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Abstract
There is increased global attention to the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility. In most developing countries the concept is still in the infancy stages of conception. The purpose of this study is to determine the level of stakeholder awareness and perception of CSR in the mining industry of Zimbabwe. The central research question was to assess the stakeholder perceptions on the phenomenon within the extractive sector, in a developing country context.

The study adopted a qualitative methodology and a case study research design. Data collection utilized the interview method to gain stakeholder insights on CSR activities practised by two mining companies. A multi-stakeholder perspective guided the research process.

The study reflected high level of CSR awareness by stakeholders of companies in the mining industry. The concept of sustainable development was given high priority by stakeholders and companies that implementing this concept were positively perceived. Poor CSR strategy formulation and implementation were highlighted by the study. The study indicated lack of transparency in mining companies’ stakeholder engagement policies.

There is need for effective communication and implementation of CSR strategies by mining companies that ensure stakeholder support. A policy framework which strikes a balance between mandatory and voluntary CSR improves participation by companies in CSR activities. A policy framework for sustainable projects to equip pupils, students and mining communities with self reliant skills has the potential to reduce dependency on companies’ philanthropic activities.

Key Words: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Stakeholder and Perception.
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CHAPTER 1

1.1 Introduction
The mining business is often associated with the concept of CSR and most companies are presently involved in CSR activities especially as it pertains to company image and competitive advantage (Mandina et al. 2014). Mining corporations have realized they cannot operate in isolation from communities because they need social support from them. When companies establish themselves to operate in a community, that business is expected to contribute positively to the economic and social lives of the community because it will be carrying out activities that affect their way of life. A company’s CSR activities are obligations over and above making profit and fulfilling legal obligations (Johnson & Scholes 2002) Some companies have engaged in various activities such as building schools, clinics and roads as a way of giving back to the community but there has been debate as to whether these acts are not mere business support services or marketing strategies, rather than CSR (Russel 2010).

Sustainability and sustainable development issues become areas of concern as societies and Governments seek to ensure that choices of resources utilization in future are not constrained by decisions taken in the present (Aras & Crowther 2007). At times mining companies are confronted by social realities they cannot comprehend while on the other hand the communities in which they operate may lack understanding of the processes involved in mining.

The economic gains from this growth in mining industry are not without problems especially in the social context where mining companies may not be acceptable to the local communities in which they establish their operations. Mining operations by their nature often cause social costs to the communities they operate in, and the strategies they implement as a way of mitigating these negative effects, greatly impacts on the perceptions of the stakeholders.

Mining companies may be convinced of providing good CSR practices to the community but stakeholders may expect and perceive otherwise. In some cases mining operations have been forced to close down due to stakeholders’ dissatisfaction with their operations. Stakeholder perceptions can be influenced by various factors which can be attributed to the individual or can be external.
The concept of stakeholder perception of CSR in most developing countries has not been well researched and this study by way of case study, sought to cover that gap by assessing stakeholder perceptions of CSR practices by mining companies to establish ways of mitigating the impact. Various CSR theories and dimensions of mining companies were discussed with the Stakeholder theory being the basis of the research.

1.2 Background to the study
1.2.1 Background to the mining industry
An overview of the mining sector in Zimbabwe by The Chamber of Mines portrayed the sector as the economic driver with the highest growth rate of 35% in the period 2009 to 2011 and a predicted growth rate of 19% in the period 2012-2015 (Chamber of Mines 2013). The major drive for this increased mining activity was the high global prices of minerals and this led to increased foreign investment in mining activities. The discovery of diamonds in the Eastern part of the country also contributed to the growth in increased mining activities.

Table 1.1: Annual Growth Rate by Sector Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas, electricity, Water</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chamber of Mines 2013

The Government of Zimbabwe has put in place legal requirements which guide mining operations in areas of environmental protection and community benefits through the Environmental Management Act (EMMA. 20:27). The mining sector currently experiences problems which include increased production costs, lack of funding and an uncompetitive fiscal and investment environment underpinned by high royalty and tax
rules (www.newsday.co.zw). Some of the major players in the mining industry include Zimasco, Unki, Mimosa, Zimplats, Hwange Colliery, Murowa and Mbada Diamonds. Zimbabwe is richly endowed with minerals such as gold, platinum, chrome, diamonds, coal and nickel. The commodities that contribute significantly to revenue are gold, diamond and platinum.

A report by Southern Africa resource Watch(2010) indicated that although large mining companies have engaged in CSR activities, they did not have clear strategies for engaging stakeholders. These CSR activities ranged from construction of business complexes in their respective communities, construction of schools, clinics or even setting up residential areas which benefit the employees and eventually the community at large. Zimplats for example, constructed a business center for the community in Mhondoro-Ngezi, at Turf where the company’s mining activities take place, Mbada Diamonds Mine invested in relocation of people displaced by its mining activities as well as initiating some income generating projects and water and sanitation projects (Mbada CSR report).

Some mining companies have cited high costs of production and low profit levels as an excuse for not engaging in CSR activities. In an article published in the Newsday, the director of Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA) urged Government owned mining entities to have very high standards when it comes to CSR programmes so that other companies may follow suit (www. newsday.co.zw). He also highlighted the fact that CSR activities in the mining industry does not relate to foreign owned companies only and should not be confused with philanthropy or handouts to the community, but should be projects that change and develop communities. Former minister of Mines and Mining Development, Dr. Obert Mpofu suggested that mining companies should also consider providing security to the agricultural sector since they are the drivers for community development of the rural areas they operate in(www.bulawayo24.com). In a joint policy brief by Progressio, NANGO and IDS, the major problem cited as hindering CSR initiatives in the mining sector in Zimbabwe is that the Mines and Minerals Act does not clearly specify that mining companies should have a CSR (Progressio, NANGO & IDS 2012).
1.2.2 Environmental Analysis

To clearly understand the industry background a critical analysis of the external environment was made by looking at the political, economic, social, technological, environmental and legal aspects (PESTEL).

**Political Environment**

The Government of National Unity was purported to have reduced sovereign risk. However, even during this period the government had been increasingly intervening in the mining services through the various governing bodies such as Ministry of Mines and Mining Development, Minerals Marketing Corporation (MMCZ) and, Zimbabwe Mining Development Corporation (ZMDC). This Government intervention was meant to protect mining companies from unfair business practices and to ensure that communities benefited from the extraction of mineral resources in their areas.

**Economic environment**

There is high unemployment in Zimbabwe and some people are being employed by the mining companies operating in their communities. Some companies have however taken this as an opportunity to obtain labour at low cost. This tendency by companies to reward labour below the level of effort put, usually results in more economic and social problems. The infrastructure has deteriorated in most mines especially those local mining companies who have challenges in accessing funding. From 2009 to date the mining sector has experienced positive estimates of growth.

**Social Environment**

The hyperinflationary era which peaked in 2009, resulted in massive emigration of skilled labour to neighbouring countries as well as abroad. The mining sector was not spared as many geologists, mining engineers and other professionals left the country for greener pastures, a situation which is still prevalent in the country. The aids pandemic has also affected workers in the mining communities.

**Technological**

The mining industry has benefited immensely from the improved communication. Through the internet, companies are able to access any information pertaining to buyers and suppliers as well as commodities available on sale. Through e-commerce mining...
companies are able to procure and ship equipment and other accessories as well as sell minerals. Mining operations have improved greatly due to use of heavy mining equipment.

Environmental
Mining operations normally cause damage to the environment through prospecting activities and disposal of waste and affluent. In Zimbabwe mining companies are required to carry an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), before they commence mining operations so that they reveal the impact of their mining operations to the environment. In many communities where mining takes place land degradation is a common issue as some mines have no laid out policies on rehabilitation. Mining companies should systematically attempt to analyse and evaluate the effects of their operations on the various communities they operate in through social accounting and reporting practices. The government enacted laws to control environmental impacts caused by mining and other activities capable of damaging the environment, the Environmental Management Act, (EMA) [Chapter 20:27].

Legal
The Government has put in place regulations some of which are regarded as not investor friendly. The Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment Act [Chapter 14:33] has been regarded as a challenge to mining operations especially by the foreign owned mining companies, especially where their CSR initiatives are concerned. The licensing, taxes and royalties regulations are also not popular with the mining companies. The Government also introduced the Community Share Ownership Trust, a scheme which the mining companies must implement.

1.3 Statement of the problem
There is increasing awareness of CSR by mining companies in Zimbabwe but there is no legislation to govern CSR activities. Mining activities normally occur in established communities and often disrupt way of life of these communities. This makes the community a key stakeholder apart from the employees, investors and government. It is important that mining companies understand the perceptions of stakeholders to enable formulation of strategies that ensure acceptance by communities and provide sustainability of both the business and the community. Awareness of stakeholder
perceptions will assist mining companies to reduce the gap of stakeholder expectations and actual CSR deliverables. Studies carried out on CSR in general and on stakeholder perceptions in other countries have revealed that stakeholders place importance on different SCR dimensions (Wyk & Cronje 2009; Jenkins & Obara (2008)). Very little is known of stakeholder perceptions within the Zimbabwean context, and in particular perceptions of CSR activities in the mining industry.

This study sought to establish how the stakeholders view the CSR practices of mining companies within the Zimbabwean context.

1.4 Research Objectives

The main objective of this study was:

1. To establish stakeholder views of CSR and determine extent to which mining companies engage in CSR activities.

The other specific objectives were:

1.1 To explore stakeholder perceptions on CSR by mining companies
1.2 To examine the differences or otherwise between stakeholders’ perceptions on mining companies CSR activities
1.3 To identify the stakeholder engagement by mining companies
1.4 To draw up recommendations to policy makers and future researchers on CSR in mining companies.

1.5 Research Questions

1.1 What are the differences or otherwise on stakeholder views of
1.2 What is the extent of stakeholder engagement with mining companies with respect to CSR activities?
1.3 What recommendations can be made to ensure that CSR practices by companies improve stakeholder perceptions as well as their CSR initiatives?

1.6 Research Proposition

That there is weak stakeholder perception of mining companies’ CSR practices in Zimbabwe.
1.7 Justification of Research
Mining operations which include excavation and processing of minerals normally occur within communities they are located. In most cases mining sites are established where communities are already in existence and there likelihood of disrupting community way of life when operations commences. Perceptions of stakeholders in different communities vary and are influenced by different backgrounds hence results of studies on perceptions carried out in one context may be very different from another context. It is therefore imperative that stakeholder perceptions are established within the context of Zimbabwe. There is need to establish how CSR practices are being carried out in Zimbabwe given the fact that for a while mining companies in Zimbabwe were not compelled by law to engage in CSR activities (RCSR 2012). Mining operations affect communities they operate in, and the strategies they implement as a way of mitigating these negative effects, greatly impacts on the perceptions of the stakeholders. This study was meant to find out how mining companies are circumventing the economic challenges being currently faced by the country to effectively implement best CSR practices for continued existence of mining operations and also establish whether the stakeholders share the same views with mining companies on these CSR practices.

1.8 Scope of the Research
The study was focused on two well established mining companies, namely Zimplats Holdings and Zimasco Holdings. Both companies have operations in Mhondoro-Ngezi area. Zimplats is a platinum mining company located at Turff in where it has underground mining operations and a residential village for its employees. The company has a processing plant in Sealous, near Chegutu. Zimasco is a large chrome producing company with operations along the great dyke. This study is confined to Zimasco’s operations in Mhondoro-Ngezi, which mainly include tribute mining. The study has been limited to this area due to time constraints and also for purposes of managing the data. Both mining companies provided three groups of stakeholder as respondents for the interviews, which are, management, ordinary employees and members of the mining communities. Respondents for the mining authorities’ stakeholder group were from The Institute of Mining Research and The Metallurgical Research Institute.
1.9 Summary
This chapter presented the background of the research, statement of the problem, justification and scope of the study. A brief overview of the mining environment was presented with reference to the PESTEL framework. The next Chapter reviews the relevant literature on CSR and stakeholder perceptions.
CHAPTER 2

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter shall conduct a critical literature review by analysing key literature on corporate social responsibility (CSR). Some of the CSR practices by corporations will be highlighted and explanation given on how these practices contribute towards sustainable development. Key dimensions of CSR will be outlined with particular emphasis on the different perceptions by stakeholders on company practices of CSR. Literature on various CSR models shall be analysed and a conceptual framework on stakeholder perceptions crafted.

The literature critique shall also seek to analyse CSR concepts that are relevant to address the main objective of the study of establishing stakeholder views of CSR and determining the extent to which mining companies engage in CSR activities.

2.1.1 Defining CSR
CSR has been defined by Russell (2010) as the activities by an organisation aimed at protecting and improving the welfare of the society beyond legal requirements to serve the direct economic and technical interests of the organisations. According to Montiel (2008) CSR involves integrating the social needs and values into strategic and daily operations of the organisations. CSR was also defined as treatment of stakeholders of a corporation in an ethically and responsible manner (Hopkins 2007). The World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) defined CSR as continuing commitment by business to contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the workforce and their families as well as of the community and society at large (WBCSD 2013). The definitions are similar in that they all focus on the business’ need to improve society welfare. Russel and Montiel agree on the fact that this extra effort on responsibility to society is meant to serve the interests of the business even though it also benefits the society. Hopkins however defined CSR from a stakeholder perspective where a company’s responsibility to stakeholders is emphasized, an aspect which is also highlighted by WBCSD in their definition.
2.1.2 Background to CSR
According to Crowther and Aras (2008) CSR has been broadly defined to be concerned with relationships between corporations, governments, stakeholders and local societies in which the company operate and it is a balance of its social, economic and environmental responsibilities (Secchi 2007). CSR is a concept that overlaps with other concepts like corporate citizenship, sustainable business, environmental responsibility, triple bottom line, social environmental accountability, business ethics and corporate accountability (Broomhill 2007). There has been significant growth of the CSR field and it has incorporated a number of theories, approaches and dimensions which include sustainable development, and stakeholder management (Gariga & Mele 2004).

2.1.3 SCR Debate
The concept of CSR has been widely contested worldwide by businesses, governments, local societies, stakeholders and academia, because it is highly contextual and it lacks an acceptable or agreed definition (Broomhill 2007). These variations in the definitions of CSR are however not as important as the debate on whether companies should or should not engage in CSR as a voluntarily moral responsibility. These issues of social responsibility are difficult to resolve in the sense that the various stakeholders have their own expectations which they believe the company should conform to, while on the other hand management of these companies are faced with a complex business environment which they have to manage (Secchi 2007).

According to Secchi (2007) proponents of CSR believe that businesses are part of the society as a system hence they should operate according to the expectations of the society in a responsible manner which will satisfy the investors and impact positively on the company’s profits. He however argued that involving companies in society welfare would result in increased company power over those societies in which they operate, leaving them vulnerable. On the other hand there are some who subscribe to Friedman’s idea that the only social responsibility of business is to utilize its resources and engage in legal business activities to increase profits (Friedman 1970), that is, wealth maximization for its shareholders. Friedman believed that the state or government is better placed to address societal problems through taxes received from companies and not to interfere with the management of companies. According to him channelling business profits towards societal issues would be tantamount to misappropriation of company funds. According to Jenkins (2005) this increased interest to CSR is a manifestation of the
struggle for power between the corporations and the societies. There has also been an economic power shift to the corporations hence they should be responsible for addressing social problems (Tsoutsoura 2004).

Some argue that CSR threatens the prosperity of both poor and rich countries as it is likely to reduce competition and economic freedom as well as undermining market economy (Henderson 2001). On the other hand neoliberals believed that it was wise to adopt CSR, if undertaken as strategic (Lantos 2001). CSR through ethics provides a shock absorbing strategy for business where issues such as that of the Enron Brothers and other failures can be minimized, Gallagher & Scott 2005). Despite the debate for and against CSR, the subject has gained momentum and there is general consensus that it is good business (Secchi 2007).

2.2 Theoretical Perspectives
2.2.1 Stakeholder Theory
The Stakeholder theory was based on the idea by Freeman (1984) that corporations consist of various stakeholders beyond their own shareholders and they should be managed with these groups in mind. Debate has been on how competing stakeholder interests can be balanced and a research carried out by Knox gave evidence that, corporations, especially the extractive and communication companies prioritise their stakeholders and they link stakeholders’ relationships through CSR programs (Knox et al. 2005). Influence of stakeholder can be classified through normative, instrumental and descriptive stakeholder theories (Jamali 2008) and the descriptive / empirical stakeholder theory has been used to describe and explain specific corporate characteristics and behaviour (Branco & Rodrigues 2007). According to Pirsch as quoted in Visser, the concept of stakeholder and CSR are closely linked to each other and the stakeholder concept is an important driver explaining corporate involvement in CSR through the relationships between the various stakeholders (Visser et al. 2007). The stakeholder concept personalises social responsibilities by specifying stakeholders to whom the company should be responsible and should respond (Visser 2010). The concept is criticized for lack of being a universally accepted concept hence the diverse interpretations of the theory (Wang 2011).
Stakeholders
Stakeholders in general refer to groups of people who have interests in a particular organisation and can affect or be affected by the practices and strategic outcomes of that organisation, (Hitt et al. 2009). Johnson and Scholes as quoted in (Kakabadse & Obara 2005) defined shareholders as individuals or groups who depend on the organisation to fulfil their own goals and on whom in turn the organisation depends. This definition was disputed by many scholars as being too broad and tends to include even potentially harmful people to the organisation, and this led to the categorisation of stakeholders as primary and secondary or internal and external stakeholders, so as to reduce the scope of the definition (Johnson & Scholes 2002; Weiss 2003).

Primary stakeholders are the important stakeholders without whose support the business cannot continue to exist and may include shareholders, other investors, customers, suppliers, community and government, while secondary stakeholders have some influence on the business but are not essential for its survival and may include media and other interest groups (Figar & Figar 2011). They also categorized stakeholders according to three main attributes which include power, legitimacy and urgency, and these attributes almost always overlapped. They further identified latent stakeholders who are made up of dormant, discretionary and demanding stakeholders as having little significance for an organization because they possess only one attribute. Expectant stakeholders include dominant, dependent and dangerous stakeholders and possess two attributes hence they have considerable influence to the company while definitive stakeholders are the most influential because they possess all three attributes. Internal stakeholders come from within the corporation and include the employees while external stakeholders are made up of all other stakeholders such as suppliers, community, and government. Managers have control over internal stakeholders but have no control over external stakeholders (Figar & Figar 2011).

The most commonly identified stakeholders include employees, government, non-profit organisations, customers, suppliers and communities in which the companies operate (Uddin 2008). In mining companies the local community is a key stakeholder and should be a strong focus for their CSR initiatives (Jenkins & Obara 2008).
Stakeholder Engagement
Most companies are being compelled by pressure from stakeholders to incorporate social environmental and governance issues into their strategies in the form of stakeholder engagement, business value chain and public disclosure (Horrigan 2010). Relationships between companies and stakeholders can be explained in terms of the function of the stakeholder as a restrictive force in some respects or as a resource exchange partner in other circumstances (Tokoro 2007). There is no clear guide pertaining to the attributes for identifying the right stakeholder hence the examination of various stakeholder classes and the need for managers to understand the dynamics of how stakeholders can shift from one class to another (Mitchell, Agle & Wood 1997). The issue of sustainability reporting is considered important only if the reported data is good enough to address community raised issues and if this is done through stakeholder engagement (Murguia & Bohling 2013). Companies should not impose CSR initiatives on stakeholders but engage and involve them so they can explore their concerns and accept changes where necessary as this will enable them to keep abreast of stakeholder expectations (Morsing & Schultz 2006).

2.2.2 Amoral, Personal and Social Views
CSR theories were also categorized into amoral, personal and social views by Klonoski (1991. According to him the amoral view sees the businesses as profit making and legitimatized by the laws governing them and includes the theory of fundamentalism and traditional shareholders model. The personal view tries to establish whether companies can be held responsible for their actions. Klonoski argued that corporate activities take place within the social context and companies should be regarded as social institutions because individuals come together to achieve some objective which is relevant to the provision of goods and services.

2.2.3 Instrumental, Political, ethical and Integrative Theories
According to Gariga & Mele (2004) CSR theories could be grouped into four main categories which are Instrumental, Political, Ethical and Integrative theories. They explained that Instrumental theories are concerned with; the economic interaction of the business and society, maximizing shareholder value, achieve competitive advantage and focus on long term profits. Political theories focus on responsible use of business power especially in its relationship with society and in the political arena, and include corporate
constitutionalism approach, integrative social contract theory and corporate citizenship. A business is said to be socially responsible in terms of its social power, the social contract that exists between business and society, and its involvement with the community somehow making it a citizen. They explained Ethical theories as doing the right thing to achieve a good society and include stakeholder theory, universal rights and sustainable development. Integrative theories focus on integration of social demands and involve issues management, public responsibility, stakeholder management and corporate social performance.

2.2.4 Ethical conception, Economic Conception and Corporate citizenship conception
Another scholar defined three approaches which include ethical, economic and citizenship conception (Windsor 2006). He highlighted that theories within the ethical conception approach use a principle of impartial moral reflection on tolerating expansive public policy and practice broad self-restraint and altruism to strengthen shareholders’ rights. The economic conception theories argue that wealth creation is the best contribution a business can make to societal welfare. Theories which fell into the corporate citizenship concept encompass economic and ethical issues.

2.2.5 Utilitarian, Managerial and Relational Theories
Utilitarian, managerial and relational theories of CSR were underscored by Secchi (2007). The Utilitarian encompasses theories on social costs and functionalism, and a firm can be said to be utilitarian because it is part of the economic system and belongs to the traditional economic approach to the firm, that is, profit maximization. This theory is supported by the neo-classicists and Keynesians. He described managerial theories as being concerned with corporate social performance, social accountability, auditing and reporting as well as social responsibility of multinationals while relational theories focus on business and society, stakeholder approach, corporate global citizenship and social contract theory.

2.2.6 Neo-liberal, Neo-Keynesian and Radical political economy theories.
Broomhill (2007) highlights three schools which include Neoliberal, Neo-Keynesian and liberal. The neo-liberal discourse around CSR shares the same view with Friedman about the Agency theory which recognises business’ sole responsibility as that of making profit and that those managers who practice CSR reduce shareholders’ wealth (Friedman 1970). They argue that CSR is just a small component of corporate strategy but also acknowledge that it reduces the risk of negative government intervention, adverse media coverage as well as negative perceptions by stakeholders. Neo-liberals
emphasize the strategic benefits to be derived from CSR and argue that employees want to be identified with companies that are socially responsible.

Broomhill (2007) also highlighted that Neo-Keynesians recognize the potential negative impact that can be caused by corporations’ activities on environment, work practices, as well as on the social and economic arena hence their argument that there is more to CSR as a business strategy than just profit. The Neo-Keynesians emphasize the need to focus on environmental and social sustainability while at the same time achieving other desirable social economic goals.

The schools discussed above possess normative views but this radical approach holds the view that CSR is subject to abuse of power by global corporations as well as national and local companies. The argument put forward by the radicals is that corporations possess too much economic power, and the absence of sophisticated analysis of this power leaves room for ruthless engagement of business at the expense of the environment and the society, hence CSR policies and practices become ineffectual and inadequate. Proponents of this approach see CSR initiatives by corporations as a way of deflecting attention from external regulation and control of corporate behaviour as well as disguising their socially, environmentally destructive behaviour (Bloomhill2007).

Those from the liberal ideological perspective have been very sceptical of voluntary CSR, arguing that it fails to deal with key political and economic mechanisms, through which multinational corporations undermine the development prospects of poor countries (UNRISD). Companies that adopt voluntary CSR find it difficult to deal with corporate accountability in cases where sharp inequities in power exist hence CSR policies are regarded as merely green wash and far from reality (Newell 2005).

2.2.7 Related Theories

Other theories related to CSR include the stewardship theory, the resource based view of the firm, the institutional theory and the theory of the firm. The stewardship theory suggests that managers are morally obliged to do the right thing without much regard to the consequences of such action on firm performance (Donaldson & Davis 1991). The resource based view pertains especially to some companies where being environmentally socially responsible may constitute to a resource or a capability that
leads to sustained competitive advantage (Hart 1995). According to Jennings & Zandbergen (1995) institutions play an important role in shaping the consensus within a firm by establishing ecologically sustainable organization. Baron (2001) referred the use of CSR to attract socially responsible consumers as strategic CSR, where firms provide a public good in conjunction with their marketing or business strategy.

2.3 CSR Perspectives
The CSR concept has many dimensions and undefined boundaries (Sharma & Mehta 2013). Companies intending to maintain operational sustainability should address key CSR dimensions such as social, economic, environmental and governance (Lins & Horwitz 2007). According to Hariyadi as cited in Setyadi (2013) CSR community empowerment programs in mining industry is concerned with four main issues of improving the micro economic aspect of the business, providing education to the society, infrastructure development and ensuring a healthy and safe environment. Other company aspects such as reputation, sustainability or sustainable development, social license to operate and healthy, safety and environment are quite significant where CSR of mining companies is concerned.

2.3.1 Economic perspective
The economic dimension of CSR relates to the direct and indirect economic impacts that a company’s operations have on the local community and the company’s stakeholders (Uddin, Hassan & Tarique 2008). They explained that economic aspects of CSR are not limited to financial issues but include the multiplier effect of good economic performance, contribution to social welfare through payment of tax as well as avoiding activities that damage trust of the community and stakeholders.

2.3.2 Legal
This aspect of CSR relates to how companies should comply with laws and regulations enacted by the responsible authorities, to govern their practices in competition, consumer protection, health and safety, and environmental sustainability (Jucan & Jucan 2010). It also encompasses the codification of what society believes is right or wrong.
2.3.3 Ethical
The ethical dimension of CSR touches on behaviours and practices by companies, which can be acceptable or proscribed by the stakeholders, society and communities in which they operate (Jucan & Jucan 2010).

2.3.4 Social License to operate
The term social licence to operate was coined by Canadian Mining executive Jim Coaney in the late 1990s and it referred to the level of acceptance or approval by local communities and stakeholders of mining companies and their operation (Majumdar & Saini 2013). According to Welson (2006) the licence to operate can be maintained or withdrawn any time depending on stakeholder perceptions as influenced by companies CSR programs, and therefore requires mining companies to consult the stakeholders.

2.3.5 Health, Safety and environment
Corporations are affected differently by CSR and the extractive sector is highly sensitive to various societal issues which include human rights and safety (Mbare 2007). Environmental concerns and sustainable development are key aspects in CSR practices of extractive industry and they involve measuring of operations on environment and ecological system as well as managing that environment (Uddin, Hassan & Tarique 2008). Local mining communities are normally exposed to loss of grazing and farming land, limited water supplies, noise and dust pollution as well as waste and effluent due to mining activities, therefore mining companies must establish good relationships with the stakeholders so that they may not be perceived as not doing enough to address social problems within the communities they operate (Mugotsi & Rea).

2.3.6 Reputation
The concept of corporate reputation lacks an agreed theoretical basis as highlighted by the various scholars on the subject (Mele 2008) and various definitions have been given by authors. A common aspect to these definitions is that the corporate will be valued from the stakeholder perspective (Tuck 2012). According to Fombrum and van Riel as cited in Tuck (2012) reputation can be explored from six facets which include economic, strategic, marketing, organisational, sociological as well as accounting views. It is important for mining companies to maintain good reputation in the communities they operate because damage to a company’s reputation may result in social unrest and
failure to obtain labour for current and future operations as well as bringing unnecessary costs to the company (Majumdar & Saini 2013)

2.3.7 CSR in Developing countries
CSR practices are likely to vary depending on the economic developmental stage of a country and voluntary CSR has often not been able to play a positive role in poverty reduction in developing countries (Bloomhill 2007). Garvey & Newell (2005) argued that CSR underestimates the importance of the power in the relationships between corporations and communities in which they invest, which makes it less applicable to developing countries hence more focus should be given to other factors related to the state, corporation and communication, which are key to effectiveness of strategies aimed at enhancing accountability to the poor.

2.3.8 Triple Bottom Line
The triple bottom line evaluates a corporation’s performance of its economic, social and environmental value that it either adds or destroys in the community in which it operates (Wayne & McDonald 2004). They argue that companies should engage in activities that do not cause harm to the society and should take into consideration all the stakeholders, a CSR concept that has been criticised of being misleading and of limited value.

2.4 Empirical evidence

2.4.1 CSR and Stakeholder perceptions
A study on stakeholder perspectives on CSR carried out to establish how the concept of CSR applied to the mining context, revealed that environment was an important dimension of CSR and that its orientation in terms of economic, environmental and philanthropic responsibilities differ on a national and global basis (Yakovleva & Vazquez-brust 2012). This study was qualitative in nature.

A study to establish the relationship between stakeholder perceptions of CSR and the factors influencing that perception was conducted by Dilling (2012). Factors such as age of the corporation and community involvement for cultural diversity, were identified as significantly influencing stakeholder perceptions. This study revealed that stakeholders perceive companies as not providing enough information concerning their CSR practices and expected more honest reporting internally and externally. The findings indicated that companies that undertook CSR practices achieved high stakeholder perception.
A quantitative research on effects of company’s CSR communication strategies on consumer perception revealed that inconsistent CSR information impacted substantially on consumers by eliciting perceptions of corporate hypocrisy (Wagner, Lutz & Weitz 2009). The study revealed that hypocrisy perceptions for proactive strategies are higher than for reactive and that companies can reduce the risk of proactive strategies and improve the effectiveness of reactive strategies by varying the abstractness of CSR policy statements although it does not completely mitigate the negative impact of inconsistent information.

A study conducted to determine the expected levels of CSR by various stakeholder groups in Iran, and compare them with the actual CSR activities revealed that there is a gap between the actual level of CSR and expected level among the participants (Salehi & Azaru 2009). Results from this qualitative study showed that Iranian companies paid attention to CSR but it was below the expected level. These findings were similar to those found by Adey et al. (2011) in a study to establish community expectations of mining operations and how well they are accepted in the communities they operate in. A qualitative methodology was used by way of case studies and findings indicated high level support for mining activities and also a wide gap between people’s expectations of how companies should perform and reality.

A research to examine and compare stakeholder’s perceptions of the sustainability activities with reality of a firms’ investment in sustainability, which was conducted from a quantitative approach through surveys on three key stakeholder groups, revealed that companies with high perception but low actual performance have considerable value at risk should public attitude change and that sustainability is an integral part of business strategy instead of a peripheral compliance issue (Peloza et al. 2012).

The study by Majumdar & Saini (2013) highlighted that CSR initiatives were influenced by politically and socially powerful people in the society at the expense of marginalised and neglected communities. The study on the factors affecting perceptions of CSR by stakeholders Wang (2011) led to the findings that values are important as a driver of ethical behaviour and that managers need to manage the convergent and conflicting interests of stakeholders. Stakeholders’ expectations of companies are intertwined
The various scholars carried out studies on stakeholder perceptions from different perspectives as discussed above. The studies carried out to establish stakeholder perceptions of CSR and compare them to reality were done and there is general agreement on the existence of a gap between expectations and actual CSR practices (Dilling 2012; Salehi & Azaru 2009; Adey et al. 2011). Factors that influenced stakeholder perceptions were attributed to individual, societal and companies’ operations and CSR practices (Dilling 2012; Majumdar & Saini 2013). Studies carried out in different countries reflected differences in CSR preferences, such as consistent communication strategies and environmental sustainability, (Wagner & Luz 2009; Yakovleva & Vaquez-Brust 2012). Most of the studies used a quantitative methodology. This study shall test expectation gap and establish how applicable it to CSR of mining companies in Zimbabwe.

2.4.2 CSR and Company Image
A study conducted by Mandina & Maravire (2014) to investigate the effectiveness of CSR in enhancing company image, utilised both quantitative and qualitative research designs. Results of the study indicated that CSR activities have a positive impact on a company’s image and that positive image creates good relations with stakeholders, attracts investors and the company enjoys positive media reviews. Similar results were found by Huang & Lien (2012) in their study to investigate the relationship between CSR and organisational performance. This quantitative research revealed that CSR is positively correlated with corporate image and organisational performance. Findings suggest that corporate image may serve as a mediator between CSR and organisational performance, implying that companies benefit from investment in CSR realization, even if they have the positive corporate image.

The study carried out by Tuck (2012) explored the relationship between mining companies and their stakeholders and provided insights into variations across stakeholder groups of both the determinants and variables. The study identifies external risks to stakeholder reputations through the industry effects and the changing expectations of stakeholders, and internal risk to reputation due to inefficient information
flows and the levels of trust (public perception) of the mining industry. The study methodology was qualitative by way of multiple case studies and it revealed that development of relationships with people within the company results in the building of trust over time leading to improvements in the reputation held by stakeholders.

The article by Regina & Ugne (2011) analyses the impact of CSR on corporate image by chronologically analysing CSR definitions and concept development. The paper also reviews the theoretical concepts of corporate image and outlines insights for causality between corporate social responsibility and corporate image as well as links between the two. Results show that CSR has positive impact on corporate image although it is not the most important factor, and this was in agreement with Mandina & Maravire 2014; Huang & Lien 2012.

Research on corporate image and its relationship with stakeholders was mostly done qualitatively except in the case of Mandina & Maravire (2014) where both research methods were used. The findings were similar in that CSR practices are said to lead to positive company image, which then creates good relations with stakeholders.

2.4.3 CSR of Mining Companies

Jenkins & Obara (2008) carried out a study to investigate the impact of gold mining in Ghana and critically examine complex relationships between the Ghanaian Government, large-scale mining company of case study. Results reflected lack of unit of measurement of social dimension to sustainable development, and that companies need to demonstrate effective use of resources and positively contribute to sustainable development. They placed emphasis on companies to consult with all stakeholders indiscriminately as choosing one group of people over the other would result in conflicts. Similar results were produced by Kemp & Owen (2013) when they discussed that site based CSR practitioners have more influence on the community and are able to hold a legitimate presence in the community and internally inconsistent approaches to relationship building and development will inevitably lead to heightened tensions over development and company-community conflicts. This quantitative study was meant to establish community relations and development functions as well as related processes within the context of large scale mining operations in West Africa.
The SADDC report by van Wyk and Cronje (2009) established the role of government in regard to community development and in monitoring the social, economic and environmental impacts of mining in Angola, Botswana, DRC, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa and Zambia. Results indicated that most communities did not benefit much from CSR programmes and implementation and monitoring of CSR activities seem to be problematic. There were serious environmental and social problems throughout the region and little development of the diamond rich communities in terms of infrastructure, hence the need to obtain support of the local communities of the mining companies. The findings also reflected that CSR reporting had little bearing to the reality on the ground and lack of government enforcement on environmental rehabilitation and mine closure commitments, rendering CSR ineffective. Results from both measure of CSR practices against benchmark tools and from community perceptions about the industry indicate that CSR is not currently experienced by community members especially in West Coast of Africa.

These studies on mining CSR and stakeholder relationships brought out varying aspects in their findings and these differences were due to different mining communities. Some of the key issues from the studies were that there was minimal benefit of stakeholders from CSR, CSR reporting not reflective of actual CSR practices, inconsistent approaches to relationship building and lack of unit of measurement of social dimension (Wyk & Cronje 2009; Jenkins & Obara 2008; Kemp and Owen 2013). The research design varied from one study to another.

2.4.4 SCR and Stakeholder Approach
The research by Kakabadse (2005) to identify key characteristics defining the concept of CSR and to examine the challenges and implications of the stakeholder approach revealed that CSR and stakeholder are intertwined and that increasing awareness of leverage power by people could significantly change the possibilities business have towards society. They underscored the fact that greater responsibility by organisations depends on position, behaviour, value system and expectations within the organisation and society.

The study by Munro (2013) examines stakeholder preferences for particular CSR activities and social initiatives in Middle East and North Africa and Middles East and
Africa, and attempts to expand on literature by looking at social initiatives relevant to today's social, community and environmental issues. The study tests multi nationalities under four broad nationality groups and also examines stakeholders of MNCs from three different sectors opposed to one or two sectors. A quantitative deductive approach was followed and results showed significant differences across nationalities of their preferred CSR and individual social initiatives were selected relative to a respondent's country of origin and host country.

The studies on CSR and stakeholder approach were similar in that they examined the relationship between CSR and stakeholder approach which is said to be intertwined. Kakabadse’s study was done qualitatively with results emphasizing that corporations’ conduct and community expectations determine the level of responsibility and results from the quantitative research by Munro reflected differences on CSR preferences across different nationalities (Kakabadse 2005; Munro 2013).

2.4.5 CSR and Corporate Strategy
A study was carried out by Setyadi et al. (2013) to establish what CSR implementation strategies are effective and on target as well as how CSR as a business strategy aims to support sustainability of a mining company’s existence and sustainable development. The study was done qualitatively and the findings are that CSR established at operational level as a strategy, supports other strategy levels in mining companies, on a business level CSR becomes a strategy to support competitive power of mining companies while at the corporate level CSR becomes a strategy which is in accordance with company vision and mission and it will penetrate to all existing company strategies as in alignment with stakeholders expectations. The results also revealed that the company should involve the government and community in the organisation, implementation and reporting of CSR activities.

Research was carried out by way of case study to highlight the assessment techniques that managers can employ to value corporate responsibility efforts, using a qualitative approach through an externalities based methodology which integrated insights from stakeholders and resource based views of the firm by (Maltz, Thompson & Ringold 2011). The article attributed failure by management to systematically assess value of CSR efforts to lack of strategic thinking of how to maximise value of CSR investments, and to
lack of proper measurement protocols. Their findings indicated that a resource based approach combined with stakeholder theory would create a strategic lens for utilising social benefit cost principles.

A quantitative approach was used by Tang, Hull and Rothathenbugh (2012) in their study to explore the role of CSR engagement strategy. Results of the study revealed that inconsistent engagements in CSR by firms affect financial performance and that stakeholders do not understand these inconsistencies hence expected benefits do not materialize for the company.

To understand the role of business in “co innovation” strategies in managing company community conflicts, Thomas (2013) explored drivers behind those that fail to implement social sustainability for the management of conflict. A qualitative methodology was used by way of case studies and findings were that CSR departments of companies should be able to articulate autonomy and recognize values, as well as incorporating co-innovative stakeholder engagement strategies which help it to relate in specific ways to the neighbouring communities.

In their study Sharma & Mehta (2012) sought to address CSR aspects and activities that can affect a business, which include health and safety, environment protection, human rights and stakeholder rights. The study which aimed at highlighting importance of CSR to business strategy of an organisation in ensuring sustainability of the business also emphasized importance of CSR as a competitive advantage and not just image building. Results suggested that traditional philanthropic activities cannot be termed CSR but that companies need to extend their support to the society and go beyond the compliance mode and integrate CSR initiatives as part of the employee and corporate ethos, and not as a distinct activity.

Studies carried out to establish the role and value of CSR as a strategy stressed on different strategies but all with the aim of improving company performance and sustainability. The strategies include CSR implementation strategies, engagement strategies and co-innovation strategies (Thomas 2013; Sharma & Mehta 2012). Most of these studies were of a qualitative nature. Results from the different studies reflected that CSR could be implemented as an operational, business and corporate level
strategy, (Setyadi 2013). The resource based approach was best combined with the stakeholder theory as a strategy for social cost benefit while inconsistent stakeholder engagement strategies affected financial performance (Maltz, Thompson & Ringold 2011; Tang, Hull and Rothathenbugh 2012). Stakeholder engagement is significant to this study and shall examine how important it is to the Zimbabwean mining sector.

2.4.6 CSR reporting
A qualitative exploratory study to explore trends in the reporting of CSR in the global mining industry by reviewing the development of the media social and environmental disclosure was done (Jenkins and Yakovleva 2005). Analysis revealed a general trend towards increased sophistication of media content with considerable variances. Results showed that media or social and environmental disclosure within the mining sector is still evolving both within companies and sector as a whole. Findings of this research also indicated that there is no real measure of the overall CSR performance for progress towards sustainability of the global mining industry due to the variability in terms of reporting, policy development and the metrics used.

A study by Mariri & Chipunza (2011) aimed at establishing the corporate priorities of CG, CSR and sustainability within South Africa’s mining industry to determine whether there were any significant similarities or differences. A descriptive quantitative design was followed to allow comparison of CG, CSR and sustainability practices among selected companies. Results reflected high reporting of CG, CSR and sustainability activities as well as stakeholder and community engagement, by South Africa mining companies with social performance as the most addressed issue within the mining sector than other indicators of economic and environmental performance.

A study was conducted at a national and global level to establish CSR trends and reporting and the results indicated high reporting standards at national level. At the global level social and environmental reporting was marred by lack of real measure of CSR, variability in the metrics used and lack of confidence in the data being reported (Jenkins & Yakovleva 2005; Mariri & Chipunza 2011). The study shall seek to establish that the implementation and reporting of CSR by Zimbabwean mining companies is poor.
2.5 Contribution of the Study

- The empirical evidence on CSR indicated that stakeholder perceptions are influenced by geographical and cultural factors, which leaves room to study stakeholder perception within the cultural background of Zimbabwean communities.

- The studies revealed lack of uniform CSR practices by corporations hence the need to establish what CSR perspectives are deemed important by the stakeholders of mining communities in Zimbabwe.

- Research on CSR and stakeholder perceptions and expectations have been done in many developed and some developing countries such as, Argentina, Iran, Australia, South Africa and other African countries but very little has been done from the Zimbabwean context and this leaves a gap which this study seeks to utilize.

2.6 Conceptual Framework

*Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework*

This conceptual Framework illustrates the relationship between CSR practice by mining companies and the perception of stakeholders. Several factors influence stakeholder perceptions including demographic factors such as age, position in society and level of
education but in this study focus is more on CSR practices and dimensions and how they influence stakeholder perception of mining companies CSR.

Mining companies that have proper implementation and reporting policies of CSR are perceived highly by their stakeholders. Stakeholders need to know what to expect when CSR projects are being launched in their communities. Ad hoc implementation of CSR projects will not be acceptable to stakeholders.

Stakeholders need to be consulted on CSR issues hence mining companies that have transparent stakeholder engagement and consultation policies are highly perceived by the stakeholders. In the case of mining companies local community stakeholders are affected most by the mining company’s operations and it will be appropriate to consult them in CSR issues. Lack of proper stakeholder engagement will result in weak stakeholder perception.

Stakeholders may not be involved in strategy implementation in companies whose operations affect them but how CSR is taken in that company will affect them. CSR that is incorporated into company business strategy will in most cases reflect high commitment to CSR by the company and this will create positive relationships between the company and the stakeholders who perceive it highly.

Company inclination to a particular CSR dimension is subject to its values, mission and resources. It would be normal for all businesses to be more inclined to the economic aspect of CSR because they need to make profit. Mining companies may however put more attention to environmental issues in a bid to promote sustainable extraction of resources. Company performance in relation to these CSR dimensions will have effect on stakeholder perception.

At times what the mining companies are offering in terms of CSR may not meet up to the expectations of stakeholders. This creates tensions between companies and the stakeholders which lead to negative perceptions of CSR by mining companies. It has been proved in studies conducted in other countries that this expectation gap exists and at times can be so wide to cause closure of mines. There is no accepted CSR
conceptual framework hence this study seeks to prove the applicability of this crafted framework.

2.7 Summary
This chapter provided background to the concept of CSR and the CSR debate. Various schools of thought and CSR theories were discussed with particular focus on Stakeholder theory as basis of the study. CSR dimensions and perspectives were addressed and review of literature highlighted how important aspects of CSR such as level of CSR practice by mining companies, stakeholder engagement, CSR strategy and policy implementation and reporting influence stakeholder perceptions.
CHAPTER 3

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter provides an overview of the methodological choices that were utilised in order to achieve the main aim of the study. The research was carried out to establish stakeholder views of CSR and determine extent to which mining companies engage in CSR activities.

Qualitative research methods were used and data was collected through in-depth interviews to targeted employees and community members of two mining companies as well as key respondents in two mining authorities. These interviews were carried out to find out the perceptions of these different stakeholder groups of CSR in mining companies.

In qualitative research, the researcher observes and records behaviour and events in their natural settings, that is, participant's perception and experiences in their mining communities (Denzin and Lincoln 2005). This study sought to establish experiences of the local community, mining employees and the government as the major stakeholders in mining companies. Perceptions by their nature present data which does not indicate ordinal values, hence the qualitative methods were most ideal to this study (Nkwi, Nyamongo & Ryan 2001).

3.1.1 Research Approach

The choice of approach depends on the nature of the research conducted. The induction approach is whereby theory follows data and it begins with (observations) in this case in depth interviews which lead to the development of theory based on the explanations that arise (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2009). This approach is also ideal for the study of small samples and is more flexible to allow changes of research emphasis as research progresses and starts with the specifics and then moves to the general (Meyers 2009). The deductive approach does not leave room for alternative explanations of what is happening outside its hypothesis and theory due to the closed questions and was not used in this study.
3.2 Research Design

Research design refers to a plan or overall framework of conducting the study, that is, it is a blueprint used to guide a research study towards its objectives (Aaker, Kumar & Dam 2003). In structuring the research, it is important to align all tools; sample, measures, programs and methods of assignment to the original research objectives (Gay 1994). A research design can be distinguished by the approach used to collect primary data which may include observations, surveys and or interviews.

Several research strategies can be employed in a study and these strategies include experiments, survey, action research, case study, grounded theory, ethnography and archival research. The research strategy for this study was a case of the mining industry in Zimbabwe, where 2 companies CSR practices were analysed through in-depth interviews.

3.2.1.1 Case Study

A case study allows for small samples to be used and is not limited to analysing a limited number of variables and use of case studies provides a systematic approach of looking at events in the manner of data collection, analysis and reporting of findings (Yin 2003). A case study would enable mining companies to establish facts about why stakeholders hold such perceptions of the CSR activities of the mining companies with which they are involved. As a research strategy, case studies are not limited to qualitative research but can be based on either qualitative and/or quantitative evidence (Yin 2002). Case studies however tend to focus on one or two particular issues. This single case with embedded units which looks into 2 mining companies is likely to be stronger than a single case design.

There are three types of case studies, mainly exploratory, explanatory and descriptive. The exploratory research which is undertaken when one is seeking insight into the general nature of a problem area is mostly considered as a prelude to social research. Descriptive research as defined by Robson is concerned with portraying accurate profile of persons, events or situations and requires that theory be developed prior to the research. Case studies seeking to investigate casual relations are explanatory.
In studying the mining industry in Zimbabwe as a case the researcher addressed the study questions, propositions, units of analysis, ways of linking the data to the propositions and the criteria for interpreting the findings. The research proposition is that there is weak stakeholder perception of mining companies’ CSR practices in Zimbabwe and the case study seeks to justify this proposition or prove otherwise. The mining companies selected are the units of analysis; Zimasco and Zimplats. Stakeholders’ perceptions on CSR are assessed through in depth interviews. The data obtained from the case study was matched with the propositions where data from the case was related to that from theoretical propositions.

This study was conducted by way of a single case study with embedded units within the qualitative method paradigm. The case is the mining industry of Zimbabwe and its sub units are the two mining companies under study. The phenomenon being studied is the same but the researcher will have the opportunity to explore the case while at the same time considering influence of different mines’ CSR programmes on stakeholder perceptions. This type of case analysis will illuminate the case better (Yin 2003).

Zimasco and Zimplats mines were selected as case companies by virtue of them being big and well established mining companies whose CSR programmes are well in place. These companies have been publishing CSR reports prior to this study implying that they consider CSR as core to their business and this makes them suitable for the study.

A case study was selected for this research because the aim was not to generalise findings but confine them to the mining industry. The scope of the research was in the stakeholder perceptions of CSR of mining companies in general and in particular the companies selected. The stakeholder groups identified for the study consists of the community, the workers and the government and they are part of the key stakeholders. Investors are also key stakeholders but were not selected for lack of accessibility and limited timeframe to get information from them.

The researcher shall endeavour to report the findings of the case in a concise manner by converting the complex phenomenon into a format that is readily understood by the reader. Each proposition shall be addressed and this shall ensure that report remains
focused and deals with the research question. Empirical evidence shall be compared to
the findings so that any new data is situated as pre-existing data.

3.3 Methods of collecting data
3.3.1 Primary data
This study was qualitative in nature and made use of in depth interviews as the most
optimal method of soliciting information.
3.3.2 Interviews
Interviews relate to conservations between two people as a way of gathering data.
Participants are asked questions in line with the phenomenon in study. Interviews can be
in the form of structured or open ended questions.

The researcher chose to conduct in-depth interviews when gathering data from key
mining respondents from mining companies, governing authorities and the community as
they allowed the researcher to establish the views and thoughts of the participants on the
CSR practices by the mining companies in their communities. Interviews allow the
researcher to gain insight and context in the topic by probing. In-depth Interviews enable
the respondents to explain what they feel is important to them. This method is useful for
gathering quotes and stories. This method is however time consuming and expensive
compared to other data collection methods. The method may also seem intrusive to the
respondent.

An interview guide was prepared for the interviews and it had topics ranging from CSR
dimensions to other factors pertaining to the community and company operations that
could influence their perceptions

The phrasing of questions and sequence of the questions varied from one interview to
another, depending on the responses given and further probe by the researcher. These
interviews enabled the participants to provide unbiased opinions and this provided the
researcher with a deeper understanding of the subject.

Prior to the interviews, the researcher had sought the consent of the participants to be
interviewed, through key people in their community and explained why this study was
being carried out. Respondents from the working community were chosen depending on
their willingness to participate while with the local community the researcher was
assisted by the head to select respondents that were well versed with mining activities and company relations with the community. Participants from the government stakeholder group were selected depending on their engagement in mining company operations and CSR practices.

### 3.3.2.1 Interview Process
During the interviews the interviewer was conversational to encourage response from the interviewees and allow smooth transition from one issue to another. The interviewer also tried to interpret the responses given and sought clarity where necessary. The interviewer also noted non verbal behaviours and own reflections of the interviews immediately after it ended. The interview lasted averagely 30 - 45 minutes and the outcome of the interviews was a mixed bag of data which allowed the researcher to analyse the data from a diversified perspective. Most interviews interacted freely although one or two respondents seemed not convinced about the confidentiality of their information. Nonetheless they still provided useful data. Interview details are outlined in table 4.1-4.5, main question’s asked are as indicated in the interview guide, Appendix1.

### 3.4 Population
The mining industry in Zimbabwe comprises the population of this study that is both large scale and small scale mining companies. Government is also part of the population as it has some stake in the mining activities and is represented by various mining authorities. The local communities in the mining areas also constitute part of the population.

### 3.5 Sampling
Purposive sampling was used for this qualitative study because comprised of the cases, which are the sampling units to be examined and are selected from a defined research population. The sample consists of two mining companies and two mining authorities. The mining companies include Zimasco and Zimplats which are all large scale miners and have been established or a relatively long period. These have been specifically selected because they have been known to carry out CSR activities that have been published. The cases are purposeful selected because they can supply a lot of data on CSR activities in the mining industry which is relevant to this study. Respondents from Institute of Mining Research and Metallurgical Research Institute constituted part of the
sample as they interact with the mining companies on a regular basis and are likely to provide unbiased information from an observer’s view.

Three respondents were selected from each mine from the workers making a total of 6 respondents. The selection of employee representatives was also purposeful as the researcher targeted those from the corporate governance department and HR who were well informed about the CSR issues. Respondents from the mining authorities were selected from the offices of those who interacted with the mines and are knowledgeable of their operations. Consent to gain access to these was sought from the highest authority.

3.5.1 Sample Size
For the Interviews, the sample size was made up of nine (3) participants from workers stakeholder group from the both mining companies; community stakeholders included six (6) respondents; and two (2) respondents were selected from two mining authorities. The total number of interviewees was eleven (11).

3.6 Data Analysis
Data analysis is a process which involves the examining and categorisation of data, generalising the categories or themes, coding of data, linking the coded categories to the propositions. Data analysis in qualitative research is an ongoing process right from when data is collected and through transcription when recurring themes, categories and patterns became evident, (Kohlbacher, Florian, (2005), Data analysis was done through content analysis to assess the perceptions of stakeholders. The content analytical summary can be used for an inductive category development (Maring, 2002).

3.7 Trustworthiness of the study
The trustworthiness of the qualitative study focussed on credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Bryman & Bell 2007).

Reliability relates to the consistence of the measure used, while validity looks at whether the instrument used was in conformity with the objectives of the study, that is, was it possible to measure stakeholder perceptions by asking questions that require them to say their opinions on the subject (Bryman & Bell 2007).
The concept of validation relates to good research practices and respondent validation by availing the study findings to participants to ensure accurate interpretation of the data while transferability relates to whether the findings can be applied in other context (Bryman & Bell 2007). This study is a single case with embedded units in the mining industry and therefore cannot be applied outside the mining context. When a study is repeated by a different researcher using the same paradigm and approaches, and come up with the same findings, then it is said to be dependable. The personal objectivity of the researcher has large impact in qualitative research as this affects the confirmability of the research.

3.8 Ethical considerations
Ethical issues in research ensures that no one is harmed or suffers adverse consequences due to the study (Cooper & Schindler 1998) hence measures were taken to ensure anonymity of respondents so as to encourage open and frank responses. It was also specified to the respondents that the research was for study only and the aims and objectives of the study were communicated to them. The researcher did not influence the responses in any way but only acted as a facilitator during interviews.

3.9 Summary
This chapter outlined the design and research methods for the study and explained the approach used by the researcher for data collection methods. This study follows an inductive approach by way of case study. Purposive sampling was used to select representative sample and primary data was collected by way of interviews. Ethical considerations were made. The following chapter presents analysis of the data.
CHAPTER 4

4 FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the results of the research on stakeholders’ view of CSR of mining companies in Zimbabwe conducted through qualitative approach of in-depth interviews. Respondents were interviewed from the community and employee stakeholder groups of Zimplats and Zimasco mining companies as case companies. The mining authorities formed another stakeholder group as respondents. The key findings of the interviews are presented in relation to the following research questions;

- How do stakeholders view CSR in Zimbabwe?
- What are the differences on CSR expectations among the stakeholders?
- What is the extent of stakeholder engagement with mining companies?

4.1.1 Case profiles

Zimplats
Zimplats is a subsidiary of a South African based mining company Implats, has its mining operations in the middle dyke in Mhondoro-Ngezi area. The giant platinum mine was established in 2001 and is operating four portals (shaft mines). The company has a smelter in Selous where part processing of the platinum ore is done in preparation for final processing in South Africa. The company creates employment for many people in Mhondoro-Ngezi community. The company has been selected as one of the cases because of its large scale operations.

Zimasco
Zimasco is a large chrome mining company whose mining claims are located throughout the great dyke. The company’s mining operations are in the Southern Dyke, that is, Shurugwi and Lalapanzi areas. Zimasco relies mostly on tribute mining by other miners both on its Ngezi claims as well as Mvurwi- Impinge area. Zimasco was also selected because it was involved in CSR activities especially in areas where it carries out direct mining operations and also because of its size.

4.1.2 Respondents’ profile
The respondents from Zimplats community stakeholder group are composed of two community members of which one is a former employee of Zimplats and a councillor. The first respondent, a former-employee was a referral from a small scale minor known
by the researcher from the area. He then referred the researcher to the councillor who in turn identified the chairman from the village near Turf, a residential area for the Zimplats employees. These were selected by virtue of them being well informed concerning Zimplats’ CSR efforts. Respondents from Zimasco community stakeholder group comprised a village head, in Bumbe area, and other two community members. The village head who is also the fourth respondent is a small scale minor in the area and is known to the researcher. The other two respondents were referrals of the village head. Respondents from employee stakeholders were part of the management from Zimplats and Zimasco. Mining authorities’ respondents consisted of a director and a chairman from the two research institutions. Relevant personal information about these respondents is as indicated in Table 4.1 below.

Table 2.1 Demographic Information of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Position in community or company</th>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>Age or time in industry</th>
<th>Period with company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Zimplats</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Former employee</td>
<td>Near Bandawa business centre</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zimplats</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Tyrony Business centre</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zimplats</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Member of community</td>
<td>Village 1 Turf</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zimasco</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Village head</td>
<td>Rutara- Ngezi</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Zimasco</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Small scale miner from community</td>
<td>Jondale-Ngezi</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Zimasco</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Community member</td>
<td>Bumbe</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Zimasco</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>GM-Marketing</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Zimasco</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Raw Materials Manager</td>
<td>Kwekwe</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Metallurgical Research Institute</td>
<td>Mining authority</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Institute of Mining Research</td>
<td>Mining authority</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Zimplats</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Corporate services executive</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Findings and analysis

A summary of the findings on the stakeholder groups is illustrated in index table 4.2 – table 4.6. This section shall address the research questions in relation to the findings literature and propositions. This analysis shall include quotes by the interviewees and shall lead to the conclusion of the study. The study has to a great extent addressed the research questions and objectives, namely how stakeholders view CSR of mining companies in Zimbabwe, what differences on CSR expectation or otherwise among the stakeholders and the extent of stakeholder engagement with mining companies with respect to CSR activities.

4.2.1 Stakeholder Perceptions of CSR

4.2.1.1 Community Stakeholders views on CSR

Zimplats

Generally all respondents share the view that CSR is about community benefitting from mining activities through support in the form of infrastructure development, employment creation and environmental sustainability. Respondent 2 from Zimplats understands CSR this way, “CSR builds relationships between the company and the communities. The community is the custodian of the resources.” This definition is reflective of the fact that the resources belong to the community and for mining companies to operate they have to maintain good relations with the community through CSR (Thomas 2012).

Respondents from Zimplats community stakeholders shared the opinion that Zimplats was capable of being socially responsible to the community but it was not in their interests to do so. This can be reflected in this statement, “Zimplats is realising huge profits but is not fully disclosing and I remember the company once had a smelter but I don’t know what happened to it. Now they are sending the platinum to South Africa for final processing.” This implies that the country is being deprived of full beneficiation of the platinum mineral. Two respondents failed to appreciate Zimplats’ CSR efforts which they claimed were meant to benefit the company more than the community. This view was exposed by Respondent 3’s statement, “They built the Ngezi tarred road but it benefits the company most because it only stretches to Zimplats’ Turf village and extension of school blocks at Turf was also meant to accommodate their employees’ children”. The CSR concept even though not appreciated by the stakeholders was meant to serve the interests of the business and also benefit the society.
Respondents reflected high awareness of CSR dimensions. All respondents from Zimplats alluded to environment responsibility as the most important dimension of CSR valued by the company and this is in line with environmental sustainability which is called for in mining activities. One respondent estimated that, “Zimplats carries out more than 40% rehabilitation of its mines, but some like respondent 2 were however convinced that the company is not giving enough resources towards CSR, “they do not pay stakeholder council’s sitting allowance”.

Views on company approach to ethical issues differed. Respondent 1 was of the view that the company respected the rights and integrity of the community because, “they relocate the community where necessary”. Respondent 2 perceives the company to be unconcerned with the community integrity because it failed to honour some of the promises made to the communities and “did not respond to community requests of construction of a hospital and a dam to enable irrigation schemes”. Respondent 3 strongly believes that the company lacks respect for the community because, “they promised to supply us with materials to build toilets and chicken projects. We were asked to dig the pits and built the chicken runs two years ago, and now our grandchildren and livestock are being trapped in the pits we dug.” Those were minor projects which the company could have easily implemented but now their failure to fulfil promised assistance is interpreted as lack of respect for the community and earns the company some negative perceptions from the community. Respondents expressed the view that CSR should be mandatory so that Zimplats may participate fully.

Zimasco
The view that CSR is about mining companies helping the communities in which they operate was shared by all three respondents. Respondent 4 understands CSR as an activity over and above the normal business operations. All respondents agreed that the company used to engage in serious CSR activities but has ceased. They all share the same view that mining has a responsibility to the community in which it operates by assisting in developmental projects and maintaining the environment. Respondent 6 highlighted that a company must make profits even as it engages in other CSR dimensions such as legal, environment and philanthropy. They all agreed that Zimasco is prioritising the economic aspect but Respondent 4 and 5 also highlighted the company as not doing much to preserve the environment by not rehabilitating the mines or
monitoring the tribute miners on rehabilitation. The respondents share the same view that Zimasco respects the integrity and rights of the community by not depriving them of their natural resource through tribute mining. Tribute mining is also aligned to long term sustainability and all respondents agreed that Zimasco is committed to it.

4.2.1.2 Employee Stakeholder Views

Zimplats
The employee respondent from Zimplats understood CSR to mean voluntary contribution to sustainable development integrating stakeholders’ expectations to optimise relationships and also as a basis for continuous improvement. The employee respondent identified some of the CSR activities as infrastructure development of roads, schools, clinics and environmental development. The company involves stakeholders in all its CSR activities. The employee respondent stressed that the company strives to strike a balance among the CSR dimensions of environment, economic development and social progress.

The respondent highlighted Zimplats’ commitment to being socially responsible through a company policy on human rights and stakeholder engagement. This reflects the extent to which the company is committed to building positive relations with the community to sustain its business activities. The respondent portrayed the company as seriously involved with stakeholder engagement by, “integrating all stakeholders’ expectations” and through its stakeholder policy. The company published CSR reports on its website and also reports on its CSR activities at certain business forums but respondent 11 admits that there have been calls for more disclosure and reporting. This call maybe prompted by lack of real evidence of the CSR activity on the ground. The respondent expressed the view that CSR should be voluntary if it has to be different from any other business activity governed by certain rules.

Zimasco
There is general consensus on most CSR aspects of the company and that it entails ploughing back to the community. Respondent 8 understood CSR to mean, “The Company has a social responsibility to play a role as partner to this environment in which it is operating.” This implies that the mining companies take part in whatever
developments the community might have and also initiate some of its own. Respondents identified CSR benefits to include assistance to less privileged, infrastructure development and sponsoring social activities such as soccer. Both respondents agreed that mining companies have a social responsibility to the communities in which they operate so that they too benefit from the extraction of the non-renewable resources.

They prioritised the economic aspect of CSR not just in terms of their company making profits but stakeholder capacity building through tribute mining agreements. One respondent stated that, “tribute miners will gain experience in mining which they will use even when Zimasco has left the area”.

They concede to the fact that company avails resources for CSR practice in the form of human resources and funds, and that it respects rights of the people by giving them access to benefit from their own natural resource by allowing them to mine on company claims and selling the chrome to the company. This respect does not extend to environmental protection and preservation as indicated by both respondents. Respondent 7 views all CSR dimensions as being equally important but respondent 8 believes ethical responsibility is most important, followed by environmental, economic, legal and philanthropic.

Stakeholders reflected lack of understanding of some company procedures and policies on CSR implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This reflects how these companies are not transparent and are reluctant to disclose CSR issues to stakeholders to the extent that even some employee stakeholders were ignorant of how CSR is implemented in their companies.

One employee respondent attributed lack of CSR activity by Zimasco to new company ownership and constraints of funding, “the new Chinese owners do not take CSR seriously” and that, “like for instance this year, no such donations were made due to tight cash flows.”

4.2.1.3 Mining Authorities /Government views

The concept of CSR was well comprehended by respondent 9 as a holistic interaction between the mining companies and the community. It also involves giving back to the community for sustainable development. Respondent 10 views CSR as activities outside normal business undertaken to benefit the companies and the community. They share
the same view that CSR activities include infrastructure development and support of community social development.

One respondent was convinced that mining companies were performing well in some areas of CSR but needed to improve in others. Some of the respondent’s responses on prioritisation of CSR economic and ethical dimensions, “difficult to tell, but it looks like these companies are embarking on CSR as a way of protecting their economic interests” and on the ethical aspect, “looks like some of them are not doing enough in this regard.” They agreed that the economic aspect of CSR was most important. Respondent 9 believed that companies did not fully commit themselves to respecting community rights and integrity. This was reflected in the statement that, “for example, relocations made by diamond mining firms meant that those relocated may not have been fully awarded what they are worth”. Respondent 10 believes large companies are committed. They consented to the fact that large companies are striving for long term sustainability. Respondent 9 explained this as being prompted by global call for sustainable exploitation of resources, resource nationalism and increased community demands. CSR was believed to be incorporated into business strategy by most companies. The respondents differed on CSR implementation with respondent 9 suggesting that most companies opted for publicity.

4.3 What are the differences or otherwise on CSR expectations among the stakeholders?

4.3.1 Mining employees perceptions

The mining company respondent from Zimplats perceived CSR to integrate stakeholders. Respondents from the mining companies were generally managers and the tendency was to give views aligned to company objectives, policies and strategies. There were differing views on CSR approach in that Zimplats focused on environmental sustainability and economic development through employment creation, and infrastructure development. Zimasco on the other hand focused on economic aspects of CSR through community sustainable development such as tribute mining. Zimasco respondents cited funding as a major challenge to implementation of CSR activities and Respondent 8 also attributed the low level participation in CSR activities to the attitude of the new company ownership, “the new Chinese owners do not take CSR seriously”. This
supports literature that a corporation’s conduct determines the level of responsibility (Kakabadse 2005).

The respondent from Zimplats stated that the company seriously engaged the stakeholders in line with the company’s stakeholder policy. There were different statements from Zimasco respondents where one maintained that “stakeholders play an advisory role” and the other states that “stakeholders are not consulted in most cases”. These variances indicate that there is misrepresentation of the true facts and supports the view that companies do not provide honest and sufficient information in their reports (Dilling 2012).

The mining companies view that Government strongly encouraged CSR practice by mining companies was shared by all respondents and they believed that tax rebates or incentives could encourage more participation of mining companies. This was emphasized by Zimasco respondent in the statement that, “Government should introduce tax incentives such as tax relief directly linked to the benefits deriving from CSR participation”. The respondents consent to CSR being voluntary.

4.3.2 Community versus Mining companies

Community and Mining companies shared the same understanding of CSR concept. Zimplats community consented to the fact that the company was committed to environmental sustainability as confirmed by some respondents’ statement, “Environmental aspects are at the top because the company is doing its best to rehabilitate its mining activities and preserve the environment by growing trees and covering pits”. One Zimplats community member agrees with the company on some of the CSR developments such as infrastructure development. Other community respondents feel the developments are too minimal and the company largely benefit from CSR. Zimplats on the other hand hold the view that they carried out many CSR projects in the area.

They do not agree on stakeholder engagement policy by the company in that the community believes the stakeholders are not consulted effectively even though a committee exists. The varied views are due to the stipulation of the engagement policy.
which, according to the respondent states that, “stakeholder views have to be taken into account and needs addressed within the company’s capacity”. The policy has its own limitations and it is not surprising that the stakeholder engagement is ineffective. The company is not practically implementing what the policy stipulates and according to literature these inconsistent engagements are not acceptable to stakeholders (Tang, Hull and Rothathenbugh 2012)

The company maintains that CSR should be voluntary for it to be effective but community believe some form of legislation will ensure compliance by the companies. They differed on ethical issues. Respondent I view the company as being ethical even to a less extent but the other respondents hold different perception. Again Respondent 1 believed the community benefitted from Zimplats’ CSR and could rank benefits according to how they were important to him. The other two Respondents believed that, “the benefits are too minimal to rank”. These different perceptions reflect that a gap exists between stakeholders and company deliverables (Salehi & Azaru 2009).

Respondents from Zimasco held the same views with the company on the company’s previous participation in CSR. According to the community the current state is that “there is nothing by way of CSR” but the company claims that there is minimal CSR. This could be true to some extent because Zimasco’s area of operation is large hence these developments could be going on in these locations, for example, the soccer team sponsored by the company is based in Kwekwe. They are also agreed on the company’s commitment to community sustainability through tribute mining arrangements. They did not agree on the nature of CSR being Voluntary, community believed that companies would only participate under obligation.

4.3.3 Government/RDC versus mining companies

There was general consensus on most CSR aspects held by mining companies and government representatives. They all shared similar views on sustainable development and stakeholder engagement. They also believed that CSR evaluation was based on the impact on the recipient and by the number of beneficiaries or developmental projects. Respondents differed on CSR reporting policy of mining companies. Government was said to benefit from CSR through financing of some of its projects, environmental protection and reduced social load. They alluded to the fact that CSR was a conscious
choice and that there was increased awareness and participation in CSR by mining companies.

Respondent 9 believes that if government developed nationwide sustainable projects and offer training programmes to communities, self-sufficiency would be enhanced. Respondent 10 believes that government should prescribe minimum CSR targets to ensure participation by small scale miners. Both respondents agree that the call by government for increased CSR participation may be too harsh for those that are already practising CSR. They also share the view that government should introduce tax incentives directly linked to CSR performance.

Different stakeholder groups may have different views on an issue depending in this case on their relationship with the mining company and how much company activities affect them (Adey et al.2011). Community stakeholders have expectations from the mining companies and may not share similar views with the employees who are also bound by the company values and ethos. The mining authorities on the other hand represent the government which has to balance the two stakeholders’ views because of its obligations to both.

4.4 What is the extent of stakeholder engagement with mining companies?

4.4.1 Community Stakeholders’ views

Zimplats

While respondent 1 held the view that stakeholders are consulted but to a less extent because chiefs and councillors are part of the stakeholders’ and they represent the community, respondents 2 and 3 felt otherwise because the views of the chiefs and councillors are not taken into account. They all alluded to the view that Zimplats initiates activities that are suitable to it and may not be what the stakeholders want. This was highlighted by respondent 2 who being a member of the community stakeholder committee revealed that, “the company bring own agenda and own proposals to the meeting” and impose on community representatives who will have to take it or leave it. The composition of the stakeholders’ council is also not very representative of the community views. The council is made up of chiefs and councillors, who are all leaders and has no representative from ordinary community members. Chiefs are given preferential treatment as stakeholders because they benefit from owning houses built by
the company and they also receive fuel allocation and gift hampers every year end while according to respondent 2 council members are not getting sitting allowance. This preferential treatment results in conflicts (Jenkins & Obara 2008).

Zimasco

All the respondents shared the same view that stakeholders are not consulted by Zimasco on issues of CSR. They alluded to the idea that currently Zimasco is not carrying out any communication or consultation with the stakeholders because there is nothing by way of CSR due to liquidity constraints. Failure by the community to expound on how the company engaged stakeholders even then may imply that the company did not fully engage stakeholders. The company however indicated through respondent 7 that, “both internal and external stakeholders are considered”.

4.4.2 Employee stakeholders’ views

Zimplats

The Zimplats employee respondent expressed the view that the company seriously engaged the community, a view which was supported by some community respondents. The respondent even supports this by explaining how the stakeholder policy is committed to stakeholder engagement and management. The respondent also highlights the significance of the chiefs as leaders in the engagement process, an aspect which the community seem to be against. The respondent indicates that all communication to the stakeholders is through the relevant leaders and in the case of the community it is the chiefs.

Zimasco

The employee respondents held different views on the extent of stakeholder engagement. Respondent 7 indicates that stakeholders are consulted and “play an advisory role” but respondent 8 states that “stakeholders are not consulted in most cases”. One respondent seem to be aware of the company values while the other is not. This highlights the fact that they are both aware of the actual situation but one does not want to be regarded as not participating. This inconsistent information leads to negative perceptions by stakeholders of the company’s CSR (Tang, Hull and Rothathenburgh 2012).
4.4.3 Mining Authorities stakeholders’ view

They shared different views on stakeholder engagement and communication of CSR information. Respondent 9 believes that brochures and stakeholder council meetings are the modes of communication and respondent 10 believes that this is done through community leaders, Rural District Councils and District Administrator (DA). Respondent 10 believed that companies were made aware of stakeholder perceptions through stakeholder committee meetings and also through the Rural District Council Planning Committee (RDCPC). This supports literature that company should involve the government, and community in the implementation of CSR (Setyadi 2013). Respondent 9 believed challenges to CSR implementation were differences between stakeholder expectations and actual CSR offer as well as policy on stakeholder engagement and management (Adey et al. 2011). Respondent 10 alludes to the idea of too much stakeholder expectations and also adds another challenge as negative views on the level of mining contribution. This negative view is prompted by the gap between expectation and actual performance.

Sustainability building capacity in stakeholders and community development, employment, and social organisational skills were given as some of CSR benefits. Misunderstanding between mining companies and stakeholders was said to be caused by differences in stakeholder expectation and what companies can offer as highlighted in literature (Dilling 2012).

4.4.4 Summary of analysis of findings

The findings brought out the following main issues of CSR in mining industry: stakeholder awareness of CSR, commitment to sustainable development, level of stakeholder engagement, poor CSR strategy implementation and monitoring and lobbying for voluntary or mandatory CSR. Findings on stakeholder views are presented in appendix table 4.4.4

4.5 Discussion of the findings

This section shall discuss the findings of the research in relation to the propositions as stated in literature review section: that most communities do not benefit from CSR; that there is poor implementation and reporting by mining companies; that there is little or no...
stakeholder engagement by mining companies, and that there is a gap between stakeholder expectations and actual CSR practices.

Firstly, in respect of communities benefitting from CSR activities by mining companies, the study does not implicitly demonstrate that Zimplats and Zimasco communities did not benefit from CSR activities. At the time of study the companies might have scaled down their CSR activities and there is evidence of benefit from CSR. This implies that stakeholders may deliberately misrepresent facts about company CSR efforts. The findings indicated that community stakeholders may be reluctant to acknowledge the benefits derived from CSR because the companies involved may have failed to oblige to some other requested service or fulfil some promised assistance. The community would then interpret and communicate this as lack of benefit from CSR activity.

Secondly, the study demonstrates that there is poor implementation and reporting of CSR activities. The findings from the case studies reflected lack of proper implementation and reporting procedures by mining companies as reflected by the responses from the three stakeholder groups. If all CSR projects are generated internally, and budgets and decisions have to be approved internally by the company CEO as one of the cases highlighted, implication is that the external stakeholders may have little or no influence over CSR initiatives. The findings contrast the view that companies should include government and community in the implementation and reporting of CSR activities (Setyadi 213). This would ensure successful implementation of CSR and a reporting system that ensures transparency.

Thirdly, the study demonstrates that there is little or no stakeholder engagement in mining companies' CSR programmes. Findings from the study reflected that both employee and community stakeholder groups alluded the view that both case companies did not seriously involve stakeholders in the formulation, implementation and reporting of their CSR programmes. Lack of CSR communication by mining companies to stakeholders, result in varied stakeholder views about CSR. These differences in perception by stakeholders affects the community or external stakeholders more than the employees because they are not informed and in most cases hold negative perceptions on CSR. This is inconsistent with the view that stakeholder engagement as a co-innovative strategy improves relations between companies and communities (Thomas 2013).
Fourthly, the study demonstrates the existence of an expectation gap in CSR practice by mining companies. The findings from the study indicate that stakeholders expect much more from the mining companies in the form of recognition as stakeholders, information, and assistance for projects of their own initiation, and yet the companies seem satisfied with their achievements in terms of CSR practice. These expectations which may be interpreted as too much by the companies and other stakeholders may be made as a result of being uninformed. This supports the view that there is a gap between stakeholder expectations and actual CSR practice (Salehi & Azaru 2009).

Apart from the research propositions, the study also demonstrated that giving preference and importance to some stakeholders over others may lead to negative perceptions by the other stakeholders. Evidence from the cases reflected this aspect where the company treated certain leaders as salient community stakeholders consulted by the company in all aspects. Culturally it is right for the companies to do so but they should not neglect other stakeholder council members as this leads to tensions within the stakeholder groups. In cases where there are gaps between what the company can offer and what the stakeholders demand, other stakeholders may perceive that these salient stakeholders are being bribed to make them ineffective as representatives.

4.6 Summary

In summary this study contributes to the stakeholder theory by identifying stakeholder perceptions of CSR of mining industry through presentation and analysis of two case studies. The study reflected high stakeholder awareness of CSR and highlighted the different perceptions held by stakeholders on CSR aspects. The study confirmed that CSR activity in mining companies was low and various reasons attributed to it. The study lacked enough evidence to support the proposition that most stakeholders did not benefit from CSR activities by mining companies. The study reflected lack of transparency in stakeholder engagement and supported the view that there was poor implementation and reporting policy on CSR of mining companies. There were suggestions for government intervention as a way of enforcing CSR practice by mining companies.
CHAPTER 5

5 CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND AREAS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

5.1 Introduction

This chapter concludes the study and it shall include a summary of the most central points of the research. The chapter shall highlight some of the possible implications of this study to mining industry; discuss the limitations of the research and areas for further research.

5.2 Research Summary and findings

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of stakeholders of CSR in the case of mining industry. Studies on stakeholder perception of CSR have been carried in other countries and this study was prompted by lack of stakeholder perceptions of CSR of mining industry within the Zimbabwean context. Stakeholders are important especially to mining companies so it was necessary to establish how sensitive they were to CSR.

Three research questions were posed to determine the stakeholder perception:

1. How do stakeholders view CSR of mining companies in Zimbabwe?
2. What are the differences or otherwise on CSR expectations among the stakeholders?
3. What is the extent of stakeholder engagement with mining companies with respect to CSR activities?

Several questions were structured to address these research questions and in-depth interviews with mining stakeholders were used as a method of collecting data to answer these questions. The research methods utilised in the study was a single case with embedded units. The single case study enables thorough investigation of the perceptions of the target stakeholder groups. Content analysis was used to analyse the data from interviews.

A conceptual framework based on literature was constructed in order to address these research questions. This framework illustrates the relationships of CSR and perceptions. The orientation and management of CSR dimensions by mining companies has
influence over perceptions of stakeholders on CSR. On the other hand CSR practices such as stakeholder engagement, policies on implementation and monitoring of CSR activities, and CSR strategies of mining companies affect the stakeholder perception. The model also highlighted the fact that there was a gap between stakeholder expectations and actual CSR practice.

5.2.1 Key findings
The key findings of the study shall be presented against the research questions.

5.2.1.1 How do stakeholders view CSR of mining companies in Zimbabwe?
This question explored the stakeholder views on their level of understanding of CSR issues, including awareness, dimensions and CSR in relation to strategy. The findings are as follows:

High stakeholder awareness of CSR
The responses by all the respondents indicated high levels of CSR understanding. This study concludes that this level of awareness of CSR by mining company stakeholders can be taken to imply the mining industry had launched awareness campaigns on CSR.

Commitment to sustainable development
Respondents from both Zimplats and Zimplats stakeholder groups indicated that the mining companies were committed to sustainable development. Zimplats respondents’ referred to sustainable development in terms of the environment and those from Zimasco referred to sustainable development through offering sustainable projects such as tribute mining. This is in line with the global call for sustainable mining and sustainable development of mining communities. This is demonstrated by the request for assistance by Zimplats community to construct a dam to facilitate irrigation projects which are long term. This research concludes that the aspect of sustainable development is important to mining stakeholders.

Poor CSR strategy implementation and monitoring.
Responses to questions that answered this research question reflected ignorance of Company policies on strategy formulation and implementation. Most respondents indicated that they did not know and this implies that there is lack of disclosure and
transparency of company CSR practices to the stakeholders. The fact that some of the employee respondents are also ignorant may mean lack of existence of those strategies and policies. These findings suggest that companies need to be more transparent and there should be regulations to enforce disclosure of CSR activities.

5.2.1.2 Differences or otherwise in stakeholder perceptions

Voluntary or mandatory CSR

The respondents from the study held different views on whether CSR should be voluntary or mandatory. The community stakeholders held the view that government should intervene in CSR activities to ensure compliance. They believed that voluntary CSR would enable companies avoid participating in these activities. Employees and mining authorities on the other hand were convinced that CSR can only be voluntary and this encourages mining companies to be responsible.

Differences on stakeholder views on other CSR aspects were insignificant to consider in these findings. The respondents held similar views on most CSR aspects. These findings suggest that there is need for more consultation on this aspect to establish the most applicable CSR in Zimbabwe.

Lack of proper stakeholder engagement

This aspect of CSR was very significant to this study. Most of the respondents indicated that there was little no stakeholder engagement by both companies. The responses by the employee stakeholders claimed that there was effective stakeholder engagement. Respondent from Zimplats even produced their policy on stakeholder engagement and human rights policy as evidence. The community stakeholder responses raised questions on the credibility effectively engaging stakeholders. With Zimplats the study provided evidence that there is some form of engagement but it was ineffective. Zimasco reflected non existence of stakeholder engagement. This study concludes that there is need to establish whether there should be some form of standard code or regulation on stakeholder engagement.

5.2.2 Key conclusions

The key findings from this study led to the following conclusions:
5.2.2.1 The need to enact standard procedures for CSR implementation and reporting

The study has revealed that mining companies do not have any manuals or codes that govern them on implementation and reporting of their CSR activities. The fact that even employees had no idea about these policies implies that CSR is not being taken seriously by mining companies. Companies must be compelled to establish these policy frameworks.

5.2.2.2 Need for stakeholder empowerment and management.

Most stakeholders are not satisfied with the stakeholder engagement policy of both Zimplats and Zimasco but seem to be powerless to do anything about it. These stakeholders need to go through stakeholder awareness campaigns and capacity building initiatives.

5.3 Discussion of main proposition

The main proposition of the study was that:

There is weak stakeholder perception of mining companies' CSR practices in Zimbabwe.

This study which was carried out from a multi-stakeholder view reflected varied perceptions by stakeholders on various aspects of CSR. The community views in most cases were different from those of the employees and mining authorities’ stakeholders. Mining employees largely concurred with the mining authorities on the theoretical aspects of what CSR should be but views of the community and some employees reflected that actual CSR practice was different. Lack of proper strategies and policies on critical aspects of CSR strategy formulation and implementation, and inconsistent communication and reporting procedures negatively impacted on the perception of stakeholders. The findings revealed that stakeholders were not given enough recognition by companies. Zimplats has a policy framework on stakeholder engagement and Human rights but according to the evidence by the community, the company is not doing much by way of effecting those policies. This results in negative perceptions of companies CSR activities and failure to appreciate companies’ CSR efforts. The conclusion is that this study supports the research proposition.
5.4 Contribution of the study

The study on stakeholder perceptions have been carried out elsewhere and the findings were similar to this study. The study supported the existing conceptual framework crafted for this study as illustrated in chapter 2 and also reflects that theoretical aspects of CSR established in other studies and in other countries are also applicable in Zimbabwe. The study revealed that unlike in some developing countries where CSR awareness was still very low, there was high level stakeholder awareness of CSR in mining industry in Zimbabwe. The results of the study provides a platform for mining companies management and policy makers to make informed decisions in their CSR approach, particularly in stakeholder engagement and management policies.

5.5 Recommendations

Managerial implications

- The management of Zimplats and Zimasco need to improve on their CSR communication and stakeholder strategies. This is especially with reference to community stakeholders whose social license to operate is very vital for these mining companies. Finding from the study have reflected lack of consistent CSR communication procedures and lack of proper implementation of existing stakeholder engagement and human rights policies in the case of Zimplats. These inconsistent communication strategies are not acceptable to the stakeholders and this at times leads to tensions and poor relationships between the companies and the stakeholders.

- There is need to improve or put CSR strategy implementation and reporting. The findings of the research indicated lack of such frameworks which was even evident in some employees failing to account for CSR activities in their companies.

Policy Implications

- The government should develop a framework for sustainable projects in schools, colleges, universities and mining communities to train them to acquire necessary skills so they avoid depending on philanthropic activities from mining companies. The dependency syndrome creates unnecessary tension between mining
companies and stakeholders who may expect more than what the company can manage.

- The government need to formulate policy framework that strikes a balance between voluntary and regulatory CSR. This can be achieved through introduction of incentives, which could be in the form of tax concessions to those companies who are already participating in CSR activities. These incentives must be based on the level of CSR participation by the mining companies. A minimum level of CSR participation is to be enforced on the small scale minors or risk their licenses being withdrawn.

- There should be pro-active government intervention in CSR reporting and stakeholder engagement policies by mining companies. There is no standard reporting of CSR activities by mining companies and stakeholder engagement depends on individual company policies. Standardisation of these policies ensures transparency of actual CSR practice by mining companies.

5.6 Further Research directions

Investigation of mining companies’ CSR compliance
The study has highlighted different perceptions of CSR where employee stakeholders were claiming compliance to CSR policies and community stakeholders refuting existence of such policies. It is important that investigation is carried out on actual compliance to these policies

Investigating the possibility of making CSR mandatory
The study also highlighted different perceptions where community stakeholders were lobbying for mandatory CSR. This shows that the companies may not be practising CSR to the level claimed. There is need to investigate the possibility CSR becoming mandatory.

Exploring effective ways of stakeholder capacity building
Another potential area of investigation is to explore effective ways of stakeholder capacity building so that they will be empowered. This leads to effective CSR.

5.7 Limitations of the Research

The study was not without its limitations. A major limitation of the study was difficulty in accessing data in the mining companies. Most of the mining companies were not willing to cooperate and time was lost trying to access them. This led to the study of only two mining companies. Some of the community stakeholders were not conversant with the English language hence credibility of the data could have been compromised during translation.

5.8 Conclusion

CSR has gained importance globally and this paradigm has just gained momentum in Zimbabwe. The study has reflected high perception of CSR awareness by stakeholders of mining companies in Zimbabwe. The study has also highlighted differences in stakeholder perceptions which are due to the different positions held by these stakeholders in society and also depending on the relationship they have with the company. Lack of stakeholder engagement was also reflected in the study. Stakeholders called for Government intervention in CSR to ensure effective CSR practice. The paradigm of CSR could be improved through stakeholder capacity building. Investigation into actual CSR practice and policy implementation can improve CSR in Zimbabwe.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1A

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER GROUP

Section A: Respondent’s background
1. Can you briefly tell us about yourself (age, position in community and relationship with company/position in the mining authority)?
2. What is your overview of the mining industry and this company in particular (age, mineral extracted and type of mining)?
3. For how long has the company been established?
4. How long have you been in the area?
5. Where do you live?
6. Has any other research been conducted in this company? When? By who?

Section B: CSR in general
1. What is your understanding of CSR? Do you have an idea what it means to this company?
2. Is there any other term you would prefer to use other than CSR and why?
3. Is this company being CSR? If yes in what ways? What activities does it carry out?
4. Do you think there is any social responsibility in mining industry? Why do you think so?
5. What do you understand by the economic, legal, ethical, environmental and philanthropic responsibilities? Do you find the economic objectives of the mining business are in contradiction to the moral obligations? If so how are they managed?
6. What is the mining company doing in the name of CSR?
7. How would you rate or prioritise the economic, legal, ethical, environmental and philanthropic aspects in the mining company?
8. What resources are allocated by the company for the CSR programmes?
9. Is the company committed to fully respecting the rights of indigenous people, bio cultural integrity, their lands and traditions?
10. Does it strive to contribute to long-term sustainability of indigenous people, communities and countries in which they operate?

Section C: CSR strategies and policies

1. Could you please tell us how decisions of CSR are made in this company?
2. What role does CSR play in this company’s strategies and activities? Is CSR taken as a separate activity from the business functions or incorporated into the business strategically?
3. Are stakeholder views taken into account when mining companies make their decisions on CSR? If yes to what extent do stakeholders influence such decisions? If no how can the process be improved? Which stakeholders are considered as important? Why?
4. How does the company implement CSR?
5. How are CSR related messages communicated to stakeholders? Does the company have any specific manuals and codes for employees and stakeholders?
6. What are the values of the mining company and how is CSR integrated into those values?
7. Are there any monitoring measures for the company’s CSR programmes? How does the company ensure that CSR principles and rules are being adhered to?
8. How are CSR practices evaluated by the mining companies?
9. Is there any policy on CSR reporting in the company? If yes how would you rate this reporting procedure?
10. How does the mining company find out about stakeholder feelings and perceptions? Are any resources used toward this end? How does the company respond to these perceptions?

Section D: benefits / challenges derived from CSR

1. What motivates this company to engage in CSR activities (reputation/image, sustainable development)?
2. What are the effects of the company’s CSR approach on image/reputation?
3. Are there any challenges faced by this company in undertaking CSR? If yes what are they? How does the company cope with the challenges?
4. How do stakeholders benefit from CSR?
5. How would you rank the benefits in terms of their importance? Why
6. Has there ever been a misunderstanding between the company and stakeholders? What was it about? How was it resolved?
7. What benefits do the government and other responsible authorities derive from good CSR approach by mining companies?
8. What are your company’s future plans
9. How important is it to be CSR? Is it a conscious choice or its mandatory?
10. What do you understand to be the company’s future plans on CSR?

Section E: CSR future perspectives
1. What is the future outlook for company regarding your CSR approach?
2. Which direction are you taking concerning CSR? What are upcoming goals and objective?
3. What do you think would encourage more CSR participation by mining companies in Zimbabwe?

APPENDIX 1B

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR EMPLOYEE STAKEHOLDER GROUP

Section A: Respondent’s background
1. Can you briefly tell us about yourself (age, position in the company)?
2. What is your overview of the mining industry and this company in particular (age, mineral extracted and type of mining)?
3. For how long has the company been established?
4. How long have you been with the company?
5. Where do you live?
6. Has any other research been conducted in this company? When? By who?

Section B: CSR in general
1. What is your understanding of CSR? Do you have an idea what it means to this company?
2. How does CSR of your company differ from that of other mining companies?
3. Is this company being CSR? If yes in what ways? What CSR activities does it carry out in as far as employees are concerned?
4. Do you think there is any social responsibility in mining industry? Why do you think so?

5. What do you understand by the economic, legal, ethical, environmental and philanthropic responsibilities?

6. Do you find the economic objectives of the mining business are in contradiction to the moral obligations? If so how are they managed?

7. How would you rate or prioritise the economic, legal, ethical, environmental and philanthropic aspects in the mining company?

8. What resources are allocated by the company for the CSR programmes?

9. Is the company committed to fully respecting the rights of indigenous people, biocultural integrity, their lands and traditions?

10. Does it strive to contribute to long-term sustainability of indigenous people, communities and countries in which they operate?

Section C: CSR strategies and policies

1. Could you please tell us how decisions of CSR are made in this company?

2. What role does CSR play in this company’s strategies and activities? Is CSR taken as a separate activity from the business functions or incorporated into the business strategically?

3. Are stakeholder views taken into account when mining companies make their decisions on CSR? If yes to what extent do stakeholders influence such decisions? If no how can the process be improved? Which stakeholders are considered as important? Why?

4. How does the company implement CSR?

5. How are CSR related messages communicated to stakeholders? Does the company have any specific manuals and codes for employees and other stakeholders?

6. What are the values of the mining company and how is CSR integrated into those values?

7. Are there any monitoring measures for the company’s CSR programmes? How does the company ensure that CSR principles and rules are being adhered to?

8. How are CSR practices evaluated by the mining companies?

9. Is there any policy on CSR reporting in the company? If yes how would you rate this reporting procedure?
10. How does the mining company find out about stakeholder feelings and perceptions? Are any resources used toward this end? How does the company respond to these perceptions?

Section D: Benefits / challenges derived from CSR

1. What motivates this company to engage in CSR activities (reputation/image, sustainable development, competition)?
2. What are the effects of the company’s CSR approach on image/reputation?
3. Are there any challenges faced by this company in undertaking CSR? If yes what are they? How does the company cope with the challenges?
4. How do stakeholders benefit from CSR?
5. How would you rank the benefits in terms of their importance? Why
6. Has there ever been a misunderstanding between the company and stakeholders? What was it about? How was it resolved?
7. What benefits does the government and other responsible authorities derive from good CSR approach by mining companies?
8. How important is it to be CSR? Is it a conscious choice for your company or is it mandatory?
9. What do you understand to be the company’s future plans on CSR?

Section E: CSR future perspectives

4. What is the position of government concerning CSR of mining companies?
5. Which direction are you taking concerning CSR? What are upcoming goals and objective
6. What do you think would encourage more CSR participation by your company and the mining industry in Zimbabwe?

APPENDIX 1C

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR MINING AUTHORITIES STAKEHOLDER GROUP

Section A: Respondent’s background

1. Can you briefly tell us about yourself (age, position in the mining authority).
2. What is your overview of the mining industry and these companies in particular (age, mineral extracted and type of mining): ZIMASCO, ZIMPLATS AND MBADA DIAMONDS?

3. For how long have you been employed with the mining authority?

4. How long have you been involved with the mining industry?

5. Has any other research on stakeholder perception been conducted in this industry? When? By who?

Section B: CSR in general

1. What is your understanding of CSR? Do you have an idea what it means to the mining industry?

2. Is there any other term you would prefer to use other than CSR and why?

3. Are the mining companies being CSR? If yes in what ways? What activities do they carry out? Are there any particular similarities or differences in the CSR of the various companies?

4. Do you think there is any social responsibility in mining industry? Why do you think so?

5. What do you understand by the economic, legal, ethical, environmental and philanthropic responsibilities? Do you find the economic objectives of the mining business are in contradiction to the moral obligations? If so how are they managed?

6. How would you rate or prioritise the economic, legal, ethical, environmental and philanthropic aspects in the mining industry?

7. What resources are allocated by the company for the CSR programmes?

8. Are mining companies committed to fully respecting the rights of indigenous people, bio cultural integrity, their lands and traditions?

9. Do the mining companies strive to contribute to long-term sustainability of indigenous people, communities and countries in which they operate?

Section C: CSR strategies and policies

1. Do you have an idea of how some of these mining companies make CSR decisions?

2. What role does CSR play mining companies’ strategies and activities? Is CSR taken as a separate activity from the business functions or incorporated into the business strategically?
3. Are stakeholder views taken into account when mining companies make their decisions on CSR? If yes to what extent do stakeholders influence such decisions? If no how can the process be improved? Which stakeholders are considered as important? Why?

4. How is CSR implemented by companies in this industry? Are there any notable similarities or differences among companies in the implementation?

5. How are CSR related messages communicated to stakeholders?

6. Do the companies have any specific manuals and codes for employees and stakeholders?

7. What are the values of the mining companies and how is CSR integrated into those values?

8. Are there any monitoring measures for the companies’ CSR programmes? How do they ensure that CSR principles and rules are being adhered to?

9. How are CSR practices evaluated by the mining companies?

10. Are there any policies on CSR reporting in the companies? If yes how would you rate this reporting procedure?

11. How do mining companies find out about stakeholder feelings and perceptions? Are any resources used toward this end? How do they respond to these perceptions?

Section D: benefits / challenges derived from CSR

1. What motivates these companies to engage in CSR activities (reputation/image, sustainable development)?

2. What are the effects of the companies’ CSR approach on image/reputation?

3. Are there any challenges faced by the mining companies in undertaking CSR? If yes what are they? How do the companies cope with the challenges?

4. How do stakeholders benefit from CSR?

5. How would you rank the benefits in terms of their importance? Why

6. Has there ever been a misunderstanding between the mining companies and stakeholders? What was it about? How was it resolved?

7. What benefits does the government and other responsible authorities derive from good CSR approach by mining companies?

8. How important is it for the mining companies to be CSR? Is it a conscious choice or is it mandatory?

9. Do you have an idea of the mining companies’ future plans on CSR?
Section E: CSR future perspectives

7. What is the future outlook for the mining industry regarding CSR approach?

8. What contribution would you suggest as an authority towards improving CSR by mining companies?

9. What would you say is Government position concerning CSR of mining companies?

10. What do you think would promote more CSR participation by mining companies in Zimbabwe?

Appendix 2
Letter of Consent

Dear Sir/Madam

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

LETTER OF CONSENT

I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is Chipo Pfumbi and I am an MBA student at the University of Zimbabwe. I am carrying out a study on stakeholder perceptions of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): A case of mining industry, and would like to talk to you about your views or perceptions of CSR of mining companies in Zimbabwe. Your organisation is one of the case companies hence you have been selected as respondent and your contribution will enable the capture of useful lessons to mining companies in their future CSR programmes.

The interview should take less than an hour. I will be taking some notes during the session, but if you do not mind I will tape record because I cannot possibly write fast enough to get it all down.

All responses will be kept confidential and will only be used for the purposes of the research and any information I will include in my final document will not identify you as the respondent. Remember, you don’t have to talk about anything you don’t want to and you may end the interview at any time.

Are you willing to participate in this interview?

_________________________     ____________
Interviewee     Date
### Appendix 3: Tables of Summary findings

#### Table 4.2: Findings for Community Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent 1</th>
<th>Respondent 2</th>
<th>Respondent 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QB1</td>
<td>Community benefit from support from mining companies</td>
<td>CSR builds relationships between mining companies and stakeholders</td>
<td>CSR-support of community over and above mining activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB2</td>
<td>limited CSR Infrastructure development, employment creation and environmental preservation.</td>
<td>Partially being CSR. Infrastructure development. Prohibit public use of recreational facilities.</td>
<td>Not being CSR Projects are for company benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB3</td>
<td>Mining companies have social responsibility.</td>
<td>There is social responsibility.</td>
<td>There is social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB4</td>
<td>Complying with regulation; improving the economy and maintaining the environment. No contradiction of economic and moral obligations</td>
<td>Employment creation, company adherence to regulation, preservation of environment, giving to the community and respecting community. No contradiction</td>
<td>Employment creation, respecting the community and maintaining the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB5</td>
<td>Committed to rehabilitation of environment.</td>
<td>Seriously committed to environment preservation</td>
<td>Rehabilitate their mines after closing them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB6</td>
<td>No resources allocated towards CSR</td>
<td>No CSR</td>
<td>nothing towards CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB7</td>
<td>Not committed to respect community.</td>
<td>Lack respect for community.</td>
<td>Does not respect integrity of community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB8</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no evidence</td>
<td>not committed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC2</td>
<td>CSR not important to company’s strategies.</td>
<td>CSR is taken as a separate activity not incorporated into business strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC3</td>
<td>Stakeholders are consulted to a less extent.</td>
<td>Stakeholder views are not taken into account. Stakeholder council not representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder views are not considered. Company initiates CSR activities that suit it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC4</td>
<td>Through company projects manager in consultation with the chiefs.</td>
<td>Through the company community development committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC5</td>
<td>There should be a community relations department.</td>
<td>Communication is made to chiefs by community liaison officers and at stakeholders’ council meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate through stakeholders’ council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC8</td>
<td>Through consultation with the chiefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC9</td>
<td>Reports to Indigenisation and empowerment ministry and to the chiefs.</td>
<td>No proper reporting policy Report to chiefs It is biased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report to the government and to the stakeholders’ council. The reporting is poor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC10</td>
<td>Through stakeholder council. Chiefs and councillors receive fuel allowances and only chiefs receive end of year hampers.</td>
<td>Through stakeholder council meetings. Not much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through the stakeholders’ council. They do nothing about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD1</td>
<td>To improve their image and reputation</td>
<td>To promote own interests and build good image</td>
<td>Company has no motivation such as image building to carry out CSR practises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD2</td>
<td>May lose their licence. Good CSR, improved company image.</td>
<td>bad reputation and image</td>
<td>Bad CSR approach affect reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD3</td>
<td>The indigenisation Act of 2011 They have to comply.</td>
<td>Indigenisation laws and community share ownership trust schemes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD4</td>
<td>Benefit through employment and improved infrastructure</td>
<td>Improved infrastructure, environment preservation and employment creation</td>
<td>Employment creation and improved infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD5</td>
<td>Employment creation, boreholes, schools and roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD6</td>
<td>Un fulfilled requests by community.</td>
<td>Not offering tribute mining to community and prohibition of community use of recreational facilities at Turf.</td>
<td>When they took land without fair compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD7</td>
<td>Improve livelihood for the local mining communities.</td>
<td>Improved living standards for the communities.</td>
<td>Good CSR will improve communities’ livelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB1</td>
<td>CSR - mining companies are responsible to the community in which they operate. Assist in developmental programmes.</td>
<td>CSR is responsibility of the mining companies to the community besides their actual business.</td>
<td>CSR is how the mining companies help the community where they mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB2</td>
<td>No CSR activity currently</td>
<td>Used to carry out CSR activities but currently it is not.</td>
<td>Company is not being CSR as it used to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB3</td>
<td>Mining must be socially responsible to the communities. Negative effects to the environment.</td>
<td>Mining affects people’s livelihood. Mining companies must be socially responsible.</td>
<td>There is social responsibility in that mining companies. Give back to communities whose lives they disturb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qb4</td>
<td>Company strives for profitability but at the same time operate within the law to improve people’s lives by providing jobs, maintain their environment and assisting them in other projects. No contradiction.</td>
<td>Companies can be economically responsible by providing jobs and accommodation, respecting the integrity of the community as well as preserving the environment.</td>
<td>Respecting the community, maintaining their environment, offering jobs and operating within regulations. Can still be morally responsible and make profits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qb5</td>
<td>Prioritising the economic responsibility but no rehabilitation of mines.</td>
<td>Tribute mining, employment creation but no rehabilitation</td>
<td>tribute mining and employment creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qb6</td>
<td>Currently there is no CSR</td>
<td>I don’t think there are any resources allocated forwards CSR.</td>
<td>There is no CSR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qb7</td>
<td>Does not deprive the local people access to their natural resource through tribute mining.</td>
<td>The company allows people to benefit from their resource through tribute mining.</td>
<td>It allows tribute mining to the local people who are able to mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qb8</td>
<td>Company has sustainability initiatives</td>
<td>Committed to sustainability</td>
<td>Committed to long term sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qc2</td>
<td>I don’t think it has any role to play</td>
<td>In this company it is not important.</td>
<td>It has nothing to do with business strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qc3</td>
<td>Stakeholders are not consulted in most cases.</td>
<td>Mostly stakeholders are not consulted.</td>
<td>Company initiates CSR activities that suit it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qc5</td>
<td>There is no</td>
<td>Currently there is no</td>
<td>There is no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD1</td>
<td>To promote good will for the company and improve their image.</td>
<td>For good company image and sustainable development.</td>
<td>To promote good reputation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD2</td>
<td>Bad CSR approach negatively impacts on the company image and reputation.</td>
<td>Good will for the company and support from the community.</td>
<td>Company’s CSR approach not satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD3</td>
<td>Changing of company ownership disrupted CSR activities.</td>
<td>Liquidity constraints are a challenge to CSR activities.</td>
<td>Challenge may be that of new owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD4</td>
<td>Employment creation, tribute mining, and maintenance of road infrastructure.</td>
<td>Improved infrastructure, tribute mining and sponsoring soccer</td>
<td>Through employment creation, tribute mining and improved livelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD5</td>
<td>Tribute mining followed by Employment creation then road maintenance.</td>
<td>Employment creation, improved road infrastructure, tribute mining then soccer sponsor.</td>
<td>Tribute mining, employment creation and support of the less privileged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD6</td>
<td>Misunderstanding - unfulfilled expectations</td>
<td>Community may expect more than what is on offer</td>
<td>Differences in expectations and actual CSR practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD7</td>
<td>Good CSR improves people’s lives.</td>
<td>Improved livelihood of the communities.</td>
<td>Welfare of the less privileged is taken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4: Employee Stakeholders –Zimasco and Zimplats (respondent 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Respondent 7</th>
<th>Respondent 8</th>
<th>Respondent 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QB1</td>
<td>Giving back to community</td>
<td>Partner to the environment company is operating in</td>
<td>Voluntary contribution to sustainable development. Integrating stakeholder expectations to optimise relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB2</td>
<td>CSR is the same</td>
<td>It is the same</td>
<td>CSR is the right name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB3</td>
<td>Infrastructure development, assisting charitable organisations and those affected by AIDS.</td>
<td>Giving to the less privileged and soccer sponsorship</td>
<td>Yes. Through infrastructure development, environmental management and observing human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB4</td>
<td>Mining companies</td>
<td>Need to plough back</td>
<td>Mining companies have a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB5</td>
<td>Operational activity within confines of the law, empathy towards all stakeholders, environmental sustainability and good corporate citizenship</td>
<td>No contradiction because company provides most of the services to community</td>
<td>Companies make profits and at the same time creating employment for the community and engaging in development projects. Also maintains the environment and respects society in areas of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB7</td>
<td>Dimensions are of equal importance</td>
<td>Ethical, environmental, economic legal and philanthropic.</td>
<td>As a company we strive to maintain a balance of the economic development, social progress and maintaining the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB8</td>
<td>Monetary and human resources</td>
<td>Funding and human resources</td>
<td>The company allocates funds for the projects and at times human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB9</td>
<td>Tribute arrangements</td>
<td>Tribute arrangements</td>
<td>Relocating affected people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB10</td>
<td>Tribute agreements are long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment through environment preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC1</td>
<td>Annual budget for CSR, CEO approves expenditure</td>
<td>At board meetings</td>
<td>At board meetings and then implementation is by the projects development manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC2</td>
<td>Incorporated into</td>
<td>Not part of business</td>
<td>CSR is integrated into the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC3</td>
<td>Both internal and external stakeholders play advisory role.</td>
<td>Stakeholders not considered in most cases.</td>
<td>Stakeholder policy stipulates that their views be considered. Chiefs and other leaders are given importance in CSR aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC4</td>
<td>Identification and approval of needs allocation of funds then implementation</td>
<td>Implementation for soccer is planned for but ad hoc for other projects- depends on funds available</td>
<td>If approved by the CEO, the projects manager implements the projects in consultation with the stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC5</td>
<td>In-house and external publications</td>
<td>Not much communication and no code of conduct</td>
<td>Through the relevant leaders. Internal codes and ISO26000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC6</td>
<td>Integrity and environmental awareness.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental protection, Health and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC7</td>
<td>Due diligence before implementation and continuous monitoring</td>
<td>Mostly soccer budgets and expenditure is monitored</td>
<td>International guidelines for CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC8</td>
<td>Regular assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Through benefits and development projects completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC9</td>
<td>No policy on reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>No policy on reporting but have stakeholder and human rights policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC10</td>
<td>Continuous consultation with internal and external</td>
<td>No surveys to establish stakeholder perception</td>
<td>Takes note of stakeholder concerns and exercise due diligence in responding to them or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD</td>
<td>Stakeholder Focus</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD1</td>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>Reputation and sustainable development</td>
<td>Sustainable development of both community and company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD2</td>
<td>Positive effects</td>
<td>Good corporate citizenship</td>
<td>Image, reputation and success is subject to our commitment to stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD3</td>
<td>Inadequate financial resources</td>
<td>Tight cash flows</td>
<td>Lack of appreciation of company CSR efforts by stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD4</td>
<td>Development of their communities</td>
<td>Better community</td>
<td>Maintained environment, infrastructure development and other community development projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD5</td>
<td>Benefits equally ranked</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders' belief that they have a right to benefit from CSR</td>
<td>Stakeholders felt they were not being given enough recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD7</td>
<td>National development</td>
<td>Good citizenship and motivated electorate</td>
<td>Community development-infrastructure and employment creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD8</td>
<td>A conscious choice</td>
<td></td>
<td>CSR creates mutual beneficial relationships. Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD9</td>
<td>CSR to be part of company business plan</td>
<td>Not much for CSR</td>
<td>Empower rural district councils and stakeholder capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE1</td>
<td>Government supports and encourages CSR</td>
<td>Encourages CSR</td>
<td>Encouragement from government for more CSR participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE2</td>
<td>Continuous participation in CSR subject to availability of funds</td>
<td>No target objectives set on CSR</td>
<td>Increase CSR participation and work on policies of disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE3</td>
<td>Increase incentives such as tax relief linked directly to CSR participation</td>
<td>Create conducive environment for mining to be profitable Tax rebates</td>
<td>Tax rebates by government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Mining Authority Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Respondent 9</th>
<th>Respondent 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QB1</td>
<td>Holistic interaction between mining company and community; giving back to community and sustainable development.</td>
<td>Activities not directly related to business operations undertaken to benefit company and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB2</td>
<td>Sustainable mining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB3</td>
<td>Infrastructure development, community development programmes and educational programmes</td>
<td>Infrastructure development, support of social activities as well as energy projects. CSR of all mining companies similar, but small companies rarely participate on CSR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB4</td>
<td>Mining companies have social responsibility to some extent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB5</td>
<td>All tied to sustainable and responsible mining</td>
<td>Economic and moral objectives can be mutually reinforcing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB7</td>
<td>Economic top most</td>
<td>Economic, legal, philanthropic Ethical and environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB8</td>
<td>Not enough commitment respect of community rights and integrity. Bio-diversity is part of statutory requirements so they have to comply.</td>
<td>Large mines are committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB9</td>
<td>Global call for sustainable exploitation of resources; resource nationalism and increased community demands.</td>
<td>Positive with large mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC1</td>
<td>PR department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC2</td>
<td>Should be part of business strategy</td>
<td>CSR as goodwill strategy is capital to company and CSR incorporated into business functions is a cost but also realises tax allowances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders are consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC4</td>
<td>Publicity stance: sponsoring visible activities</td>
<td>CSR programmes are implemented in conjunction with the community who may also provide other materials and labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC5</td>
<td>Corporate brochures and annual reports; stakeholders meetings and management</td>
<td>Through community leaders, rural district councils and the District Administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some do for employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC7</td>
<td>Sustainable development of communities.</td>
<td>Sustainable development and good citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC8</td>
<td></td>
<td>No standard monitoring guidelines but some companies have own guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC9</td>
<td>Impact on recipient community based on implementation framework</td>
<td>By number of beneficiaries or infrastructure developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC10</td>
<td>Maybe Global Reporting Initiatives</td>
<td>Company annual reports. Good because it is reflected in company performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community stakeholder committee and rural district council planning committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD1</td>
<td>Image building and risk management</td>
<td>Reputation and sustainable development and tax allowances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD2</td>
<td>Good CSR builds company images</td>
<td>Positive effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD3</td>
<td>Stakeholder expectations versus actual company CSR offer. Stakeholder engagement and management</td>
<td>Financing; too much expectation from community stakeholders and negative views on level of contribution by mines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD4</td>
<td>Sustainably building capacity in stakeholders</td>
<td>Community development, employment, improved infrastructure and improved social organisational skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4.4: Key concepts from findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Level of CSR</th>
<th>Lobby for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QD6</td>
<td>Quantum of projects and cut off in terms of CSR activities</td>
<td>Stakeholders' belief that they have a right to benefit from CSR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD7</td>
<td>Reduce social load from government by providing public goods.</td>
<td>Financing of part of their budgets and environmental protection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD8</td>
<td>Voluntary/conscious choice</td>
<td>Conscious voluntary choice. Good for company social relations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE1</td>
<td>Increasing awareness and participation in CSR by mining companies.</td>
<td>Increased CSR participation due to government inclination towards participation policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE2</td>
<td>Developing nationwide sustainable projects and offering training programmes to communities to increase self-sufficiency.</td>
<td>That government prescribe minimum CSR targets to ensure participation by small scale miners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE3</td>
<td>Government at times too harsh to mining companies. Profitability in mining depends on commodity cycles. Companies may reduce CSR activities to cut cost resulting in conflicts with stakeholders.</td>
<td>Government is calling for increased CSR participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE4</td>
<td>Tax incentives and recognition</td>
<td>Tax concessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder 1</td>
<td>Community benefit from support from mining companies</td>
<td>Zimplats rehabilitate their used up mines</td>
<td>There is less stakeholder engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder 2</td>
<td>CSR builds relationships between mining companies and stakeholders community as custodian of resources</td>
<td>Zimplats is committed to sustain the environment through rehabilitation of mines</td>
<td>Stakeholders are consulted but the stakeholders’ council is ineffective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder 3</td>
<td>CSR-support of community over and above mining activities.</td>
<td>Zimplats concerned with environment - rehabilitates its mines</td>
<td>There is no proper stakeholder engagement because the present council is not effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder 4</td>
<td>CSR - mining companies are responsible to the community</td>
<td>Less environmental sustainability through rehabilitation but</td>
<td>There is no stakeholder engagement or consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>CSR is responsibility of the mining companies to the community besides their actual business.</td>
<td>Zimasco is committed to sustainable development through tribute mining.</td>
<td>Stakeholders are not consulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 6</td>
<td>CSR is how the mining companies help the community where they mine.</td>
<td>No sustainable environment management but offer tribute mining for sustainable development.</td>
<td>There is no stakeholder engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 7</td>
<td>Giving back to community.</td>
<td>Committed to sustainable development through tribute arrangements.</td>
<td>There is no stakeholder consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 8</td>
<td>Partner to the environment company is operating in.</td>
<td>Tribute arrangements ensure sustainability of community.</td>
<td>Stakeholders are not considered in most cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondernt 9</td>
<td>Holistic interaction between mining company and community; giving back to community and sustainable development.</td>
<td>One of the values being sustainable development of the communities they operate.</td>
<td>Not sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondernt 10</td>
<td>Activities not directly related to business operations undertaken to benefit company and stakeholders.</td>
<td>One of the values is sustainable development.</td>
<td>Stakeholders should be consulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondernt 11</td>
<td>Voluntary contribution to sustainable development integrating all stakeholders.</td>
<td>Ensure sustainable environment by rehabilitating mines.</td>
<td>Have a stakeholder policy, consultation through stakeholder committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations for relationship building</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>