

# A G D I Working Paper

WP/18/024

**Does CSR contribute to the development of rural young people in cultural tourism of sub-Saharan Africa? Evidence from the Niger Delta in Nigeria<sup>1</sup>**

Forthcoming: Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change

**Joseph I. Uduji**

(Corresponding Author)

Department of Marketing

Faculty of Business Administration

Enugu Campus

University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria

E-mails: [joseph.uduji@unn.edu.ng](mailto:joseph.uduji@unn.edu.ng); [joseph.uduji@gmail.com](mailto:joseph.uduji@gmail.com);

[joseph.uduji@yahoo.com](mailto:joseph.uduji@yahoo.com);

Phone: +2348037937393.

**Elda N. Okolo-Obasi**

Institute for Development Studies,

Enugu Campus

University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria

E-mails: [eldanduka@yahoo.com](mailto:eldanduka@yahoo.com); [ndukaelda@yahoo.com](mailto:ndukaelda@yahoo.com);

Phone: +2348063631111; +2349094501799

**Simplice A. Asongu**

Department of Economics, University of South Africa.

P. O. Box 392, UNISA 0003, Pretoria South Africa.

&

Department of Economics & Development Studies,

Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria

E-mails: [asongusimplice@yahoo.com](mailto:asongusimplice@yahoo.com) /

[asongus@afridev.org](mailto:asongus@afridev.org)

---

<sup>1</sup>This working paper also appears in the Development Bank of Nigeria Working Paper Series.

Research Department

**Does CSR contribute to the development of rural young people in cultural tourism of sub-Saharan Africa? Evidence from the Niger Delta in Nigeria****Joseph I. Uduji, Elda N. Okolo-Obasi & Simplic A. Asongu**

January 2018

**Abstract**

Handicrafts are key cultural products consumed in the Nigeria's tourism industry. Owing to low entry barriers, as handicrafts require a low level of capital investment, there is potential to develop viable linkages between tourism and local handicrafts sectors that create economic opportunities for local artisans. Thus, we assess the impact of a new corporate social responsibility (CSR) model of multinational oil companies on the development of rural young people (RYP) in cultural tourism in the Niger Delta of Nigeria. Six hundred RYP were sampled across the rural Niger Delta region. Using the logit model, results indicate that RYP have remained widely excluded from the General Memorandum of Understandings (GMOUs) interventions in cultural tourism projects due to the traditional beliefs that cultural affairs are prerogatives of elders, a caveat to the youths. This implies that if the traditions of the communities continue to hinder direct participation of the RYP from the GMOUs cultural tourism project interventions, achieving equality and cultural change would be limited in the region. The findings suggest that since handicrafts are key cultural products consumed in the tourism industry, GMOUs can play a role in helping to create an appropriate intervention structure that will be targeted towards youth empowerment in the area of traditional handicraft. This can be achieved if the Cluster Development Boards (CDBs) would focus on integrating rural young artisans into local tourism value chains and ensuring that they benefit economically from the sector. The CDBs should aim at creating space for the views of rural young indigenous people's handicrafts; emphasizing the value of indigenous knowledge, particularly on arts and crafts for tourists and expatriate in multinational corporations in Nigeria.

**Keywords:** Inequality, cultural tourism, handicrafts, corporate social responsibility, multinational oil companies, rural young people, sub-Saharan Africa.

## **1. Introduction**

Inequality in human capital formation is one of the major impediments to inclusive growth. Among those who have been left behind, the youth population has been much more affected across various dimensions (African Development Report, 2012). Young people experience a diverse set of challenges across socio-economic, geographical, political and cultural divides during their transition from adolescence to adulthood. In today's labour market, the transition from school to work is particularly challenging in Africa, but also globally (African Competitiveness Report, 2017). In Africa, young people are striving to achieve economic independence and to find their identity against the background of weakening family and community structures as well as educational systems that often do not equip them with the skills demanded in the labour market (African Development Report, 2015). The current generation of youth in Africa is also the largest the continent has ever seen. The growth of Africa's economies has not been successful in absorbing youth into the labour market (African Economic Outlook, 2017).

Meanwhile, Nigeria is the seventh largest producer of oil in the world, and the largest in Africa. The Nigerian economy is heavily reliant on the oil sector, and it is estimated that the oil and gas sector accounts for over 95 percent of the foreign export earnings and about 65 percent of the Nigerian government revenue (FGN, 2017). The Niger Delta where multinational oil companies (MOCs) maintain a significant presence has become a theatre of incessant violent conflicts. The federal government is in joint-venture agreements with the MOCs operating in the oil and gas sector in Nigeria. The federal government controls and owns the land including its natural resources in the subsoil. This is a major source of conflict in the Niger Delta (Ekhaton, 2014). Also, the significant vacuum in governance capacity cannot be understood without consideration of several decades of authoritarian rule, as well as structural adjustment programme that increased youth employment and impoverishment. This has contributed to the rise of militant youth groups that align themselves with traditional rulers and engage in sabotage of oil company equipment (and violence with competing groups) in order to extract concessions and compensation from the oil companies for their communities (Watts, 2004). It is against this backdrop of escalating and often violent domestic protest, increasing international criticism of MOCs and the associated reputational risk that, MOCs have been rapidly adopting of corporate social responsibilities (CSR) in the region.

Each year, MOCs invest in social projects and programmes in communities, primarily in the Niger Delta. The initial investments that were in agricultural development programmes in the early sixties, have grown over the years to include health care, roads and civil infrastructure, water projects, small businesses and education, which could benefit the host communities (Ite, 2005). Over the years, MOCs have improved on how they engage with local communities to deliver these projects. In 2006, they introduced a new way of working with communities called Global Memorandum of Understanding (GMOU). The GMOUs represent an important shift in CSR approach in the region, placing emphasis on more transparent and accountable processes, regular communication with the grassroots, sustainability and conflict prevention (SPDC, 2013). However, academics such as Edoho (2008), Frynas (2009), Akpan (2006), Tuodolo (2009), Idemudia (2014), Uduji and Okolo-Obasi (2017) and others have argued that the CSR process in Nigeria is not far reaching or deeply entrenched. Thus, it has been contended that some of these CSR initiatives are not carried out on a coherent and sustained bases (Amaeshiet *al*, 2006). Moreover, Ite (2007), Eweje (2006), Lompo and Trani (2013), Renouard and Lado (2012) support CSR initiatives in Nigeria, arguing that CSR is making significant progress in the area of local community initiatives in the Niger Delta region.

Nevertheless, the region possesses a wide variety of places whose history, culture, landscape, and ecology have the potential for generating a vibrant cultural tourism industry that could provide significant employment opportunities to rural young people (African Development Bank, 2011). Handicrafts are key cultural products in the Niger Delta that are consumed in the tourism industry of the region. Owing to low entry barriers, and as handicrafts require a low level capital investment, there is potential to develop viable linkages between tourism and local handicrafts sectors of rural young people (RYP) that could create economic opportunities for local artisans in the region (Economic Development in Africa Report, 2017).

In 2015, about 60 young artists from the Niger Delta were enrolled at Bruce Onobrakpe training center in Agbarha – Otor, Delta State for training in arts and crafts (UNWTO/Casa Africa IPD – Institute of Tourism, 2015). The participants, made up of academically-trained and traditionally-apprenticed artists, were drawn from Abia, AkwaIbom, Bayelsa, Delta, Imo and River States of Nigeria (African Competitiveness Report, 2017). The training was a partnership between the Shell Petroleum Development Company, SPDC Joint Ventures and

the Bruce Onobrakpeya Foundation. The programme was focused on metal construction, ceramics (pottery) and leather crafts, after which the participants were provided with entrepreneurial opportunities and mentoring under Onobrakpeya, a renowned Nigerian Printmaker, Painter and Sculptor (African Economic Outlook, 2017). Pottery, basket-making, cane furniture, cloth-weaving, mat-making and gold-smiting trades thrive in the Niger Delta with quality and standard comparing favourably with others anywhere in the world (Benson, 2014). Craft shops with wares such as caring, hand woven clothes, ebony rings, bowls, ash-trays, flower pots, trinkets, bracelets, bangles, chins and earrings favoured by fashion-conscious foreigners are found in major towns of the Niger Delta region (Nwaolikpe, 2013). This paper contributes to inequality debate in the African tourism and inclusive growth literature from the CSR perspective, by assessing empirical evidence in two areas that have received much attention in the literature. The two areas of focus equally represent two main questions, notably:

- i. What is the level of multinational oil companies' CSR investment in cultural tourism development in the Niger Delta region?
- ii. Do multinational oil companies' GMoUs interventions impact on the development of handicraft of rural young people in cultural tourism in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria?


### **Study Hypothesis**

Due to the traditional beliefs of the region, cultural affairs are prerogatives of the elders, a caveat to the youths. Thus, we hypothesize that the CSR of the MOCs has not significantly impacted on the traditional handicraft development of the rural young people of the Niger Delta region.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 considers the context of rural young people in sub-Saharan Africa while Section 3 reviews the key tourism market segments in the Niger Delta region. The African conceptualization of CSR is disclosed in Section 4 whereas; Section 5 looked at the concept of CSR from Nigerian perspective, and the Global Memorandum of Understanding (GMoU) mechanism is presented in Section 6. Section 7 describes the theoretical perspective. The methodology and data are discussed in Section 8. Section 9 presents the empirical results while Section 10 provides the main findings and corresponding discussion. Section 11 concludes with implications and future research directions.

## 2.The context of rural young people in sub-Saharan Africa


The global population of young people is more than 1 billion, and their numbers are declining in developed regions but increasing in developing regions (Bloom, 2012). Approximately 85 percent of the world's youth population lives in developing countries, and this rate is expected to approach 90 percent in coming years (World Bank, 2012). The majority of young people live in rural areas in sub-Saharan, South-Central and South-East Asia, and Oceania (ILO, 2012). Most young rural people work in family farming and the informal sector, which are typified by low levels of income and productivity, poor working conditions, absence of social protection, limited opportunities of advancement and absence of social dialogue (IFAD/ILO, 2012). Africa will continue to account for a significant and rising share of the global youth population, rising from a fifth in 2012 to as high as a third by 2050 (Asongu, 2013; Filmer & Fox, 2014; Asongu & Nwachukwu, 2018; Asongu et al., 2018). Current trends suggest that much of the youth bulge will be concentrated in West, Central and East Africa (Bertrand & Crepon, 2014). It leaves Africa with the challenge of providing jobs to 29 million labour market entrants every year, which is close to 6 percent of the current workforce (Herrington & Kelly, 2012). Figure 1 identifies Nigeria in the continent of Africa.



**Figure 1.**Nigeria in the Continent of Africa

According to Economic Development in Africa Report (2017), the total number of young working people has increased rapidly in Africa from 44 million in 1950 to 230 million in 2015, while its share in the total population has remained stable at around 19 percent. It is estimated that Africa will have almost 300 million more young people by 2060 (ILO, 2010).

The continent has, however, struggled to provide employment opportunities for youth (Population Reference Bureau, 2007). Amare (2014) finds that in Africa, youths are twice as likely to be unemployed as their elders. The unemployment challenge for youths in Africa, however, extends beyond job creation, as underdevelopment of youths is also a widespread concern in rural areas and in the agricultural sector (FAO, 2010). In sub-Saharan Africa, unemployment rates are higher among young women than young men, reaching 19.2 percent and 15.8 percent respectively (UNCDF, 2011). Furthermore, unemployment is not only a major concern for the uneducated but also educated youth, as almost half of the 10 million graduates of African universities each year fail to find a job (UNECA, 2011).



**Figure 2:** Constituents Administrative States of the Niger Delta, Nigeria.

In rural Nigeria, young people are generally viewed as passive recipients of support, rather than active agents capable of solving problem (Uduji & Okolo-Obasi, 2018a; Onuoha, 2014). As such, they are rarely included in decision making processes or debates, and they often face negative misconceptions about their skills and capabilities (IFAD, 2011b). Youth policy and planning in rural Nigeria, especially in the informal sector, suffers from a lack of context-specific evidence on the diverse aspirations of young women and men, as they face obstacles in accessing land and financial services (Uduji & Okolo-Obasi, 2018b; Akande, 2014). The paucity of broad and project-level data on rural youth as a distinct group makes it difficult to assess the challenges this group faces and to adopt appropriate solutions (IFAD, 2010). Rural

labour market data are generally scarce and are rarely disaggregated by age and gender, and the young rural women and men are often unaware of youth programmes and face difficulties accessing youth development initiative, which tend to be more suited to urban challenges (IFAD, 2011a). In the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, many rural young people are most interested in working in the oil and gas sector, having seen others reap large rewards from the sector. However, MOCs often voiced concern that employing young rural people could expose them to security problems which might hinder their production activities, given the restiveness and prevalence of rent-seeking activities in the region (PIND, 2011). In the GMoU projects and programmes of MOCs, the Niger Delta elders are thrice more likely to be involved than the youths, due to the culture and traditions of the oil-host communities (Uduji & Okolo-Obasi, 2017). Traditionally, cultural development activities are reserved role of elders in the region. Thus, we hypothesize that the new CSR model of working with communities has not reduced the inequality in rural young people's participation in the cultural tourism sector development of the Niger Delta.

### **3.Key tourism market segments in the Niger Delta region**

Tourism is an important sector for Africa economies. The sector has expanded significantly since the mid-1990s, with the number of tourist arrivals to the continent doubling from 24 million between 2005 and 2008, and increasing to 56 million between 2011 and 2014 (Economic Development in Africa Report, 2017). In terms of growth, international tourist arrival to Africa grew by an average of 6 percent per year during the period of 1995-2014 (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2016). The contribution of tourism to GDP and employment reflects the sector's economic relevance. The tourism sector's total contribution to the continent's GDP doubled from \$166 billion between 1995 and 1998, to \$336 billion between 2011 and 2014 (Economic Development in Africa Report, 2017). As a share of GDP, tourism contributed 6.8 percent to Africa's GDP in 1995-1998, 9.6 percent in 2005-2008 and 8.5 percent in 2011-2014. Considering only its direct contribution to GDP, tourism accounted for 2.9 percent in 1995-1998, 4 percent in 2005-2008 and 3.5 percent in 2004, 2011-2014 (UNWTO/Casa Africa/IPDT-Institute of Tourism, 2015).

In Nigeria, the Niger Delta region possesses a wide variety of places whose history, culture, landscape, and ecology have the potential for generating a vibrant tourism industry. These include areas such as Ogoni land in Rivers State, and Kaima and Odi in Bayelsa State, which



epitomized the ‘Niger Delta cause’ worldwide (Agba *et al*, 2010). There are numerous sites in the region that are famous for their cultural, historical and ecological features. Also, crafts are symbols of Niger Delta’s material and spiritual heritage. Crafts are still well integrated into the living patterns of the people and inseparable from their spiritual philosophies, and prized objects for the promotion and preservation of tourism in the region (Onyima, 2016). Handicrafts in the Niger Delta are often grouped as follows: textiles, pottery and ceramics, bronze, brass and iron works, fibre, crafts, ivory, jewelry, leather works, tie and dye, wood works, calabash decoration; and most of them are found in museums all over the world (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2016). Table 1 shows a list of potential attractive sites, arts and crafts in the Niger Delta region. According to Akande (2014) these sites portend great potentials for sustainable tourism that could further drive the economy of the Niger Delta region. Adeniran and Akinlabi (2011) noted in particular that the Cross River State has many tourism avenues that are currently being developed by the State Government.

**Table 1.** Potential Attraction Sites, Arts and Crafts in the Niger Delta, Nigeria.

| <b>State</b>     | <b>Major Ethnic Group</b>             | <b>Attraction sites</b>  | <b>Arts and Crafts</b>  |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Abia State       | Igbo                                  | Arochukwu caves<br>National war Museum<br>Akwete Weaving Center<br>Azumini Blue River<br>Tourism village<br>Museum of Colonial History | Leather Work,<br>Textile Making<br>Grass and Cane weaving,<br>Glass making<br>Ceramics work<br>Makeup art<br>Fibre Making,<br>Bead and Jewelry Making<br>Local Pottery  |
| Akwai Ibom State | Ibibio<br>Anang<br>Oron               | Ibena Sand Beach/Mobil Oil Treatment plant<br>Ekpo Masquerade Festival,<br>Ibom Golf Course<br>Oron Museum                             | Grass and Cane weaving,<br>Ceramics work<br>Bead and Jewelry Making<br>Local Pottery<br>Makeup art<br>Mask Weaving<br>Sculpture/wood work<br>Ivory Carving<br>Mask Wearing<br>Calabash decorations<br>Boat and paddle carving |
| Bayelsa State    | Ijaw<br>Nembe<br>Ogbia<br>Epie-Atissa | Oloibiri Oil Museum<br>Brass Beach<br>Slave Transit Hall, Akassa<br>Sea Turtle Breeding  | Ceramics work<br>Local Pottery<br>Boat and paddle carving<br>Fibre Making   |

|                   |   |  |  |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
|                   |   | Ground, Akassa   | Bead and Jewelry Making<br>Mask Weaving/Carving<br>Ivory Carving<br>Cloth Weaving<br>Mask Wearing<br>Calabash decorations<br>Makeup art  |
| Cross River State | Ibibio<br>Anang<br>Oronyakkur<br>Ogoja<br>Itgidi    | Kwa Falls<br>Agbokim Fall<br>Obudu Cattle Ranch<br>Coercopan<br>Cross River National Park<br>Drill Ranch<br>Tinapa<br>Ekpe Masquerade<br>National Museum<br>Rock With Foot Prints<br>Mary Slessor House/Tomb | Leather Work<br>Textile Making<br>Grass and Cane weaving,<br>Glass making<br>Ceramics work<br>Bead and Jewelry Making<br>Local Pottery<br>Mask Weaving/Carving<br>Ivory Carving<br>Cloth Weaving<br>Mask Wearing<br>Painting/ Makeup art<br>Metal/Iron Works<br>Brass work<br>Calabash decorations |
| Delta State       | Urhobo<br>Ijaw<br>Isoko<br>Itsekiri<br>Anioma       | Chief Nana's Palace<br>Koko Port<br>Escravos Beach<br>Ethiope River<br>Forcados Beach<br>Igwe Festival   | Grass and Cane weaving,<br>Glass making<br>Ceramics work<br>Bead and Jewelry Making<br>Local Pottery<br>Mask Weaving/Carving<br>Boat and paddle carving<br>Ivory Carving<br>Mask Wearing<br>Painting/ Makeup art<br>Bronze work  |
| Edo State         | Bini<br>Ishan<br>Akokoedo<br>Etsako<br>Esan<br>Owan | Fuga Caves<br>Okomu Wildlife Sanctuary<br>Igun Bronze Casting<br>Oba's Palace<br>Ramat Park<br>Sakpoba Holiday Resort<br>Agoro Shrine<br>Samorikal Hills   | Sculpture and wood wok<br>Textile Making<br>Grass and Cane weaving,<br>Ceramics work<br>Bead and Jewelry Making<br>Ivory Carving<br>Painting / Makeup art<br>Metal/Iron Works<br>Brass work<br>Bronze work<br>Calabash decorations   |

|              |                                  |   |  |
|--------------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Imo State    | Igbo<br>Ndoni                    | Oguta Lake Holiday Resort<br>Ikeji Festival of Arondizogu<br>Palm Beach Holiday Resort<br>Zoological and Botanical Garden<br>Amusement Park | Leather Work<br>Textile Making<br>Grass and Cane weaving,<br>Glass making<br>Ceramics work<br>Bead and Jewelry Making<br>Local Pottery<br>Ivory Carving<br>Cloth Weaving<br>Mask Wearing<br>Painting/ Makeup art<br>Metal/Iron Works<br>Wood work        |
| Ondo State   | Ijaw<br>Yoruba<br>Epi-Atissa     | Idanre Hills<br>Owo Museum<br>Opalelloro Water Falls  | Tie and Dye Textile<br>Makeup art<br>Local Pottery<br>Textile Making<br>Wood carving/Sculpture<br>Cloth weaving<br>Grass and Cane weaving<br>Painting/decoration<br>Glass and Metal Works<br>Brass/Iron work<br>Ceramics work<br>Bead and Jewelry Making |
| Rivers State | Ndoni<br>Ijaw<br>Ikwere<br>Ogoni | Isaac Boro Park<br>Monument of King Jaja of<br>Opobo<br>Port Harcourt<br>Tourist Beach<br>Ifoko Beach<br>Okrika Aquatic Stadium             | Bead and Jewelry Making<br>Local Pottery<br>Mask Weaving/Carving<br>Boat and paddle carving<br>Ivory Carving<br>Grass and Cane weaving,<br>Glass making<br>Ceramics work<br>Mask Wearing<br>Painting/ Makeup art<br>Bronze work                          |

---

**Source:** Authors' Compilation

According to Uduji and Okol-Obasi (2017), the list in Table 1 illustrates some fraction of the key cultural products, handicrafts, heritage, conservation and ecological tourism attraction market segments that are present in all the states of the Niger Delta and some, (especially the Cross River State) that have a great abundance of features of tourist interest. Nwaolikpe (2013) argue that the high number of expatriates and well-paid Nigerians in the oil and gas sector present a viable, largely untapped potential for developing tourism in the Niger Delta

region. However, Onyima (2016) argue that roads, connectivity and security must be improved if the potential of tourism for expatriates and those that could afford it is to be enhanced. Quite a number of other studies have also analyzed the cultural tourism and sustainable development with the frameworks of countries, regions and the world at large. They include: Scott *et al* (2014), Chalernmpat *et al* (2016), Akama and Kieti (2003), Axelsen and Swan (2010), Alegre and Garau (2010), Antimora *et al* (2012), Butcher (2009), Weisheng *et al* (2016), Juan *et al* (2016), World Travel and Tourism Council (2015), UNWTO (2013), UNESCO (2004), Bochenek (2013), Alivizetou (2008), Alzhrani (2013), Benson (2014), Godden (2002), ICOMOS (2002), Keitumetse (2006), Kurin (2004), Kuruk (2004) and Kuutma (2009). However, from a CSR perspective, the extant literature is sparse on the development of rural young people in cultural tourism of sub-Saharan Africa. This paper further differs from extant literature by explicitly articulating the relationship that exists between CSR of multinational oil companies and equality in cultural tourism development of rural young people in oil host communities in Nigeria.

#### **4. African conceptualization of CSR**

The literature on CSR in Africa argue that the motivation for CSR comes from the institutional failure of government, unlike in Western countries where government pressure on MOCs has gone a long way in shaping CSR initiatives (Philips, 2006; Asongu & Nwachukwu, 2016). Frynas (2009) argue that the absence of government action in providing amenities for its citizens accentuates the role of multinationals in CSR and philanthropy which are not regarded as CSR in Western countries. Muthuri (2012), relying on the extant literature on CSR in Africa, posited that the CSR issues prevalent in Africa include poverty reduction, community development, education and training, economic and enterprise development, health and HIV/AIDS, environment, sports, human rights, corruption and governance, and accountability. CSR in Africa is culture-specific and affected by the local context (Muthuri and Gilbert, 2011). Thus, CSR in Africa is a product of historical and cultural influences (Idemudia, 2008).

#### **5. Nigerian conception of CSR**

Philanthropic initiatives as CSR by companies are prevalent in Nigeria. Uduji and Okolo-Obasi (2017) have argued that the Nigerian conception of CSR should be remarkably different from that of developed countries. Amaeshi *et al* (2006) argue earlier that CSR in the Nigerian context should be aimed towards addressing the peculiarity of the socio-economic development challenges of the country (e.g. poverty alleviation, health care provision,

infrastructural development, education, etc.), and would be informed by socio-cultural influences (e.g. communalism and charity); they might not necessarily reflect the popular Western standard/expectations of CSR (e.g. consumer protection, fair trade, green marketing, climate change concerns, social responsible investments, etc.). Thus, it is confirmed that CSR is part of corporate culture in Nigeria; as philanthropy is seen to be a cultural driver for CSR activities in the country.

## **6. The Global Memorandum of Understanding (GMOU) Model**

A GMOU is a written statement between MOCs and a group (or cluster) of several communities in the Niger Delta of Nigeria. Clusters are based on local government or clan/historical affinity lines as advised by the host State Government. The governing structures are well defined, with a 10-person Community Trust, a Cluster Development Board (CDB), and a Steering Committee chaired by the State Government (SPDC, 2013). The CDB functions as the main supervisory and administrative organ, ensuring implementation of projects and setting out plans and programmes. It is the decision-making committee, and the GMOU enables representatives of State and Local Governments, MOCs, Non-Profit Organizations (such as development NGOs) to come together under the auspices of the CDB as the governing body (Ite, 2007). Under the terms of the GMOUs, the communities decide the development they want while MOCs provide secured funding for five years, ensuring that the communities have stable and reliable financing as they undertake the implementation of their community development plans. MOCs also provide access to development experts to oversee project implementation and build the capacity of the CBDs to grow into functional community foundations. The GMOU model replaces the previous approach whereby MOCs agreed to hundreds of separate development projects with individual communities and managed them directly (Alfred, 2013). GMOUs appears to have engendered better ownership and a stronger sense of pride among communities as they are responsible for implementing their projects (Chevron, 2014). Also, the transparency and accountability in the GMOU model seems to provide a good platform for other local and international donor agencies to fund development projects directly through the CBDs (SPDC, 2013).

Meanwhile, MOCs operating in the Niger Delta have continued to face the challenge of how to determine the success or failure of their CSR initiatives either in terms of its effect on community development or its impact on corporate community relations. To address this problem, MOCs in 2013 launched the Shell Community Transformation and Development

Index (SCOTDI). SCOTDI represents an innovative framework that integrates and adapts a number of international principles into a composite index in a manner that is responsive to local context. The framework is used to assess and rank the performance of the different GMoU clusters within the host communities of MOCs. Therefore, in rating the RYP opinion of GMoUs in riverine community of the Niger Delta, we shall be drawing heavily from the SCOTDI. According to Idemudia and Osayande (2016), SCOTDI is a composite index for weighing, scoring and ranking the performance of GMoU cluster based on five key criteria (transparency and accountability, inclusiveness and participation, governance and democracy, business climate and progress towards sustainability), which are consistent with international best practice in development discourse. These five criteria constitute the criteria reference system and are similar to the criteria used by a similar study that undertook a social performance review of gold mine in Papua New Guinea (Macintyre *et al*, 2008). Idemudia and Osayande (2008) noted that the specific objectives of SCOTDI are: to provide a framework for ranking GMoU clusters; to engender healthy competition among GMoU clusters via an annual Community Transformation Development (CDT) award competition; to align MOCs capacity building interventions, business value expectations, and reputation enhancement opportunities. SPDC (2013) explains the criteria for assessment (SCOTDI) as follows: (i) transparency and accountability (the extent to which GMoU processes especially if the institution is open to scrutiny and provides information on its activities to its stakeholders); (ii) inclusiveness and participation (the creation of equal opportunities for the entire community to participate in the development process, and effects to address marginalization and exclusion of vulnerable groups in benefit distribution); (iii) governance and democracy ( the manner in which power is exercised in the management of economic and social resources, and adherence to laid down procedures); (iv) business climate (the enabling environment for MOCs to operate and its alignment with strategic priorities) and (v) progress and sustainability (the deployment of innovation in project execution, capacity to implement quality projects, alignment of projects to felt needs, diversity and growth in funding).

## **7. Theoretical perspective**

Most of the research on CSR Pyramid of Carroll (1991) has been in a Western context which suggests that culture may have an important influence on perceived CSR priorities (Burton *et al*, 2000). Just like Crane and Matten (2004) address this point explicitly by discussing CSR in a European context using Carroll's CSR Pyramid, Visser (2006) used the four-part construct of Carroll to look at how CSR manifests itself in an African context. Visser's

evidence of how CSR is practiced in an African context has been used to challenge the accuracy and relevance of Carroll's Pyramid. Most critically, Africa's CSR Pyramid suggest that the relative priorities of CSR in Africa are likely to be different from the classic, American ordering of the four kinds of social responsibilities: economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic. Visser (2006) makes it clear that social responsibility in the African context should be given priority in the sequence of philanthropic after economic.

However, this finding remains speculative and provocative, and would therefore benefit from further empirical research. This study adopts quantitative methodology, but views the outcome from Visser's Africa's CSR model.

## **8. Methodology and data**

The study adopts a quantitative methodology, as a contribution given the paucity of quantitative works in the region (Lompo & Trani, 2013). Survey research technique was used with the aim of gathering cross-sectional information from a representative sample of the population. It is essentially cross-sectional as it describes and interprets what exists at present in the region.

### ***Study area***

Table 2 captures the area of study with the current trend in the oil-host communities of the Niger Delta region as at 2017.

**Table 2.** Demographic characteristics of oil producing communities in the Niger Delta

| State       | 2006 Population | Size of the State in KM <sup>2</sup> | Major Ethnic groups                          | Violence Levels | % Oil Production | Location of Oil     | MOCs                              | Movement Groups   |
|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Akwabom     | 3,902,051       | 8,412 Km <sup>2</sup>                | Ibibio, Anang and oron                       | Significant     | 45               | Off shore           | Exxon Mobile, Shell, Agip         | MEND, IWAAD, Afigh, Ekid, Niger Delta Avengers                                      |
| Abia        | 2,881,380       | 5,834 km <sup>2</sup>                | Igbo   | Moderate        | 10               | Off shore/ On Shore | Shell, Agip, Total                | IPOB, MASSOB, Niger Delta Avengers  |
| Bayelsa     | 1,704,515       | 10,773 km <sup>2</sup>               | Ijaw, Nembe, Ogbia and Epie-Atissa           | High            | 40               | Off shore/ On Shore | Exxon Mobile, Shell, Agip, Total  | MEND, IYC, Delta Avengers   |
| Cross River | 2,892,988       | 13,564 Km <sup>2</sup>               | Ibibio, Anang and oron, YakkurOgoja, Itigidi | Moderate        | 12               | Off shore/ On Shore | Shell, Agip, Total                | MEND, IWAAD, Ekid Delta Avengers  |
| Delta       | 4,112,445       | 16,842 Km <sup>2</sup>               | Urhobo, Ijaw, Isoko, Itsekeri, and Anioma    | High            | 38               | Off shore/ On Shore | Shell Chevron, Total              | IYC, Itsekiri Youth Council, Urhobo Economic foundation, MEND, Niger Delta Avengers |
| Edo         | 3,233,366       | 14,825 Km <sup>2</sup>               | Benin, Ishan, Akokoedo, Etsako, EsanOwan     | Low             | 18               | Off shore/ On Shore | Shell, Agip, Total                | Egbesu, MEND, Niger Delta Avengers  |
| Imo         | 3,927,563       | 5,100 km <sup>2</sup>                | Igbo, Ndoni                                  | Moderate        | 10               | Off shore/ On Shore | Shell, Agip, Total                | IPOB, MASSOB, Niger Delta Avengers  |
| Ondo        | 3,460,877       | 12,432 Km <sup>2</sup>               | Ijaw, Yoruba, Epie-Atissa                    | Moderate        | 10               | Off shore/ On Shore | Shell Chevron, Total              | OPC, MEND, Niger Delta Avengers   |
| Rivers      | 5,198,716       | 11,077                               | Ndoni, Ijaw&Ikwere, Ogoni                    | High            | 40               | Off shore/ On Shore | Shell Chevron, Total, Halliburton | MOSOP and MEND, Niger Delta Avengers  |
| Total       | 31,313,901      |                                      |  |                 |                  |                     |                                   |   |

**Source:** Authors' compilation

### **Sample size**

The z-score sampling technique (Smith, 2013) was used to obtain a sample size of 600 young people in the rural communities of the Niger Delta region of Nigeria as shown in Equation 1.

$$\text{Sample size} = (z)^2 \times \text{std}(1-\text{std}) / (\text{mr})^2 \quad \text{Eq. (1)}$$

where, z = z-score = confidence level



Std = standard deviation

mr = margin of error = confidence interval

1 = constant

Therefore, we chose a confidence level of 90 percent, with 5 percent margin of error and a standard deviation of 0.5. Substituting the values in our equation, we have:

z-score @ 90 percent confidence level = 1.645 (z-score table)

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Thus sample size} &= (1.645)^2 \times 0.5(1-0.5)/(0.05)^2 \\ &= 0.6765/(0.05)^2 \\ &= 0.6765/0.0025 \\ &= 270.60\end{aligned}$$

This was approximated to 300, and also doubled to further minimize the possible errors in the sample selection. Hence, a total sample unit of 600 respondents was chosen for the study.

### ***Sampling procedure***

The selection of the sample involved both purposive and simple random samplings. In the first stage, two local government areas (LGAs) each were purposely selected from the nine states of Niger Delta region. This selection was made on the basis of their hosting at least a major tourist interest and having a good number of people involved in traditional handicraft (Table 1). In stage 2, from each of the selected LGAs, three rural communities were purposefully selected based on the availability of more tourist features interests than the other communities. This resulted in selecting fifty-four rural communities. Finally, out of the selected rural communities, households were randomly selected with the help of community gate keepers to make up the 600 respondents used for the study (Table 3).

**Table 3. Sample Size Determination Table**

| <b>States</b> | <b>Population</b> | <b>% of Total Population</b> | <b>Total Sample Per State</b> | <b>Samples Per Community</b> |
|---------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Abia          | 2,881,380         | 9%                           | 55                            | 14                           |
| Akwalbom      | 3,902,051         | 12%                          | 75                            | 19                           |
| Bayelsa       | 1,704,515         | 5%                           | 33                            | 8                            |
| Cross River   | 2,892,988         | 9%                           | 55                            | 14                           |
| Delta         | 4,112,445         | 13%                          | 79                            | 20                           |
| Edo           | 3,233,366         | 10%                          | 62                            | 15                           |
| Imo           | 3,927,563         | 13%                          | 75                            | 19                           |
| Ondo          | 3,460,877         | 11%                          | 66                            | 17                           |
| Rivers        | 5,198,716         | 17%                          | 100                           | 25                           |
| Total         | 31,313,901        | 100%                         | 600                           | 150                          |

**Source:** National Population Commission (2007)/Authors' computation

### **Data collection**

Data for the study were collected from primary sources using a participatory rural appraisal (PRA) technique of written semi-structured interview (SSI) questionnaire. The use of participatory research techniques in collecting CSR impact data especially as it concerns the rural household in the host communities of the MOCs is based on the fact that it involves the people being studied, and their views on all the issues are paramount. The semi-structure interview questionnaire was the major tool the study used for the household survey. It was directly administered by the researchers with the help of research assistants. The use of local research assistants was because of the inability of the researchers to speak the different local languages and dialects of the many ethnic groups of Ijaws, Ogonis, Ikweres, Etches, Ekpeyes, Ogbas, Engennes, Obolos, Isokos, Nembes, Okirikas, Kalabaris, Urhobos, Iteskiris, Igbos, Ika-Igbos, Ndonis, Orons, Ibenos, Yorubas, Ibibios, Anangs, Efiks, Bekwarras, Binis, Eshans, Etsakos, Owans, Itigidis, Epies, Akokoedos, Yakkurs, *inter alia*, in the sampled rural communities.

### **Analytical framework**

Data collected from respondents in the field were subjected to a series of treatments. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the data so as to answer the questions and test the hypotheses motivating the study. To answer the research questions, descriptive statistics was used and the results were presented in tables, figures and charts. But in testing the hypothesis, inferential statistical tool-estimation of logit model of receipt and non-receipt of MOCs's corporate social responsibility via the GMoUs by rural households as functions of selected socio-economic variables were used. For binominal response variables, the logistic link is the natural logarithm of the odds ratios stated thus:

$$\text{Log} \left( \frac{P_i}{1-P_i} \right) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X_1 + \alpha_2 X_2 + \alpha_3 X_3 + \alpha_4 X_4 + \dots \dots \dots \alpha_n X_n \text{Eq. (2)}$$

Hence, the impact of multinational oil company's CSR activities via GMOU on developing the rural young people handicraft and cultural tourism in the Niger Delta region was estimated using the Equation 3.

$$\text{Logit (EYCT)} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \text{Gmou} + \alpha_2 \text{Age} + \alpha_3 \text{Gen} + \alpha_4 \text{PriOcc} + \alpha_5 \text{HHSize} + \alpha_6 \text{Edu} + \alpha_7 \text{AY} + \alpha_8 \text{YOHM}. \text{Eq. (3)}$$

where:

EYCT = Empowerment of rural young people through cultural tourism development.

GMOU =Multinational oil companies (MOCs)'s corporate social responsibility via GMOU (total amount received by the rural household valued in Nigeria naira (NGN)). The actual variable considered here is intervention in cultural tourism development embarked upon by the MOCs via GMOU as acknowledged by the rural communities.

Age = Age of the respondent

Gen = Sex of the respondent

PriOcc = Primary occupation of the respondent

HHSize = Household size of the respondent

Edu = Highest level of education of the respondent

AY = Annual income of the respondent

Exp = Experience of the respondent in cultural tourism (experienced =1 otherwise =0)

MS = Marital status of the respondent

YOHM = Income of other household members

\*In this model, the main parameter of interest is  $\alpha_1$  in terms of sign and significance.

Given the sample size, ten important covariates were included so as to maintain reasonable degrees of freedom in the estimates. The corporate social responsibility (CSR) of the MOCs via GMOU, which is our main variable of interest, was included as one of the covariates. It is measured here as total receipt of resources by the rural households from the MOCs under GMOU interventions in provision of critical factors that will help develop and harness the handcraft potentials of the rural youths in the study area.

## 9.The empirical results

**Table 4.**Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

| <b>Variables</b>                   | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>%</b> | <b>Cumulative</b> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|----------|-------------------|
| <b>Sex</b>                         |                  |          |                   |
| Males                              | 315              | 52.5     | 68                |
| Females                            | 285              | 47.5     | 100               |
|                                    | 600              | 100      |                   |
| <b>Primary Occupation</b>          |                  |          |                   |
| Farming                            | 289              | 48       | 48                |
| Trading                            | 58               | 10       | 58                |
| Fishing                            | 152              | 25       | 83                |
| Government/Private Paid Employment | 38               | 6        | 90                |
| Handicraft                         | 45               | 8        | 97                |

|  |     |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|-----|
| Hunting  | 18  | 3   | 100 |
|  | 600 | 100 |     |
| <b>Years of Experience in Handicraft</b>         |     |     |     |
| None   | 555 | 93  | 93  |
| 0 - 10 Years                                     | 0   | 0   | 93  |
| 11 - 20 Years                                    | 8   | 1   | 94  |
| 21 - 30 Years                                    | 13  | 2   | 96  |
| Above 30 Years                                   | 24  | 4   | 100 |
|  | 600 | 100 |     |
| <b>Age of Respondents</b>                        |     |     |     |
| Less than 20 years                               | 75  | 13  | 13  |
| 21-30 years                                      | 224 | 37  | 50  |
| 31-40 years                                      | 205 | 34  | 84  |
| Above 40 years                                   | 96  | 16  | 100 |
|  | 600 | 100 |     |
| <b>Level of Education</b>                        |     |     |     |
| None   | 66  | 11  | 11  |
| FSLC   | 323 | 54  | 65  |
| WAEC/WASSCE                                      | 133 | 22  | 87  |
| B.Sc and Equivalent and above                    | 78  | 13  | 100 |
|  | 600 | 100 |     |
| <b>Marital Status</b>                            |     |     |     |
| Single   | 166 | 28  | 28  |
| Married  | 369 | 72  | 100 |
| Widow  | 23  | 10  | 110 |
| Divorced/Separated                               | 42  | 8   | 118 |
|  | 600 | 100 | 218 |
| <b>Household Size</b>                            |     |     |     |
| 1-4 Person                                       | 208 | 35  | 35  |
| 5-9 Person                                       | 318 | 53  | 88  |
| 10-14 Person                                     | 62  | 10  | 98  |
| 15 Person and above                              | 12  | 2   | 100 |
|  | 600 | 100 |     |
| <b>Monthly Off Cultural Tourism Income Level</b> |     |     |     |
| 1000 - 50,000                                    | 62  | 10  | 10  |
| 51,000 - 100,000                                 | 125 | 21  | 31  |
| 101,000 - 150,000                                | 160 | 27  | 58  |
| 151,000 - 200,000                                | 102 | 17  | 75  |
| 201,000 - 250,000                                | 73  | 12  | 87  |
| 251,000 - 300,000                                | 56  | 9   | 96  |

|  |     |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|-----|
| Above 300,000                          | 22  | 4   | 100 |
|  | 600 | 100 |     |
| <b>Monthly Cultural Tourism Income</b> |     |     |     |
| None                                   | 489 | 82  | 82  |
| 1000 - 50,000                          | 52  | 9   | 90  |
| 51,000 - 100,000                       | 26  | 4   | 95  |
| 101,000 - 150,000                      | 15  | 3   | 97  |
| 151,000 - 200,000                      | 11  | 2   | 99  |
| Above 200,000                          | 7   | 1   | 100 |
|  | 600 | 100 |     |

---

**Source:** Authors' computation

In Table 4, we show the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, and that some youths are making a living from cultural tourism products already. However only 8% of the respondents are involved in traditional handicraft. Also a further analysis shows that those involved are mostly elderly people as the years of experience shows that 53% of them have over 30 years while 29% have between 20-30 years and the rest 18% have between 10-20 years. This simply means that none of those in handicraft have less than 10 years of experience, showing that very few youths (if any) are involved. The average age of the respondent is 32 years and only 11% of them cannot read or write, others are literate to a reasonable extent. That notwithstanding, some RYP are still earning a living out of cultural tourism as guides, but the submission of this paper is that if attentions are paid to the traditional handicraft, the income of those involved will substantially increase. Irrespective of the high potentials of cultural tourism and the potentials in the host community, only 18% of the respondents earn some form of income from cultural tourism. Out of this about 6% earn more than 100,000 Nigeria naira per month.

**Table 5.** Projected effects of GMoUs interventions in handicraft development of the RYP as part of cultural tourism development in the Niger Delta region

|           |                   | B     |       | S.E.  |       | Wald  |       | df    |       | Sig.  |       | Exp(B) |       | 95.0% C.I. for EXP(B) |  |
|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-----------------------|--|
|           |                   | Lower | Upper | Lower | Upper | Lower | Upper | Lower | Upper | Lower | Upper | Lower  | Upper |                       |  |
| Step 1(a) | <i>AGE</i>        | -.017 | .009  | 3.205 | 1     | .073  | .983  | .966  | 1.002 |       |       |        |       |                       |  |
|           | <i>GENDER (1)</i> | .019  | .212  | .033  | 1     | .856  | .962  | .635  | 1.459 |       |       |        |       |                       |  |
|           | <i>HHSIZE</i>     | -.014 | .021  | .492  | 1     | .483  | .986  | .947  | 1.026 |       |       |        |       |                       |  |
|           | <i>PRIOCC</i>     | -.024 | .010  | .120  | 1     | .729  | .996  | .976  | 1.017 |       |       |        |       |                       |  |
|           | <i>EDU</i>        | .017  | .021  | .652  | 1     | .419  | 1.017 | .977  | 1.059 |       |       |        |       |                       |  |
|           | <i>AY</i>         | -.096 | .114  | .715  | 1     | .398  | .908  | .727  | 1.135 |       |       |        |       |                       |  |
|           | <i>YOMH</i>       | .047  | .115  | .171  | 1     | .679  | .954  | .761  | 1.194 |       |       |        |       |                       |  |
|           | <i>GMOU</i>       | 1.125 | .041  | 9.137 | 1     | .003  | 5.133 | 1.045 | 1.229 |       |       |        |       |                       |  |
|           | Constant          | 1.929 | .667  | 1.940 | 1     | .164  | 2.533 |       |       |       |       |        |       |                       |  |

Variable(s) entered on step 1: AGE, GENDER, HHSIZE, PRIOCC, EDU, AY, YOHM, GMOU.

**Source:** Authors' computation

**Table 6.** Z Value table of the impact of GMOUs interventions on handicraft development of RYP as part of cultural tourism development in Niger Delta region.

| Predictor Variable | Coefficient                   | Z - Value                    |  |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
|                    |                               | $z = \frac{\hat{B}}{SE}$     |  |
| AGE                | -.017<br>(.009) <sup>a</sup>  | 3.205<br>(.073) <sup>b</sup> |  |
| GENDER(1)          | -.019<br>(.212) <sup>a</sup>  | .033<br>(.856) <sup>b</sup>  |  |
| HHSIZE             | -.014<br>(.021) <sup>a</sup>  | .492<br>(.483) <sup>b</sup>  |  |
| PRIOCC             | -.024<br>(.010) <sup>a</sup>  | .120<br>(.729) <sup>b</sup>  |  |
| EDU                | .017<br>(.021) <sup>a</sup>   | .652<br>(.419) <sup>b</sup>  |  |
| AY                 | -.096<br>(.114) <sup>a</sup>  | .715<br>(.398) <sup>b</sup>  |  |
| YOHM               | .047<br>(.115) <sup>a</sup>   | .171<br>(.679) <sup>b</sup>  |  |
| GMOU               | 1.125*<br>(.041) <sup>a</sup> | 9.137<br>(.003) <sup>b</sup> |  |
| Constant           | 1.929<br>(.667) <sup>a</sup>  | 1.940<br>(.164) <sup>b</sup> |  |

\* significant at 5%; - a = This only refers to standard error (SE) b= Associated P Value of the Z value

**Source:** Authors' computation

In the logistic regression analysis conducted to predict the impact of the CSR of the MOCs via GMoUs intervention on development of handicraft as part of cultural tourism development of rural young people, the variables in the model above were used as predictors. A test of the full model against a constant only model was statistically significant, indicating that the predictors as a set reliably distinguished between the “yes” and “no” impact of GMoUs (chi square = 23.029,  $p < .000$  with  $df = 8$ ). Nagelkerke’s  $R^2$  of .754 indicated a strong relationship between prediction and grouping. Prediction success overall was 75 percent. (75.4 percent for “yes” and 74.6 percent for “no”). The Z-value for GMoU is 9.137, with an associated p-value of .007. Having set our significance level to 0.05, we accepted the null hypothesis because the p-value is more than 0.05. Hence the study concludes that the CSR of the MOCs has not significantly impacted on the traditional handicraft development of the rural young people. Hence there are still high levels of inequalities in participating in cultural tourism development by the RYP in the Niger Delta region. However, the EXP (B) value of the Predictor – GMoU is 5.133, which implies that, if the CSR interventions of the MOCs targeted at empowering the RYPs through traditional handicraft as part of cultural tourism development is raised by one unit, the odds ratio is 5.1 times as large and therefore that rural young people are 5.1 more times likely to participate and be engaged more in traditional handicrafts in the host communities.


## **10. Main findings and discussion**

The summary statistics of Figure 3 show that multinational oil companies are becoming more socially responsible to the host communities in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. There is no doubt that oil has been of great benefit to the Nigeria State in general and the host communities in particular. For example, in the area of capacity building, MOCs have been investing in equipping the youths of Niger Delta with essential skills (Marine and other engineering, geology and mining, sea welding, ICT skills, etc) for future leadership. According to Chevron (2014), the urban-based youth capacity building programme conducted in partnership with Africa Center for Leadership and Strategic Development trained 240 youths in leadership, ICT skills, programme management and peace building, along with a six-month mentorship programme. This programme has helped to mold change agents for social development in the region, as 130 youths from the programme are already engaged in social work in their communities, while 61 of them are currently earning income through entrepreneurial employments. The youth trainees that have passed through this

programme show significant and positive changes in disposition and attitude, as well as renewed sense of purpose for the region.

However, this is just but a very little fraction of the teeming population of the youths who are mostly rural based and is very prone to causing violence because of idleness. The finding of this study is that while training the youth in a high skilled profession is very good, it is of utmost importance to realize that going back to revive and modernize the traditional handicrafts of the region will cost the MOCs little but will empower so many youths. Such traditional handicraft include: Leather Work, Local Pottery, Textile Making, Mask Wearing, Wood carving, Sculpture, Tie and Dye Textile, Ivory Carving, Cloth Weaving, Grass and Cane, Weaving, Painting, Glass and Metal Works, Brass work, Bronze work, Calabash decorations, Iron work, Ceramics work, Fibre Making, and Bead & Jewelry Making. If emphasis is placed on these, the cultural tourism of the region will experience a big boost.

Also, in October 2014, MOCs held its first youth link forum to promote youth development. The forum provided an avenue through which 234 Niger Delta youths were provided resources and opportunities to make them more employable (PIND, 2011). The forum also provided an excellent networking opportunity for the attendees. The programme engaged the youths in hands-on-workshops on writing a good resume, how to conduct themselves in a job interviews and how to start an agri-business (Chevron 2014). These are good CSR initiatives for youths in the region, but may not benefit the young local artisans who live in rural communities and need to learn and expand their handicrafts.




**Figure 3.**Percentage distribution of GMoUs intervention of MOCs by sectors in the Niger Delta.



**Source:** Authors' calculation

In Figure 3, we showed that while education in the form of provision of infrastructure, library and laboratory equipment, scholarship and teachers training accounted for 23% of the CSRs of the MOCs, health services accounted for 18% and the most interestingly is that youth empowerment in cultural tourism accounted for only 0.4%. Worthy to note is that, most of the forms CSR including the listed skill acquisition are city based, this will not do much as the 2006 population censuses estimated the youth population of the Niger Delta to be 15,343,812 people out of which 11,354,421 are in the rural communities. It is on the basis of this knowledge and finding that this study submits that what will tackle the violence disposition of the Niger Delta youth is definitely CSR intervention they can easily owned that will cover a large population and will require little start-up fund.

According to Visser (2006) social responsibility in an African context should not begin with good intention, but with the stakeholder actions. ILO (2012) emphasized that the majority of youths in sub-Saharan Africa live in rural areas and work in family farming and the informal sector. Therefore a good intended GMoU cluster for pro - youth project should begin from the rural areas. To support Visser (2006), Figure 4 suggests that the interests of most rural young people are in cultural tourism development, to the extent that 48 percent are willing to get involved in full-time business of handicrafts while 26% are willing to get involved part-time.




**Figure 4.**Percentage distribution of the young people's willingness to be involved in cultural tourism development

**Source:** Authors' calculation

Figure 5 suggests that GMoUs intervention in RYP development in the Niger Delta has not received significant attention. But if MOCs should go by Amaeshi *et al* (2006) that the CSR

concept in Nigeria should be based on cultural and social-economic factors, then GMoUs intervention has not impacted on rural youths' development.




**Figure 5.**Rate of receipt of intervention in cultural tourism development from the MOCs

**Source:** Authors' calculation

However, to get the actual feelings of the rural young people on youth inequality in GMoUs approach, their opinions were sought for in six major criteria developed from SCOTDI. The assessment was done to find out issues on the governance, inclusiveness, transparency, participation, continuity and outcome of the GMoUs in the Niger Delta region from the perspective of rural young people. Figure 6 shows the criteria and the variables, rating them either none, very low, low, moderate, significant or high. The overall rating of the GMoUs interventions in youths' cultural tourism (handicraft) development in Niger Delta is **very low**. Therefore Figure 6 provides evidence to support Anyanwu *et al* (2016) that another group of Africans that have remained widely excluded from recent economic progress are the young people. Moreover, the lack of gainful employment for young Africans is a major critical policy challenge in Africa that can be addressed through GMoUs intervention in oil host communities.

Although a small share of tourist expenditures is on handicrafts, several studies suggest that the economic benefits that accrue to the poor are comparatively high (Agba *et al*, 2010; Adeniran & Akinlabi, 2011; Onyima, 2016). For example, GMoUs can facilitate market opportunities for rural young people in local handicrafts by organizing local craft exhibition in rural communities and through coordinated visits to the fair that would allow expatriates to

source handicrafts directly with local youth artisans. This is a creative way of appreciating rural young people in craft entrepreneurship by setting-up craft exhibition shows, to showcase local handmade crafts. By doing this, RYP can make a lot of money within a short period of time. RYP entrepreneurs are looking for opportunities like this, in which CDB can tap into and reduce youth uprisings in the region. Engaging directly with local youth artisans in rural communities with few or no intermediaries allows for a greater capture of expatriate expenditures by young local artisans and encourages the utilization of local skills and materials; with tourism thus generating an important source of income for semi-skilled and unskilled rural young people, while contributing to the preservation of local heritages of the Niger Delta region. GMoU can also play a role in helping to create an appropriate intervention structure for CDBs to actively engage in integrating young local artisans into local tourism value chains and ensuring that they benefit economically from the sector.



**Figure 6.** Rating of the GMoUs interventions in youths’ cultural development in Niger Delta

**Source:** Authors’ calculation

Wood carving is one of the most cherished traditional crafts that is commonly practiced by the people of Niger Delta. Therefore, GMoUs intervention in training RYP in cane weaving, a common aspect of woodcarving that requires the practice of interweaving reeds of cane into chairs, tables, stools and other attractive items which can be used in furnishing homes and offices. RYP can also be trained in using strands of woven grass in making hand-held fans, mini tables, hats and baskets for domestic uses. This finding supports Economic Development in Africa Report (2017) in that the art of wood carving demands great craftiness and young people would devote ample time to acquiring its techniques. In some families and households, the craft is often inherited as fathers pass it to younger generations. Through appropriate GMoUs intervention for the in-depth expertise of woodcarving, RYP could

design and implement production of figurines, doors, panels and other utensils which are useful for artistic decoration of homes and offices.

On the whole, our findings provide a viable linkage between tourism, local handicraft sectors and corporate social responsibility that create economic opportunities for local youth artisans in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. Most critically, it is suggested that the relative priorities of CSR of MOCs in Nigeria should be different for the classic Western version; but in line with Visser (2006) and Amaeshi *et al* (2006) in considering the importance of socio-cultural context of Africans and Nigerians in particular. However, in extension and contribution, we argue that if MOCs are to work towards an ideal CSR implementation for rural youths in the Niger Delta, GMoUs should assign cultural tourism development a priority. It is our contention that MOCs are in a position to enrich cultural tourism transformation and inclusive growth in Nigeria by facilitating the participation of rural youths. Hence, embracing rural youth's involvement in Nigeria's arts and crafts production should form the foundation of CSR practice in Niger Delta, which in turn would provide the enabling environment for more widespread responsible business in the oil-host communities.

## **11. Conclusion and policy implications**

Handicrafts are key cultural products consumed in the Nigeria's tourism industry. Owing to low entry barriers, as handicrafts require a low level of capital investment, there is potential to develop viable linkages between tourism and local handicrafts sectors that create economic opportunities for local artisans. Thus, we set out to assess the impact of a new CSR model of multinational oil companies on development of rural young people in cultural tourism of the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. This paper contributes to the inequality debate in African tourism and inclusive growth from the CSR perspective by assessing empirical evidence in two areas that have received much attention in the literature. The two areas are encapsulated in the following questions:

- i. What is the level of multinational oil companies' CSR investment in cultural tourism development in the Niger Delta region?
- ii. Do multinational oil companies' GMoUs interventions impact on the development of handicraft of rural young people in cultural tourism in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria?

Six hundred RYP were sampled across the rural Niger Delta region. Using the logit model, results indicate that RYP have remained widely excluded from the General Memorandum of

Understandings (GMoUs) interventions in cultural tourism projects due to the traditional beliefs that cultural affairs are prerogatives of elders, a caveat to the youths. This implies that if the traditions of the communities continue to hinder direct participation of the RYP from the GMoUs cultural tourism project interventions, achieving equality and cultural change would be limited in the region. The findings suggest that since handicrafts are key cultural products consumed in the tourism industry, GMoUs can play a role in helping to create an appropriate intervention structure that will be targeted towards youth empowerment in the area of traditional handicraft. This can be achieved if the Cluster Development Boards (CDBs) would focus on integrating rural young artisans into local tourism value chains and ensuring that they benefit economically from the sector. The CDBs should aim at creating space for the views of rural young indigenous people's handicrafts; emphasizing the value of indigenous knowledge, particularly on arts and crafts for tourists and expatriates in multinational corporations in Nigeria.

It is worth mentioning that while this study contributes to extant literature on the role of oil from the perspective of CSR in cultural tourism development of rural young people in the Niger Delta region, it also provides essential policy directions on the relationship. However, completing this study with the role of women and gender in African tourism policies will be needful in the region.

### **Acknowledgment**

The authors are indebted to the editor and reviewers for constructive comments.

### **Disclosure statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors. Funding for this research was provided by the authors.

## References

- Adeniran, A.J. & Akinlabi, F.J. (2011). Perceptions on cultural significance and heritage conservation: a case study of Sussan Wenger's building, Osogbo, Nigeria. *African Journal of History and Culture*, 3(5), 73-88.
- Africa Competitiveness Report.(2017). *Addressing Africa's Demographic Divided*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- African Development Bank. (2011). *Enhancing Capacity for Youth Employment in Africa*. Tunis: Africa Capacity Development Brief.
- African Development Report.(2012). *Towards Green Growth in Africa*. Tunis-Belvedere: African Development Bank.
- African Development Report. (2015). *Growth, Poverty and Inequality Nexus: Overcoming Barriers to Sustainable Development*. Abidjan: African Development Bank.
- African Economic Outlook (2017). *Entrepreneurship and Industrialization*. Abidjan: African Development Bank/Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/United Nations Development Programme.
- Agba, A.M., Ikoh, M. U., Bassey, A.O. and Ushie, E.M. (2010). Tourism industry impact on Efik's culture, Nigeria. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(4), 355-365.
- Akama, J.S. & Kieti, D.M. (2003). Measuring tourist satisfaction with Kenya's wildlife safari: a case study of Tsavo west national park. *Tourism Management*, 24, 73-81.
- Akande, A.F. (2014). An assessment of the impact of culture and tourism on international public relations practice: a study of Nigerian tourism development corporation (NTDC). *Journal of Culture, Society and Development*, 4, 11-18.
- Alfred, C. (2013). Global memorandum of understanding: an analysis of Shell Petroleum Development Company's current community development model in the Niger Delta.

*International Journal of Innovative Social Science and Humanities Research*, 2(1), 1-14.

Alivizatou, M. (2008). Contextualizing cultural heritage in heritage studies and museology. *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, 3, 44-54.

Alzahrani, D.A. (2013). The adoption of a standard definition of cultural heritage. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 3(1), 9-12.

Alegre, I. & Garau, J. (2010). Tourist satisfaction and dissatisfaction. *Anal of Tourism Research*, 37(1), 52-73.

Axelsen, M & Swan, T. (2010). Designing festival experiences to influence visitor perceptions: the case of a wine and food festival. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(4), 436-450.

Akande, T. (2014). Youth unemployment in Nigeria: a situation analysis. Broking Institute, Africa in Focus, September 23, 2014.

Akpan, W. (2006). Between responsibility and rhetoric: some consequences of CSR practice in Nigeria's oil province. *Development Southern African*, 23(2), 223-240.

Amaeshi, K., Adi, B., Ogbechie, C. & Amao, O. (2006). Corporate social responsibility in Nigeria: Western mimicry or indigenous influences? *Journal of Corporate citizenship*, 24, 83-99.

Amare, T. (2014). Africa's high youth unemployment: is population to be blame? *The Guardian*, July 11, 2014.

Antimova, R. Nawiji, J. & Peters, P. (2012). The awareness/attitude-gap in sustainable tourism: a theoretical perspective. *Tourism Review*, 67(3), 7-16.

Anyanwu, J.C., Erhijakpor, A.E.O. & Obi, E. (2016). Empirical analysis of the key drivers of income inequality in West Africa. *African Development Review*, 28(1), 18-38.

- Asongu, S. A., (2013). How would population growth affect investment in the future? asymmetric panel causality evidence for Africa. *African Development Review*, 25(1), 14-29.
- Asongu, S. A., & Nwachukwu, J. C., (2016). Transfer mispricing as an argument for corporate social responsibility. African Governance and Development Institute, 16/031, Yaoundé.
- Asongu, S. A., & Nwachukwu, J. C., (2018). Openness, ICT and entrepreneurship in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Information Technology & People*, 31(1), 278-303.
- Asongu, S. A., Nwachukwu, J. C., & Orim, S.M. I., (2018). Mobile phones, institutional quality and entrepreneurship in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 131(C), 183-203.
- Benson, E.I. (2014). Cultural tourism and sustainability in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 3(14), 649-655.
- Bertrand, M. & Crepon, B. (2014). Micro-economic perspectives, in Hino, H. and Ranis, G. (Eds.) *Youth and Employment in sub-Saharan Africa: Working but poor*. Oxford and New York: Routledge.
- Bloom, D.E. (2012). Youth in the balance. *Finance & Development*, 49(1), 6-11.
- Bochenek, M. (2013). Festival tourism of folk group dancers from selected countries of the world. *Polish Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 20(2), 95-99.
- Butcher, J. (2009). Ecotourism as life politics. *Journal of sustainable Tourism*, 16(3), 315-326.
- Burton, B.K., Farh, J. L. and Hegarty, W. H. (2000). A cross-cultural comparison of corporate social responsibility orientation: Hong Kong vs. United States students. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 4(2), 151-167.



- Carroll, A.B. (1991). The Pyramid of corporate social responsibility: towards the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34, 39-48.
- Crane, A. & Matten, D. (2007). *Business Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chalermapat, P., Rene, D. & Karin, P. (2016). Floating markets in Thailand: same, but different. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 10.1080/14766-825.2016.1253704.
- Chevron.(2014). *Corporate Responsibility Report of Chevron in Nigeria*.Lagos: policy, Government & Public Affairs (PGPA) Department.
- Economic Development in Africa Report.(2017). *Tourism for Transformative and Inclusive Growth*.New York/Geneva: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
- Edoho, F. M. (2008). Oil transnational corporations: corporate social responsibility and environmental sustainability. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15(4), 210-222.
- Ekhator, E.O. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and Chinese oil multinationals in the oil and gas industry of Nigeria: an appraisal. *Cadern De Esthudos Africanos*, 28, 119-140.
- Eweje, G. (2006). Environmental costs and responsibilities resulting from oil exploration in developing countries: the case of the Niger Delta of Nigeria. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 69(1), 27-56.
- FAO. (2010). *Rural Youth Employment in Developing Countries: A Global view*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.
- Filmer, D. & Fox, I. (2014). Youth employment in sub-Saharan Africa. *Africa Development Series*, Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Frynas, J. (2009). *Beyond Corporate Social Responsibility: Oil Multinationals and Social Challenges*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Godden, L. (2002). Indigenous heritage and environment. *Environmental and Planning Law Journal*, 19(4), 260.
- Herrington, M. & Kelly, D. (2012). *African Entrepreneurship: sub-Saharan African Regional Report 2012*. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM), Cape Town: Cape Town University.
- ICOMOS.(2002). Principles and guidelines for managing tourism at places of cultural and heritage significance. Icomos International Cultural Tourism Committee/Charter.
- Idemudia, U. (2014). Corporate-community engagement strategies in the Niger Delta: some critical reflections. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 1(2), 154-162.
- Idemudia, U. (2008). Conceptualizing the CSR and development debate: bridging existing analytical gaps. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 29, 91-110.
- Idemudia, U. & Osayande, N. (2016). Assessing the effect of corporate social responsibility on community development in the Niger Delta: a corporate perspective. *Community Development Journal Advance Access published June 30, 2016*.
- IFAD. (2011a). *Feeding Future Generations: Young Rural People Today- Prosperous, Productive Farmers Tomorrow*. Proceedings of IFAD's Governing Council High-Level Panel and Side Events, 2011.
- IFAD. (2011b). *Rural Poverty Report 2011 -New Realities, New Challenges: New Opportunities for Tomorrow's Generation*. Rome: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).
- IFAD. (2010). *Investing in the future: Creating Opportunities for Young Rural People*. Rome: International Fund for Agricultural Development.
- IFAD/ILO. (2012). *Promoting Decent and Productive Employment of Young People in Rural Areas: A Review of Strategies and Programmes*. Workshop Report.

- ILO. (2010). *Global Employment Trends for Youths: Special Issue on the Impact of the Global Economic Crisis on Youth*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- ILO. (2012). *Investing in Youth for Rural Transformation: Rural Policy Briefs*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Ite, U. E. (2007). Changing times and strategies: Shell's contribution to sustainable community development in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Sustainable Development*, 15(1), 1-14.
- Ite, U.E. (2005). Poverty reduction in resource rich developing countries: what have multinational corporations got to do with it? *Journal of International Development*, 17(7), 913-939.
- Juan, G.B., Marta M. & Manuela, P. (2016). Understanding museum visitor's experience: a comparative study. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and sustainable Development*, 6(1), 47-71.
- Keitumetse, S. (2006). UNESCO 2003 convention on intangible heritage: practical implications for heritage management approach in Africa. *The Southern African Archeological Bulletin*, 61(184), 166-171.
- Kurin, R. (2004). Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the 2003 UNESCO convention: a critical appraisal. *Museum International*, 56(1&2), 66-76.
- Kuruk, P. (2004). Cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and indigenous rights-an analysis of the convention for safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. *Macquarice Journal of International and Comparative Environmental Law*, 1(1), 111-134.
- Kuutma, K. (2009). Cultural heritage: an introduction to entanglements of knowledge, politics and property. *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics*, 3(2), 5-12.
- Lompo, K. &Trani, J.F. (2013). Does corporate social responsibility contribute to human development in developing countries? Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 14(2), 241-265.

- Macintyre, M., Mee, W. & Solomon F. (2008). Evaluating social performance in the context of an 'audit culture': a pilot social review of a global mine in Papua New Guinea. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15(2), 100-110.
- Muthuri, J. N. (2012). *Corporate Social Responsibility in Africa: Definitions, Issues and Processes*. Royal Hollowing University of London, School of Management Research Seminar.
- Muthuri, J.N. and Gilbert, V. (2011).An institutional analysis of corporate social responsibility in Kenya.*Journal of Business Ethics*, 98, 467-483.
- National Population Commission (2007).Report of Nigeria's national population commission on the 2006 census.*Population and Development Review*, 33(1), 206-210.
- Nwaolikpe, C. J. (2013). Culture and Nigerian identity in the print media.*Arabic Journal of Business and Management Review*, 3(3), 63-71.
- Onuoha, F.C. (2014). Why do youth join Boko Haram? United States Institute of Peace: Special Report 348, June, 2014.
- Onyima, B.N. (2016). Nigerian cultural heritage: preservation, challenges and prospects. *OGIRISI: a new Journal of African Studies*, 12, 273-292.
- Philips, F. (2006).Corporate social responsibility in an African context.*Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 24, 23-27.
- PIND.(2011). *Niger Delta Youth Assessment*.Abuja: Foundation for Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta.
- Population Reference Bureau. (2007). *Africa's Youthful Population: Risk or Opportunity?* Washington, D.C: PRB.
- Renouard, C. &Lado, H. (2012).CSR and inequality in the Niger Delta (Nigeria).*Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 12(4), 472-484

- Scott, A.C., Girish, P. & Miguel, M. (2014). Consumer behavior in tourism: concepts, influences and opportunities. *Current issues in Tourism*, 17(10), 872-909.
- SPDC. (2013). *Shell in Nigeria: Global Memorandum of Understanding*. Port Harcourt: Shell Petroleum Development Corporation (SPDC) in Nigeria.
- Tuodolo, F. (2009). Corporate social responsibility: between civil society and oil industry in the developing world. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 8(3), 530-541.
- Uduji, J.I. & Okolo-Obasi, E.N. (2017). Multinational oil firms' CSR initiatives in Nigeria: the need of rural farmers in host communities. *Journal of International Development*, 29(3), 308-329.
- Uduji, J.I. & Okolo-Obasi, E.N. (2018a). Adoption of improved crop varieties by involving farmers in the e-wallet programme in Nigeria. *Journal of Crop Improvement* <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427528.2018.1496216>
- Uduji, J.I. & Okolo-Obasi, E.N. (2018b). Young rural women's participation in the e-wallet programme and usage intensity of modern agricultural inputs in Nigeria. *Gender, Technology and Development*, 22(1), 59-81. doi:10.1080/097185.24.2018.1445894
- UNCDF. (2011). *Listening to Youth: Market Research to Design Financial and Non-Financial Services for Youth in sub-Saharan Africa*. New York: United Nations Capital Development Fund.
- UNECA. (2011). *Africa Youth Report 2011: Addressing the Youth Education and Employment NEXUS in the New Global Economy*. Addis Ababa: ECA Publications and Conference Management.
- UNWTO/Casa Africa IPDT-Institute of Tourism (2015). *Tourism in Africa: A Tool for Development – Affiliate members Regional Reports*. Volume 4, Madrid: UNWTO.
- UNWTO (2013). *Sustainable Tourism for Development Guidebook*. Madrid: UNWTO

UNESCO (2004). *Programme: Tourism, Culture and Development in West Africa*. UNESCO, September

Visser, W. (2006). Revisiting Carroll's CSR Pyramid: An African Perspective, in E.R. Pederson & M. Huniche (eds), *Corporate Citizenship in Developing Countries*, Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press, 29-56.

Watts, M. (2004). Resource curse? Governmentality, oil and power in the Niger Delta. *Geopolitics*, 9(1), 50-58.

Weisheng, C., Shiheng, Z. & Philip C. (2016). The influence of destination image and tourist satisfaction on tourist loyalty in Korea. *International Journal of Culture Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10(2), 223-234.

World Bank. (2012). *Youth Employment Programmes: An Evaluation of World Bank and IFC Support*. Washington D.C.: World Bank Independent Evaluation Group.

World Travel and Tourism Council (2015). *Global Talent Trends and Issues for the Travel and Tourism Sector*. London: WTTC.

World Travel and Tourism Council (2016). *Travel and Tourism: Economic Impact 201-Africa*. London: WTTC.

**DRAFT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RURAL OIL HOST COMMUNITIES IN NIGER DELTA**

State \_\_\_\_\_ LGA \_\_\_\_\_

City/Town \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Respondent: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Sex of Respondent  
 Male [ ] Female [ ]
2. Age Bracket:  
 a) Between 20 – 30 [ ] b) Between 31 – 40 [ ] c) Between 41 – 50 [ ]  
 d) Between 51 - 60 [ ] e) Above 60 [ ]
3. Marital Status:  
 a) Married [ ] b) Single [ ] c) Separated [ ] d) Widowed [ ] e) Divorced [ ]
4. Number living in household at present (Household Size):  
 \_\_\_\_\_
5. Highest Educational Qualification of Respondent:  
 a) None [ ] b) Primary [ ] c) Secondary [ ] d) Tertiary [ ]
6. Religion of the Respondent  
 a) Christianity [ ] b) Islam [ ] c) Traditional d) others [ ]
7. Employment status of Respondent  
 a) Government/Private Paid Employment [ ] b) Farming [ ] c) Trading [ ] d)  
 Handicraft (Mechanic, welding, bicycle repairs, woodwork, clothe weaving etc.) [ ] e)  
 Unemployed [ ] g) Others [ ]
8. If engaged in handicraft, what is the major handicraft you are involved? (tick as many as applied)

| Handicraft              | Fully involved | Partly involved | Not involved |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Leather Work            |                |                 |              |
| Textile Making          |                |                 |              |
| Grass and Cane weaving  |                |                 |              |
| Glass making            |                |                 |              |
| Ceramics work           |                |                 |              |
| Painting/Makeup art     |                |                 |              |
| Fibre Making            |                |                 |              |
| Bead and Jewelry Making |                |                 |              |
| Local Pottery           |                |                 |              |
| Mask Weaving            |                |                 |              |
| Sculpture/wood work     |                |                 |              |

|                         |  |  |  |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| Ivory Carving           |  |  |  |
| Mask Wearing            |  |  |  |
| Calabash Decorations    |  |  |  |
| Boat and paddle carving |  |  |  |
| Cloth Weaving           |  |  |  |
| Brass work              |  |  |  |
| Metal/Iron Works        |  |  |  |
| Bronze Work             |  |  |  |
| Tie and Dye Textile     |  |  |  |

Others (Pls Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

9. How long have you been in this handicraft Business:  
a) 0- 10 Years [ ] b) 11- 20 Years [ ] c) 21 - 30Years [ ] d) 31 - 40 Years [ ] e) Above 40 Years [ ]
10. In this business of handicraft, have you received any form of support from any of the oil companies  
a) Yes [ ] b) No [ ]
11. If yes, what is the nature of the support  
a) Infrastructural development [ ] b) Soft/grant Loan [ ] c) Training [ ] d) others \_\_\_\_\_
12. What is your range of monthly income from the business  
a) (0- 50,000) [ ] b) (51,000 – 100,000) [ ] c) (101,000 – 150,000) [ ] d) (151,000- 200,000) [ ]  
e) (201,000 – 250,000) [ ] f) (251,000 – 300,000) [ ] g) (301,000- 350,000) [ ] h) 351,000- 400,000 [ ] i) Above 400,000) [ ]
13. Do you earn money in any cultural tourism activities (Business)  
a) Yes [ ] b) No [ ]
14. If yes, how long have you been in the Business:  
a) 0 - 10 Years [ ] b) 11- 20 Years [ ] c) 21 - 30Years [ ] d) 31 - 40 Years [ ] e) Above 40 Years [ ]
15. What is your range of monthly income from the business  
a) (0- 50,000) [ ] b) (51,000 – 100,000) [ ] c) (101,000 – 150,000) [ ] d) (151,000- 200,000) [ ]



e) (201,000 – 250,000) [ ] f) (251,000 – 300,000) [ ] g) (301,000- 350,000) [ ] h) 351,000- 400,000 [ ] i) Above 400,000) [ ]

16. Do you or any other person(s) in your household that earn income from cultural tourism activities

a) Yes [ ] b) No [ ]

17. If yes, what is the range of the monthly income from other household members put together

a) (0- 50,000) [ ] b) (51,000 – 100,000) [ ] c) (101,000 – 150,000) [ ] d) (151,000- 200,000) [ ]

e) (201,000 – 250,000) [ ] f) (251,000 – 300,000) [ ] g) (301,000- 350,000) [ ] h) 351,000- 400,000 [ ] i) Above 400,000) [ ]

### Section B Knowledge and Participation in GMOUs

18. Are you aware of the GMoUs of the Multi-national oil companies?

a) Yes [ ] b) No [ ]

19. If yes, from 1- 11 ( 1 the most important) rate the activities of the MOCs in the following area

| Activities                    | Rate 1 - 11 |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Housing and Roads             |             |
| Health Services               |             |
| Education                     |             |
| Fishing                       |             |
| Agriculture and rural Farming |             |
| Skill Acquisition             |             |
| Rural Electrification         |             |
| Policy Advocacy               |             |
| Eco Cultural tourism          |             |
| Chieftaincy Matter            |             |
| Direct Youth Employment       |             |

20. How and where do you get the Household drinking water?

a) Tap [ ] b) Stream [ ] c) River [ ] c) Borehole [ ] d) Hand dug Well [ ] e) Rain Water [ ]

Other (pls specify)\_\_\_\_\_

21. When a member of the Household is sick, how is (s)he treated?

- a) By a qualified doctor in a hospital [ ] b) We buy drugs in a drugstore (chemist) [ ]  
 c) We see a traditional medical expert [ ] d) We treat him/her ourselves [ ] e) We just pray [ ]  
 f) We do nothing [ ] g) We take other actions  
 (pls specify)\_\_\_\_\_

22. Educational qualifications of members of the household?

| Level of schooling                               | No in Household |
|--|-----------------|
| No schooling                                     |                 |
| Primary education                                |                 |
| Junior secondary education                       |                 |
| Senior secondary education                       |                 |
| College of Education/Polytechnic                 |                 |
| First Degree (University)                        |                 |
| Postgraduate Qualifications (PGD, MSc, PhD, etc) |                 |
| Other (Special, Islamic, etc) Education          |                 |

23. Do you have any project(s) in education (School Building, Library, Scholarship etc?) in your community sponsored under any GMOU?

- a) Yes [ ] b) No [ ]

24. If yes, how has it affected the development of education in your community?

- a) It has provided more opportunities to the less privileged [ ]  
 b) it has widened the inequality gap [ ]  
 c) it has increased the level of literacy in the community [ ]  
 d) it has not made any impact [ ]

25. Do you have any water project(s) (Boreholes, Taps etc) sponsored under GMoU in your community?

- a) Yes [ ] b) No [ ]

26. If yes, how has it affected the development in your community?

- a) It has provided more access to clean water [ ]  
 b) it has reduced the incidence of water born diseases [ ]  
 c) it has increased labour man-hour by reducing the amount time spent going to stream [ ]  
 d) it enhances the breeding of mosquitoes [ ]  
 e) it has not made any impact [ ]

27. Do you have any project(s) in Traditional cultural tourism (Handicraft development etc) in your community sponsored under any GMoU?

- a) Yes [ ] b) No [ ]

28. If yes, how has it affected the development of cultural tourism in your community?
- a) It has provided more opportunities to the less privileged [ ]
  - b) It has widened the inequality gap [ ]
  - c) It has increased the level of illiteracy in the community [ ]
  - d) It has not made any impact [ ]
29. Do you have any health project(s) (hospitals, maternities, etc) sponsored under GMoU in your Community?
- a) Yes [ ] b) No [ ]
30. If yes, how has it affected the development in your community?
- a) It has provided more access to health care facilities [ ]
  - b) It has reduced the incidence of infant mortality [ ]
  - c) it has reduced the incidence of maternal mortality [ ]
  - d) has made no impact [ ]
31. Name any other project sponsored under GMOUs in your community

---



---



---



---



---

32. At what state is each of the projects?

| Project                       | Completed and in use | Completed but not yet in use | Nearly Completion | Just Started | Just Proposed |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Housing and Roads             |                      |                              |                   |              |               |
| Health Services               |                      |                              |                   |              |               |
| Education                     |                      |                              |                   |              |               |
| Fishing                       |                      |                              |                   |              |               |
| Agriculture and rural Farming |                      |                              |                   |              |               |
| Skill Acquisition             |                      |                              |                   |              |               |
| Rural Electrification         |                      |                              |                   |              |               |
| Policy Advocacy               |                      |                              |                   |              |               |
| Eco Cultural tourism          |                      |                              |                   |              |               |
| Chieftaincy Matter            |                      |                              |                   |              |               |
| Direct Youth Employment       |                      |                              |                   |              |               |

33. In your opinion, what is the impact of such project on development of your community?

---

---

---

---

34. In your view, what do you think the impact of GMOU overall is with respect to cultural tourism?

a) Positive [ ] b) Negative [ ]

35. If Positive, in what ways do you think it help?

a) It provides job for unemployed youth [ ]

b) It reduces the rate of crime [ ]

c) It is major source of income for families and communities [ ]

d) It make for positive output in the families [ ]

Others (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

36. If you have opportunity to partake in handicraft development, how will you react to it

a) I will take it with both hands [ ] b) I will consider it twice [ ] c) I am Not interested d) I am not sure [ ]

37. How will you rate these criterions of the CDBs in your community (Rate appropriately from 1% -100%)

| Criterion     | Rate |
|---------------|------|
| Governance    |      |
| Inclusiveness |      |
| Transparency  |      |
| Participation |      |
| Continuity    |      |
| Outcome       |      |

*We thank you most sincerely for your time and support in completing this questionnaire.*

Name of Enumerator: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_