SPDC (n=185)		AGIP (n=167)		TOTAL E&P LTD. (n=167)		Total (N=519)		Decision
		Weighted Mean	Std. Dev.	Weighted Mean	Std. Dev.	Weighted Mean	Std. Dev.	Weighted Mean	Std. Dev.	
7	SPDC/AGIP/TOTAL E&P employs many qualified youth in my community	2.47	1.40	2.50	1.19	3.17	1.11	2.80	1.23	Not Significant
9	My access to basic needs such as water, health care, food, electricity, income, agricultural product has changed since SPDC/AGIP/TOTAL E&P Ltd came to my community.	3.08	1.45	2.74	1.42	3.28	1.12	3.03	1.33	Significant
12	SPDC/AGIP/TOTAL E&P Ltd conducts regular empowerment programmes for the youth in my community	2.74	1.46	2.66	1.37	3.74	1.32	3.04	1.38	Significant
13	SPDC/AGIP / TOTAL E&P Ltd award scholarship to students in my community	2.65	1.33	2.68	1.38	3.25	1.28	2.58	1.33	Not Significant
	Aggregate Mean							3.8		Significant

The table 7 above which interrogated the performances of the selected IOCs in their various communities of operation shows the means of the respondents on the performance of the company in the host communities. The respondents were interrogated with questions in item number 7, 9, 12 and 13 with total mean of 2.80, 3.03, 3.04 and 2.58 respectively. Some means were less than the criterion mean of 3.0. The aggregate mean of 3.8 showed that the performance of the company in the host community was relatively high. However, the weighted mean of 3.74 shows that Total E&P Nig. Ltd has provided or assisted to develop the host community they operate by provisions of more social amenities, than SPDC with weighted mean of 3.08. But the weighted mean of 2.74 shows that AGIP Oil producing Company has not done enough in the provisions of social amenities in comparison with TOTAL E&P and SPDC in their host communities.

6. Testing of Hypotheses; 1 (Correlation coefficient)

H₀: There is no significant relationship between the Companies and the host community.

Table 8 : Correlations Statistics

		Company	Host Community
Company	Pearson Correlation	1	.681
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.13
	N	519	519
Host Community	Pearson Correlation	.681	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.13	
	N	519	519

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation table in 8 above revealed a positive correlation coefficient of 0.68 with a probability of 0.13 at a sample size of 519. Although the correlation coefficient was high but there is no statistical significant relationship between the companies and the host Community. The alternative hypothesis is rejected and the null hypothesis accepted. That is, P-value > 0.05 level of significance.

Hypotheses 2 (Correlation coefficient)

H₀: There is no significant relationship between the Company's performance and Corporate Social Responsibility in the host community

Table 9: Correlation Coefficient on company's Performance on Corporate Social Responsibility

		Company's Performance	Cooperate Social Responsibility
Company's Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.815**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	519	519
Cooperate Social Responsibility	Pearson Correlation	.815**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	519	519

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation table in table 9 above revealed a positive correlation coefficient of 0.815 with a probability of 0.00 at a sample size of 519. Thus, the Company's performance has significant relationship with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). The alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis rejected. That is, P-value < 0.05 level of significance.

Table 10: H₀: There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of SPDC and TOTAL E&P NIG. LTD in the provision/ development of her host community.

Status	N	\bar{X}	SD	Df	z-cal	Critical value	Levels of significance	Decision
SPDC	185	2.66	1.35	707	-7.17	1.96	0.05	H ₀₁ is rejected (Significant)
TOTAL E&P Ltd.	167	3.36	1.21					

The table 10 above shows that the calculated z-value of -7.17 is greater than the critical z-value of 1.96 with 707 degree of freedom at 5% critical level. Since the calculated z-value is greater than the critical z-value, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is significant difference between the mean ratings of SPDC and TOTAL E&P NIG LTD in the provision/ development of her host community. The IOCs have different approaches in implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility in their host communities.

Table 11: H_0 : There is no significant difference between the Mean Ratings of AGIP and SPDC on her Relationship with the Host Community

Status	N	\bar{X}	SD	Df	z-cal	Critical value	Levels of significance	Decision
AGIP	167	2.70	1.48	707	-7.66	1.96	0.05	H_{02} is rejected (Significant)
SPDC	185	3.49	1.16					

The table 11 above shows that the calculated z-value of -7.66 is greater than the critical z-value of 1.96 with 707 degree of freedom at 5% critical level. Since the calculated z-value is greater than the critical z-value, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is significant difference between the mean ratings of AGIP and SPDC on their relationships with their host community.

Table 12: H_0 : There is no significant difference between the Mean Ratings of AGIP and TOTAL E&P NIG. Ltd. in the Provision/Development of her Host Community

Status	N	\bar{X}	SD	Df	z-cal	Critical value	Levels of significance	Decision
AGIP	167	2.52	1.35	605	-6.17	1.96	0.05	H_0 is rejected (Significant)
TOTAL E&P Ltd.	167	2.36	1.21					

The table 12 above shows that the calculated z-value of -6.17 is greater than the critical z-value of 1.96 with 605 degree of freedom at 5% critical level. Since the calculated z-value is greater than the critical z-value, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is significant difference between the mean ratings of AGIP and TOTAL E&P NIG LTD in the provision/ development of her host community. The community rated TOTAL E&P high than AGIP in the implementation of the Corporate Social Responsibility in their host communities.

Table 13: H_0 : There is no significant difference between the Mean Ratings of AGIP and SPDC on her Relationship with the Host Community

Status	N	\bar{X}	SD	Df	z-cal	Critical value	Levels of significance	Decision
AGIP	167	2.70	1.48	705	-7.68	1.96	0.05	H_0 is rejected (Significant)
SPDC	185	3.49	1.16					

The table 13 above shows that the calculated z-value of -7.68 is greater than the critical z-value of 1.96 with 705 degree of freedom at 5% critical level. Since the calculated z-value is greater than the critical z-value, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is significant difference between the mean ratings of AGIP and SPDC on her relationship with the host community.

7. Conclusion

Arising from the major findings of this research, there is no doubt that the host community to AGIP is faced with underdevelopment which hinders the relationship between the community and them. The deficiencies are traceable to inadequate representation, poor accountability by community leaders and host company. On the other hand, Egi community as well as Rumuobiokani/Rumuomasi community host to Total E & P Nig. Ltd and SPDC are also faced with underdevelopment but not to the extent of the Rumueme/Rumuolumeni community. SPDC and Total E&P Nig Ltd has been able to carry out some level of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in these communities where they operate, but the youths in these communities are faced with the challenges of unemployment as many of the youths ride Okada or Keke and are engaged in other menial jobs that cannot carter well for their families. This research discovered that there is no existing company Corporate Social Responsibility law in Nigeria constitution compelling companies to develop the host community, but what is on ground are advisory policies like the polluter pay principle which says if you pollute the environment you will pay for the cost of removing the pollution and also pay the cost of the damage to the environment and others. The issue is that most of the policies are not self-activating and companies capitalize on it by carrying out minor project like construction of one borehole in a community and claim they have carried out Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). The aftermath of the actions has led to poor company's participation in host community development and has triggered the incessant restiveness in the oil bearing communities in Rivers State as we

sometime observe as well as the agitations by Niger Delta youths for resource control in the oil rich Niger Delta Region in Nigeria. The findings also shows that the people are dissatisfied with the lack of response from the international oil Companies (IOCs) and have thus in recent years been agitated for the improvement in their situation through riots, conflicts, demonstrations and occasional dialogue with the company. This shows that without been confrontational most times, there would be no adequate compensation or provision of amenities and facilities for the communities in which they are operate. The international oil Companies (IOCs) are not committed to Corporate Social Responsibility, their practices fall short of the core value of Corporate Social Responsibility advocated by World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD, 2000) in Natufe 2001); which is community development, environmental protection, stakeholder's right, employee right and human rights. International oil Companies (IOCs) Oil in general often engage in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a mere palliative to calm aroused communities so as to enable them continue their oil exploration activities unhindered in the Niger Delta Region.

References

- [1]. Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (2005). *The Globalization of the World Politics*. Oxford University Press London
- [2]. Centre for Strategic Research and Development of Georgia (CSR DG) (2007). *Public perception and expectation toward corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Georgia*
- [3]. Hopkins, R. (2003). *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton University Press, 1970; revised edition paradigm publishers.
- [4]. Natufe, O. I. (2001). *The Problematic of Sustainable Development and Corporate Social Responsibility: Policy Implications for the Niger Delta*, New Jersey Conference paper.
- [5]. National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2010). *Annual Abstract of Statistics, 2010*. Federal Republic of Nigeria. <http://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng> > download
- [6]. Osemeke, L., Adegbite, S. & Adegbite, E. (2016). "Corporate social responsibility initiatives in Nigeria", in *Key Initiatives in Corporate Social Responsibility: Global Dimension of CSR in Corporate Entities*, pp. 357-375, Springer.
- [7]. Oyegun, C. U. (2003). *Essentials of social and Environmental Research*. Port Harcourt, University of Port Harcourt Press. pp 150-179.
- [8]. Smith, B. (2003). *The Role and Responsibility of Oil- Producing Multinationals in Nigeria*. *Journal of International Affairs*, Fall 53, No.1.
- [9]. Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics, an Introductory Analyses* (2nd Ed.). Harper and Row Incorp.