Business-NGO collaboration in a conflict setting: partnership activities in the Democratic Republic of Congo

Kolk, A.; Lenfant, F.

DOI
10.1177/0007650312446474

Publication date
2012

Document Version
Author accepted manuscript

Published in
Business & Society

BUSINESS-NGO COLLABORATION IN A CONFLICT SETTING:

PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES IN THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO

ANS KOLK & FRANÇOIS LENFANT

Business and Society, forthcoming

ABSTRACT

While business-NGO partnerships have received much attention in recent years, insights have been obtained from research in 'stable' contexts, not from conflict-ridden countries where such collaboration may be even more crucial in building trust and capacity and in addressing governance problems given the absence of a reliable state. This paper aims to shed light on business-NGOs collaboration in a conflict setting, exploring partnership activities in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Most partnerships found are philanthropic, and deal with 'traditional' issues such as health and education in a donor-recipient mode with limited community involvement. There are only a few real transformative partnerships, which address aspects directly related to the conflict from a wider community focus; these involve extractive companies most exposed via mineral development/production. We also found so-called 'engagement' collaboration which can be divided into activities including the transfer of funds (and characterised by service delivery), and those without funds, focusing on knowledge exchange that furthers companies' awareness of conflict-sensitive issues into their operations. Peculiarities of the different types of partnerships are discussed as well as implications for research and practice.

BUSINESS-NGO COLLABORATION IN A CONFLICT SETTING: PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES IN THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the potential of cross-sectoral collaboration in tackling societal issues has received considerable attention, from the perspective of both academics (e.g. Austin, 2000; Bäckstrand, 2006; Kolk et al., 2011; Selsky and Parker, 2005, Van Huijstee et al., 2007) and practitioners (recent examples include Horton et al., 2009; Hudson, 2009). Partnerships are increasingly considered as having the potential to address global problems that one single actor cannot solve, including poverty, development and climate change (e.g. Bäckstrand, 2008; Forsyth, 2007; Kolk et al., 2008; Reed and Reed, 2009). However, despite the broad interest, it is noteworthy that this literature is generally situated in relatively stable countries, i.e. conflict settings do not receive specific consideration. While lack of good governance has been related to the emergence of partnerships, given that governments, companies and NGOs are unable to unilaterally achieve desired public objectives (Andanova et al., 2009; Braithwaite and Dahos, 2000; Dahan et al., 2010; Kolk et al., 2008), the need to fill regulatory gaps is often not placed in the context of (violent) conflict.

On the one hand, a conflict setting further complicates the formation and implementation of partnerships as activities take place in a highly complex and volatile environment, thus requiring an even greater degree of understanding of the specific backgrounds of each partner, as well as their perceptions and expectations, than in more stable countries. On the other hand, it can be argued that in the context of an institutional void, with governance structures in flux, and different groups fighting for scarce resources and/or government power, the role of companies and NGOs, individually but particularly jointly, can be very important to help address issues related to instability and/or conflict. Collaboration can build trust and local capacity, enable learning and exchange, and encourage community involvement, thus creating conditions for peace and rehabilitation. Such a perspective extends recent attention to the role of business in conflict resolution to pay specific attention to their collaborative activities in this regard (cf. Jamali and Mirshak, 2010; Kolk and Lenfant, 2009; Oetzel et al., 2007). In this paper, we will examine business-NGO collaboration in such a conflict setting, exploring partnership activities in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) for a sample of 59 international companies active in this country.

The DRC, situated in the heart of Central Africa, has been ravaged by conflicts in the past decade. Despite formal peace agreements in 2006 and 2008, bouts of violence have continued to occur regularly, especially in the Eastern provinces of Katanga, North Kivu, South Kivu and Ituri, which has had a devastating impact on the economy. The conflict that began in August 1998 drastically reduced national output and government income, also due to informal activities and illegal exploitation of the country's resources by various local, regional and international economic actors (UN, 2001). The DRC's enormous wealth of natural resources has been seen as a burden rather than a blessing throughout its history (Hochschild, 1998). Abundance of valuable resources has benefited a few powerful individuals rather than contributing to the development of many, as poverty is widespread. This is illustrated by figures concerning life expectancy (48 years), mortality of children under 5 (199 per 1,000) and DRC's ranking in the Human Development Index (176 out of the 182 countries) (UN, 2010; World Bank, 2010). The number of deaths resulting from violence, famine and diseases from August 1998 until April 2007 has been estimated at more than 3.9 million, with over 100,000 people being displaced as a results of fighting since mid-2005 alone, and sexual violence is highly prevalent in the North-eastern part of the country (IRC, 2007, p. ii; MSF, 2005). The DRC is a clear example of a fragile country trapped in a vicious cycle of conflict, poverty and poor governance, with a very negative impact on local communities, especially in the Eastern provinces.

By exploring collaborative activities with an eye to their potential for contributing to a diminution of conflict and a restoration of trust, our study contributes to the literature on partnerships by adding a different context and (societal) purpose. Moreover, it can help shed some light on debates regarding the (potential) role of business in conflict resolution, and how business can be involved in community development beyond philanthropy (e.g. Bowen et al., 2008; Muthuri, 2008; Muthuri et al., 2009), where empirical evidence, especially from 'difficult research' settings, has been limited. In the next section, we will pay some attention to existing insights, and how they are approached in this study to create a framework for analysis. This is followed by an explanation of our sample and methodology, a presentation and discussion of findings, and conclusions and implications.

BUSINESS, CONFLICT AND COLLABORATION

In the past decade, attention has increased for the role of business in conflict areas, including the issues that multinational companies (MNCs) face when operating in such contexts, sometimes also highlighting their positive, possibly 'leading-edge' involvement (e.g. Bais and Huijser, 2005; Bennett, 2002; Gerson, 2001; Haufler, 2004; Jamali and Mirshak, 2010; Kolk and Lenfant, 2009; Nelson, 2000; Oetzel et al., 2007). MNCs can take individual actions or supplement those undertaken by others (Bennett, 2002; Oetzel et al., 2007). Looking at types of activities, companies can play a role to address conflict directly (for example, via security arrangements, negotiations or withholding payments) or indirectly via lobbying governments or other relevant actors, or by supporting philanthropic activities (Oetzel et al., 2007).

How companies react to conflict situations is part of a broader literature on business for peace that has increased in attention in the past decade, as shown by a 2010 issue of

Journal of Business Ethics fully dedicated to Peace Through Commerce, and other publications by both academics and practitioners (Fort and Schipani, 2004; International Alert, 2005; Wengler and Mockly, 2003). 'Business for peace' covers the more generic contributions of business to further the cause of peace regardless of whether they are directly involved in a conflict zone. The business-peace nexus has been examined through various lenses. One has concentrated on business in conflict zones, with a clear emphasis on embracing 'do no harm policies' or implementing codes of conduct or multistakeholder schemes to certify 'conflict' commodities. Another has focused on the role of the private sector in contributing to economic development as a prerequisite for stability and peace, or through studying the role of a particular industry (such as tourism, sports, or mining). Business for peace has been looked at from different disciplines, particularly political science and international relations (Bennett, 2002; Haufler, 2002, 2004; Wolf et al., 2007), and management, including business ethics and business and society perspectives (e.g. Fort and Schipani, 2004; Nelson, 2000; Warhurst, 2005). Typically, MNCs' reactions to conflict are determined by a variety of factors such as conflict intensity, geographical location, investment structure, firm size, firm experience, industry, firm type/ownership and stakeholder pressure (Berman, 2000; Oetzel et al., 2007), but very few empirical studies have been carried out to examine the exact drivers of companies' reaction in a given conflict context. However, while hard evidence and empirical research is lacking, there seems to be consensus about the fact that not all business fosters peace, but that ethical business does (Fort, 2010).

Strategies that ethical companies can deploy to promote peace can be divided into five main categories (Fort and Schipani, 2004; Oetzel et al., 2010): promoting economic development, enhancing the rule of law, contributing to a sense of community, engaging in track two diplomacy, or engaging in conflict sensitive practices. Similar models developed in the practitioner-oriented literature (International Alert, 2005; Nelson, 2000) categorized activities that business can carry out to promote peace according to the following channels: *core business*, i.e. maintain operations to generate wealth and provide jobs (cf. Bais and Huijser, 2005; Fort and Schipani, 2004); *social investment*, i.e. support humanitarian efforts (Gerson and Colletta, 2002) or engage in partnerships that help address the main drivers of conflict, particularly corruption, poverty and social inequality (Bennett, 2002; Nelson, 2000); or *policy dialogue*, i.e. engage in track two diplomacy or provide incentives to warring parties to engage in peace talks (Zandvliet, 2005). A distinction is also made between three strategies: compliance, do no harm and peace building (Nelson, 2000). Other frameworks have been designed that categorize possible business strategies into direct or indirect influences on the conflict on the one hand, and unilateral or collaborative interventions on the other hand (Oetzel et al., 2007). These interventions can take place at micro, meso or macro levels, and before, during or after a conflict (International Alert, 2005; Zandvliet, 2005).

The role of collaborative activities is mentioned very often in relation to conflict, also in co-creating a more sustainable peaceful society. Several publications emphasise the added value for business to engage in partnerships with other actors in (post)conflict settings (e.g. Bais and Huijser, 2005; Haufler, 2002; Haufler and Ballentine, 2005; Kolk and Lenfant, 2009), but evidence on such collaboration is very limited. This is partly due to the fact that governments and NGOs have traditionally been seen as quintessential actors with a 'mandate' or responsibility for dealing with peace and conflict issues (Barnes, 2005). This is in a sense comparable with the broader area of partnerships for development, where public-nonprofit collaboration has had a much longer history than those involving business (Kolk et al., 2008). Another factor that may explain the lack of studies is the absence of data about business activities in conflict countries due to the difficult setting and the sensitivities surrounding it, as well as the complexities of collecting information on the ground. Hence, while partnerships have received increasing research attention overall, as outlined in the introduction, this does not apply to partnerships in conflict countries, and even less those in Africa, a region underexposed in research on business and corporate social responsibility more generally, except for Nigeria and South Africa (Kolk and Lenfant, 2009; Kolk and Van Tulder, 2010; Visser, 2006). The relevance of partnerships involving business in conflict countries in Africa seems high, however, particularly given the often large corporate presence, and their potential impact on creating conditions for a (more) peaceful situation, a likely prerequisite for development, in the context of a governance vacuum and the absence of a clear and reliable regulatory framework. We focus on business-NGO collaboration, in which NGOs often link to or represent broader constituencies, including local communities, a linkage that we explore as well.

In conflict countries, MNCs can learn from NGOs how to operate in conflict prone zones or how to engage with communities in areas where governments have failed to provide them with basis services. NGOs have extensive knowledge of the local context, and engage in a variety of activities with regard to peace building (for example, those that involve early warning, advocacy, socialisation, social cohesion, service provision and intermediation between various parties) (World Bank, 2006). Despite criticism on NGOs concerning (in)effectiveness or lack of accountability (e.g. Goodhand, 2006; Uvin, 1999), their track record in fragile settings is widely recognised (Barnes, 2005). Typically, publications on business-NGO partnerships in conflict countries emphasise that they should involve more than a provision of funds (Haufler and Ballentine, 2005; World Bank, 1998) and move beyond a restricted humanitarian response to a more strategic involvement (Ward, 2004) in order to achieve a greater impact in promoting peace and development. Contributing to sustainable community development can be seen of part of such strategies, which is particularly relevant for MNCs (Ite, 2007; Newell and Frynas, 2007), also in the context of corporate innovation.

Community-business interaction in Africa has received attention most notably in relation to Nigeria, with studies taking a critical look at oil companies' impact on and engagement strategy with local communities, especially Shell's relationship with the Ogoni communities (Eweje, 2006, 2007; Idemudia and Ite, 2006; Ite, 2004, 2007; Wheeler et al., 2002). Studies that examined the usefulness, relevance and impact of MNCs' involvement in community development initiatives revealed their inability to integrate community expectations (Eweje, 2006, 2007). Improving business-community communication (Idemudia, 2007) and managing community expectations in the context of dysfunctioning governments so as to avoid/diminish conflicts (Eweje, 2006; Garvin et al, 2009; Idemudia and Ite, 2007; Wheeler et al., 2002) is not only relevant in Nigeria, but also in the DRC, a country ranking among the world's weakest in terms of governance (Brookings Institution, 2008). In such contexts, corporate community engagement activities, such as philanthropy and corporate donations, have been criticized for failing to address the challenges faced by poor communities (Manteaw, 2008; Muthuri, 2008) or tackle the root causes of conflict (Idemudia and Ite, 2006). Business-led community development initiatives can then do more harm than good and be potentially disruptive (Akpan, 2006; Idemudia and Ite, 2006; Ite 2004). In the DRC context, this is compounded by the fact that extractive activities have often had a negative impact due to dislocation, issues surrounding land and property rights, environment degradation and social disruption. In that light, partnerships give MNCs an opportunity to take local needs into account and address relevant issues, including how to reduce conflict and/or further peace and development (cf. Nwankwo et al., 2007). However, to what extent there is collaboration, what this entails in terms of types and focus on conflict is unclear; this is what will be explored below. Before moving to the empirical study, we will first indicate how we approach partnerships in a conflict setting.

In examining collaborative activities between firms and NGOs in the DRC, we have taken Austin (2000) as starting point, especially his collaboration continuum, with philanthropic on one end, and integrative on the other. However, this model was shown to be difficult to apply even in 'normal or typical' CSR projects (Jamali and Keshishian, 2009), let alone in conflict settings, where partnerships' objectives often seem much broader, also in community terms, beyond the organisational realms. We have thus adjusted Austin's continuum to be more in line with the specific context, particularly with regard to the 'intermediate', transactional stage. Accordingly, we consider *philanthropy* as similar to Austin (2000), in that it is a charitable activity with a donor and a recipient, and "low levels of corporate-community interaction" (Muthuri, 2008, p. 185). This is comparable to the traditional approach towards community participation as noted by Muthuri et al. (2009), and the transactional type distinguished by Bowen et al. (2008).

Different from Austin (2000), but more in line with the developmental period of Muthuri et al. (2009), we have 'relabelled' transactional to '*engagement*', in the sense that there is community-company or company-NGO interaction, exchange of knowledge and information, often organized as a platform, but not necessarily involving transfer of funds. We made a distinction between engagement with funds (i.e. involving a service delivery element, with a learning component, yet no broad community impact) and engagement without funds, i.e. engagement exclusively based on an exchange of knowledge or skills. Such engagement includes multi-stakeholder dialogues, peace fora or company appraisals. Learning, exchanging information on issues salient in conflict settings, such as governance, revenue transparency, the elimination of conflict diamonds, artisanal mining, or violence against women, and getting to know one another seem to prevail above concrete activities funded by companies in a 'transaction' mode. This type of engagement seems more suitable in conflict settings in that it is meant to build trust and confidence and address issues directly related to conflict. A recent study examining cross-sector collaboration and public-private partnerships in fragile states designed a partnership framework in conflict zones which emphasized the importance of inclusive and flexible engagement for building trust and gaining credibility among communities (Abramov, 2010). We did not follow the 'transitional' term used by Bowen et al. (2008) for this second type as it suggests that this is an 'in-between'.

The most intensive form of collaboration is what we refer to as *transformation*, which in some respects resembles what both Austin (2000) and Muthuri et al. (2009) designated as 'integrative', and Bowen et al. (2008) as transformational. However, as our focus is on the societal implications, i.e. possible effects on conflict and community interaction/involvement, and not so much on the impact on the organizations (i.e. whether or not it integrates or is integrated), transformation seems a better characterization than integration.[1] Austin (2000, p. 77) did mention, in relation to his collaboration value construct, that partners could also "come together out of a joint concern about addressing a particular social problem". It is on this approach that we build, with the 'value' to be derived from the collaboration relating to the (co-)creation of a peaceful context from which communities (and/or NGOs representing their interests or working with them) and business can profit. Transformative partnerships have a strong sustainable community development focus, address issues that are highly relevant in conflict settings, and are geared towards building or strengthening communities' capabilities.

It should be noted that our study did not aim to (and could not) assess community impact; in that sense we focus on the intentions of the partners, not so much the outcome. Measuring the effectiveness of cross-sectoral partnerships is not an easy endeavour (Kolk et al., 2008; Lund-Thomsen, 2009) as monitoring and evaluation systems are rarely part of collaboration agreements (Rein and Stott, 2009), and baseline assessments and consensus about suitable criteria to measure effectiveness are usually lacking (Lund-Thomsen, 2009, Van Huijstee et al., 2007). This becomes even more difficult in complex settings, such as those characterized by weak governance and by conflicts, given the high degree of sensitivity of collaboration, the absence of standardized and reliable figures, the lack of formalization, and the different institutional norms (Kolk et al., 2008). Measuring the impact of partnerships is compounded by so-called attribution problems if partnerships address a web of complex interrelated issues in which other actors are 'intervening' as well, which makes it close to impossible to assess 'causal' relationships. To fully understand projects' (partial) success or failure, the analysis needs to go beyond the traditional input-output-outcome methodology and "incorporate the role of politics and power struggles between different actors in local settings" (Lund-Thomsen, 2009, p.59). An examination of the impact of such collaboration is something for future work, but for now, given the dearth of research on this topic, we thought it would be worthwhile to first of all obtain some more insight into what collaborative activities may be found in a conflict setting and how they can be characterized. This is what will be done next. We will offer some reflections on impact in the final section of the paper after our presentation and examination of the findings.

SAMPLE AND METHODOLOGY

In order to explore business-NGO collaboration in a conflict setting, we selected companies operating in the DRC following the criteria used in other research (Kolk and Lenfant, 2009). As comprehensive data(bases) on companies in that context are not easily available, we first looked at those companies appearing in the 2010 largest lists and those mining companies with net assets higher than $200 million. This resulted in only 13 companies, too small a sample to draw conclusions regarding business-NGO collaboration. As smaller companies may also be influential in conflict resolution activities at a local level (cf. Johnson, 2010), the sample was enlarged by taking two extra criteria into consideration: first, relatively small ('junior') mining companies with minimum net assets of $5 million to account for this relatively important sector with emerging activities; second, companies from other sectors with a minimum annual turnover of $10 million to include those ‘middle-range’ companies that are not necessary global (such as Mwana Africa, BRC Diamond, African Metals, African Rainbow Minerals, Africo Resources, JFPI Corp, MAG industries, Aden Services) but with a large regional presence, especially in Africa, and perhaps better local ‘knowledge’ as well.

This resulted in a sample of 59 companies, of which a majority (n=31 or 52%) operate in the extractive industries (n=6 in oil and gas; n=25 in mining). The remainder was spread over other sectors ranging from banking (n=4), food services (n=4) to telecommunication (n=6). A majority of the companies (64 %) originates from Western/OECD countries, of which 13 (22%) from Canada; all 13 are active in the extractive industries. Interestingly, we found a number of companies from emerging markets (seven from South Africa, three from China, one from India, two from the DRC, and one from Angola). This shows the importance of South-South economic and business linkages (including the emergence of Chinese companies) and a clear presence of South Africa in the African mining sector. For the 59 companies, we collected in the period January-June 2010 the latest available reports and other company information if available, and did an extensive web search. In addition, a questionnaire was sent in both English and French to obtain information on their collaborative activities, to which 15 responded. A more detailed list of companies and sources available is included in Table 1, which we will discuss in the next section.

In a second step, given that this paper focuses on collaboration between business and NGOs and that obtaining information from the latter perspective would be helpful as well, we identified all international NGOs with a major presence in the DRC. To this end, web search, databases (Oxfam, Irin, Congo planet, Wango) and the extensive network of one of the authors (who has vast experience in working with NGOs in the region) were used to select those NGOs that were likely to be knowledgeable of partnership activities and/or active themselves: IRC, Oxfam NL, Cordaid, 11.11.11, IKV-Pax, Justice and Peace, Search for Common Ground, International Alert, Pact, Amnesty International, Merlin, Catholic Relief Services, World Vision, Broederlijk Delen, Business Council for Peace, Business Humanitarian Forum, Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed conflict, International Crisis Group, Life and Peace Institute, NIZA, Corporate Engagement Project, and RAID. An email was sent to representatives of these NGOs asking them whether they knew or were involved in partnership cases in the DRC, resulting in a response rate of 82%. We then established contacts with local NGOs - Pole Institute and 12 regional Congolese NGO platforms – to check the partnership activities already identified and possibly identify more cases. An e-mail was sent (yielding six responses) which confirmed what we already found. Subsequently semi-structured interviews were conducted with staff involved in partnerships within Search for Common Ground, Pact, Pole, and the Corporate Engagement Project; these NGOs were selected because of their strong orientation on conflict resolution. We also examined other documentation from the NGOs, including annual plans and reports, and information from websites.

The company information was used to explore companies' approaches to conflict (building on Jamali and Mirshak, 2010; Oetzel et al., 2007; Wolf et al., 2007). Furthermore, company information served, together with the data obtained from NGOs as just described, to analyse whether and in what type of partnership activities companies were involved (building on Austin, 2000; Muthuri et al., 2009).

FINDINGS

Overview of companies, their peculiarities and community orientation

Table 1 gives an overview of the 59 companies in our sample, and their details as to sector, size of turnover, and country of origin. Moreover, it also shows (in the last two columns) whether the companies have provided information in reports or websites in relation to conflict, and whether they responded to the questionnaire. The Table is sorted according to the categories we identified by building on existing literature on business and conflict (Jamali and Mirshak, 2010; Kolk and Lenfant, 2009; Oetzel et al., 2007): ‘avoidant’, ‘business as usual’ and ‘conflict resolution’. The first category, ‘avoidant’, includes companies that neither disclose much information nor answered our questionnaire. Second, ‘business as usual’ is used for those companies that provide some information, and usually discuss community aspects, but are not specific about the (DRC) conflict setting and keep it generic. Third, ‘conflict resolution’ involves those companies that communicate / respond and show awareness of the dilemmas of operating in a conflict setting and the possible role of business. Some more details and examples of companies’ statements will be given below.

================

Table 1 around here

================

Before moving to that information, it is important to note that the three categories are not ‘normative’ labels, but are rather meant to assess the extent to which companies take a public position on conflict and their role in it, whether they show awareness of the setting in which they operate, or avoid communicating about it. What companies state publicly is not necessarily what they do in reality; companies can, for example, be active in lobbying or undertake activities that they do not report. However, the latter component, as far as partnering with NGOs is concerned, could have been captured by the fact that we approached NGOs as well. A final caveat is that we, following Jamali and Mershak (2010), used categories while a continuum might better portray the situation. Despite these limitations, we still found it helpful to give some more insight into how much openness there is amongst companies active in a conflict setting, and to what extent they communicate on / show awareness of its peculiarities. This is a different approach than a purposeful sample amongst a small set of companies that have already shown to be leading in terms of recognition of their role in conflict, as done by, for example, Jamali and Mershak (2010).

As shown in Table 1, a large majority of the companies in our sample (n=37 or 63%) falls in the 'business-as-usual' category, 24% (n=14) can be characterised as 'avoidant', while very few (n=8 or 14%) are explicit about conflict resolution. In line with Kolk and Lenfant (2009), these findings point at companies' limited openness and recognition of conflict sensitivity in their operations. If we look at industry, country of origin or turnover of the companies in the 'avoidant' category, the majority did not disclose information about their turnover. There seems to be no direct relationship with industry or country of origin: 10 out of 14 (71%) come from Western/OECD countries (figure for total sample is 64%), and 8 out of 14 (57%) operate in the extractive industries (figure for the total sample is 52%). With regard to the business-as-usual group (n=37), 24 (65%) come from Western/OECD countries, while 15 (41%) are active in the extractive industry. Conflict resolution companies are typically extractive companies, with six (75%) from OECD countries and the other two from South Africa, suggesting that corporate social responsibility awareness in home countries might play a role, as does the industry. However, these observations should be treated with caution in view of the limited sample size overall.

If we consider what companies state on websites and in reports about their involvement in the communities in which they operate (not specifically in the DRC), this is mostly rather generic. A search for 'motivations' for their activities shows a diverse set of statements. These range from obtaining a social license to operate (De Beer, Metorex), to ensuring that communities are better off as a result of their presence (AngloGoldAshanti), to seeking to earn the consent and the support of the communities (Anglo American), to building strong supportive relations with local communities (Banro, MagIndustries, Rangold, De Beer, Engen). A relatively small percentage of companies (9%) considers community investments as a sustainable business strategy, indicating an alignment between business logics and social investments. Benefits that companies mention to derive from community development are "creating long term social value" (Standard Bank), "reputational enhancement, greater community goodwill and stronger, more stable and supportive communities" (BHP, Freeport), linking the "wellness of communities and the success of our business " (Standard Bank), "maintaining our lead position and ….. to better understand the nature of the competitive field and business environment" (Engen), and "community investment is most effective and lasting if it meets both business and social needs" (Katanga). Rangold states its commitment "to the integration of sustainable environmental and social impact management into its business activities" while Engen's community engagement efforts "provide the opportunity to build important relationships and to engage with people who have decision-making power over Engen", which seems in line with existing frameworks accounting for companies' reaction to stakeholder claims and demands based on power relationships (Calvano, 2008; Holzer, 2008).

Interestingly, only one company (Randgold) openly states that community development is "instrumental for allaying suspicions and conflicts". With regard to the dilemmas faced by extractive companies in terms of combining their core activity of mining finite resources with their commitment to sustainable community development, Anglo American is one of four companies (AGA, BHP Billiton and De Beer are the other three) that is open about the fact that there is a natural tension between "community expectations and the level of sustainable benefits which can be delivered by resource companies, but this can be mitigated through a healthy and transparent process of dialogue". More companies refer to consultation with communities and activities carried out in cooperation with community members. A community liaison committee (Rangold), community liaison forum (Engen), or community advisory panels (Freeport) were typically mentioned as being used to share information openly with community constituents, gather input, address areas of mutual concerns and capture communities' priorities to translate them into concrete actions.

Only three companies (Engen, De Beer and Katanga) explicitly stated that their community investment strategies were in support of government priorities, thus addressing criticisms that private actors' intervention in social areas undermine government capacity and are therefore likely to be counterproductive (Ite, 2005). This issue is even more salient in the DRC context where government authorities, especially in the Eastern provinces, are either absent or not functioning, leaving non-state actors that have a genuine interest in providing social services with a dilemma: waiting for the government to be capable enough to formulate and execute a social plan, or provide services unilaterally or collaboratively, based on needs expressed by the communities themselves or by non-state units acting on their behalf. The type of collaborative activities that can be found in the DRC will be discussed next.

Partnership activities

On the basis of the data collected from and about companies and NGOs, we classified the partnerships' activities in different categories, as explained above: philanthropy, engagement and transformation. Table 2 gives an overview, sorted by company. The second category, 'engagement', turned out to comprise business-NGO collaboration involving transfer of funds (in which NGOs were paid for service delivery with a learning component) and those without it, in which there is only exchange of knowledge and/or skills.

================

Table 2 around here

================

We found 39 partnerships in the DRC involving a company from our sample with one or more partners. Of these 39 partnerships, 22 are philanthropic, 13 engagement (of which 8 involved transfer of funds and 5 did not), and 4 transformative partnerships. They are undertaken by 17 companies (out of the 59, or 29%) in total; of these 17, 8 have just one partnership (generally philanthropic), 9 have multiple ones. Some restrict this set of activities to philanthropy only (Africo Resources, Heineken, Texaf); others combine philanthropy and engagement (Banro, Vodacom); or engage in all three main categories (AngloGoldAshanti, Katanga, Freeport-Tenke); Anvil combines engagement and transformation. Below we will first examine different types of partnerships and then pay some attention to the companies.

Philanthropic partnerships in the DRC are typically small scale, address societal issues such as health, safety, education, infrastructure, and HIV/Aids, and are based on a clear donor–recipient model. This involves the mere provision of funds for 'entertainment' purposes (funding of a festival in the case of Heineken), for purchasing products (wheelchairs in the case of Africo Resources; medical equipment to hospitals or education material to schools in the case of Celtel) or for 'infrastructural'/logistic components such as repairing hospitals (Celtel, First Quantum). Frequent beneficiaries of philanthropic partnerships are children homes, orphanages, churches, and/or other charitable organisations. While these types of activities are highly important in a region devastated by decades of conflict and government dysfunction, they can only address part of the problem. In the case of the health sector, for example, it is also crucial that there is enough medical staff with sufficient skills who receive their salaries regularly. Philanthropic partnerships do not take a more comprehensive view and mostly tend to operate in isolation, not being part of a larger regional or national health or education planning.

Somewhat differently, partnerships classified as *engagement* go beyond resource transfer with some community involvement. First Quantum and Pact for example, address female literacy and village farming, Banro and Fondation Femme focus on HIV/Aids education for women, and Vodacom and Cell Life developed software to provide information for HIV/Aids patients. These collaborative activities do not have the same integrated, community-wide sustainable development approach as their transformative counterparts (see below), and miss a conflict lens in both partnership design and execution. It could be argued that engagement without the transfer of funds may have a transformative purpose, yet the transformation takes place at the organisational level, between the partners, building trust, enabling learning and exchange, instead of at the community level. Engagement in the form of partnerships thus resonates with other engagement forms, such as a multistakeholder forum, whereby NGOs involve companies to adhere to standards or improve their practices. This engagement form is highly relevant in a context of a governance vacuum, such as a conflict region, where guidelines for and habits of peaceful interaction are neither inherent to business practice nor fully integrated in existing codes such as the OECD guidelines for MNCs (how to operate properly in weak governance zones, including how to interact with rebels, for example).[2]

Not surprisingly, those engagement partnerships that involve transfer of funds encompass collaboration between companies and service delivery NGOs, while in those joint activities without funding, watchdog, lobby and research NGOs are mostly active. NGO partner type is thus related to the resource transfer mode. In the DRC, the private sector is under high scrutiny from lobby and advocacy NGOs such as Global Witness and Human Rights Watch, which makes funding-based engagement virtually impossible due to the accusations that these NGOs would face of being co-opted were they to receive funds from companies. Quite some NGOs in this category have an explicit policy not to accept resources from the private sector.

Transformative partnerships have a sustainable development community focus, addressing issues that are relevant to conflict settings; they can play a role in helping diminish problems by building/strengthening local capabilities. While limited in number, they also stand out with regard to the position taken by companies. In the partnership between Katanga, Pact and local communities, for example, the company sees its role not only in terms of providing funds but also in taking “a leadership role in developing social development programmes, including facilitating and motivating partners and donors and leveraging third-party funds, fostering self-sufficiency, mobilising communities to take responsibility for their own futures”. In the Anvil-Pact partnership, which aims at capacity building of village water committees, the transformative aspect originates precisely from the different roles played by both parties: Anvil provides technical training in pump repair and management, while Pact provides support in community mobilisation and ownership of the pumps.

In fragile conflict settings, companies appear to need the knowledge and expertise of NGOs for their community engagement endeavours. For that matter, NGOs often act as a buffer for community relations. Pact, for example, coordinates community relations of six mining companies in the DRC through the organisation of village-based workshops during which communities assess their existing community development situation, set goals for change and develop plans to address their priorities in this respect. The Anvil-Pact partnership also seeks to enhance the company’s understanding of what it takes to do business in the DRC by making sense of the existing, sometimes confusing standards such as the OECD guidelines on conducting business in developing countries. In another partnership, Care assists Banro in conducting needs assessments and baseline studies in order to identify and analyse communities’ priorities in terms of infrastructure rehabilitation and livelihoods.

All companies involved in transformative partnerships are extractive companies and operate in Eastern Congo, where bouts of violence occur regularly. Two of the four companies have been exposed to NGO criticism: AngloGoldAshanti (campaign led by Human Rights Watch) for offering logistical and financial support to a rebel group, and Anvil (campaign led by RAID) for “letting” the army use the company’s assets prior to perpetrating massacres. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the four companies’ activities are in the development or production phase, i.e. they have been involved in the DRC for quite some time now and maintained operations throughout the conflict. Some larger extractive companies with activities in the DRC (BHP, Anglo American and De Beer) are still in the exploration phase and do not have similar partnerships (only Anglo American reports a philanthropic one). This suggests that the stage/level of operational activity is also a factor that plays a role in the type of partnerships companies are engaged in. Companies such as Mag Industries and Tullow, for example, clearly indicated not to have large or advanced enough operations in the DRC to engage in partnerships with NGOs. Tullow has not begun its exploration activities, which explains why they do not have “formalized engagement programmes with local or international NGOs yet”. De Beer and Chevron, for example, with a (still) limited presence in the DRC, but a large one in Angola, do have substantial transformative partnerships in the latter country.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper aimed to help shed more light on collaborative activities involving companies and NGOs in a conflict setting. While business-NGO partnerships have received much attention in recent years, insights have been obtained from research in ‘stable’ contexts, not from conflict-ridden countries where such collaboration may be even more crucial in building trust and capacity and in addressing governance problems given the absence of a reliable state. Data was collected from and about companies active in the Democratic Republic of Congo, using both primary and secondary sources (involving companies and NGOs). We analysed the positions taken by companies vis-à-vis the conflict based on their communications and categorised business-NGO partnership activities. While many companies are not very open about their (potential) role in conflict resolution, others pay attention to community aspects, although frequently not in the specific DRC setting in which they operate. The most 'aware' companies seem to be those originating from Western countries as well as South Africa and active in the extractive industries, with high levels of operational activities. Contributing to economic development and fostering a sense of community are the most typical peace-related activities carried out by those 'aware' companies. There was no evidence of businesses engaging in track two diplomacy or policy dialogue, either unilaterally or collaboratively. In our findings, most companies are compliant, or at best adopt 'do no harm' strategies, while very few pro-actively engage in peace-building activities.

A majority of the partnerships found in this study are philanthropic, and deal with 'traditional' issues such as health, safety, and HIV/Aids in a donor-recipient mode with limited community involvement. There are only a few real transformative partnerships, which address aspects directly related to the conflict, have a community-wide, sustainable community development focus and are characterised by a mix of mutual learning, project implementation, and capacity/institution building. In between these two types, we found so-called 'engagement' collaboration which can be divided into activities including the transfer of funds, and those without it. While the former is mostly oriented at service delivery, the latter seems particularly relevant in the conflict context as well since it is based on knowledge exchange that furthers companies' awareness of conflict-sensitive issues into their operations (i.e. how to deal with rebels and with artisanal miners, how to reduce violence against women) and thus indirectly helps reduce conflict via the organisational route.

This is a type of community development innovation, also visible in transformative partnerships, that may have an impact on how companies deal with conflict. This is something that can be diffused within the organisation as well, impinging on the micro level (internally, between managers and employees and possible other stakeholders (cf. Kolk et al., 2011); in the case of MNCs even across locations (Kolk and Van Tulder, 2010). While it relates to Austin's observation that companies are "seeking new strategies of engagement with their communities that will have greater corporate relevance and higher social impact" (Austin, 2000, p. 70) beyond philanthropy, the conflict dimension makes the engagement types that we distinguish somewhat specific and interesting to explore further for its broader existence and applicability. Our paper has sketched different collaboration venues for companies operating in conflict contexts to engage with local communities, in partnership with NGOs, to tackle poverty and conflict-related issues. In that light, it can be argued that transformative partnerships that (in)directly contribute to peace through reducing tensions and fostering a sense of togetherness among local communities are innovative forms of governance that business can promote, or participate in, as part of their corporate innovation strategy. It may also have its (trickle) effects within organizations and infuse new ways of thinking and behaviour on the part of both internal and external stakeholders (Kolk et al., 2011).

Table 3 summarises peculiarities of the different partnership forms distinguished in the paper, considering the type of NGOs that companies collaborate with, the degree to which conflict issues are addressed, the level of community involvement and the domain/focus of activity. As such, our classification in three main categories was inspired by Austin (2000) and Muthuri et al. (2009). Muthuri et al. (2009) observed a shift in corporate community involvement over time from traditional (prior to 2000), to developmental (between 2000 and 2002), and integrative (2003-2006) based on a case study. Austin's collaboration continuum also suggests an evolution of partnerships according to three different stages from philanthropic to transactional and subsequently integrative, along seven dimensions. His model, which helps "understand what kinds of transformation would be required to move to a different point on the continuum" (Austin, 2000, p. 90), posits that cross-sector collaboration is meant to develop according to specific drivers and enablers. It should be noted, however, that our findings in a conflict setting seem different. This may be (partly) due to the different geographical peculiarities (US/Western in the case of Austin, DRC in our paper), and political and organisational settings (‘peace’ and stability versus conflict and low governance).

================

Table 3 around here

================

In our sample, there is no evidence of time-bound evolution or a continuum from one collaboration type to another. While we only considered the existing partnerships at one specific moment (unlike what Austin did), we were able to get some insight into background and development of the various initiatives. On the basis of our results, it looks as if in conflict settings, the range of collaboration modes is quite wide, and does not follow a linear path leading to an ultimate form (presumably the transformative partnership then). It should be noted, though, that Austin (2000, p. 72) also mentioned that “progression along the continuum is not automatic”; however, his addition that “regression can occur” appears more focused on a time-bound evolution than we think to be likely for a conflict setting such as the one we analysed in our paper.

We also found a relatively unique partnership type, engagement without funds, which is based on knowledge exchange or mutual learning among lobby/advocacy NGOs and companies. This collaboration form appears to be fairly recent, especially in conflict settings where the relationship was typically hostile and confrontational, as evidenced by the myriad of reports written and campaigns led by the former against the latter. More generally, there seems to be a general shift in engagement strategies from a sectoral point of view. Business and NGOs are more inclined nowadays to interact positively with one another in an African conflict setting, which is a trend also observed in non-conflict settings (e.g. Yaziji and Doh, 2009). Learning via partnerships in conflict settings seems less related to the partnering process itself than to the issues and the context in which both companies and NGOs operate.

Still, this is something that deserves further research, given that our study and sample was limited, not only in numbers but also in its focus on just one conflict country. In this regard, it is notable that even though our findings indicate that engagement without funds is not necessarily suitable for evolving into a more integrated, or transformative partnership, one case (the Care-Banro partnership) developed from the engagement into the transformative type. In that specific instance, engagement served both the company (Banro) and the NGO (Care), which shared an interest in contributing to peaceful societies and sustainable community development, to get to know each other before committing to a transformative partnership. The community needs assessment conducted by Care led to the design of a community-based development programme for the next 10 years in partnership with the company.[3]

Hence, while our study helps to provide more insight into the role of business-NGO collaboration, follow-up research is necessary, also in other settings and with broader sets of companies and partners. Investigation of the actual impact on communities needs further attention as well, as this was beyond the scope of this paper. In the cases that we examined, we found no evidence of objective, independent evaluations of the partnerships. There was no systematic assessment of partnership benefits (and goals being attained) at company, NGO, community or issue levels. We did not specifically ask to review partnership contractual agreements where goal-setting and the definition of verifiable indicators on how to measure progress would typically be mentioned, but evidence that these existed at all is lacking as well. In some cases, such as engagement without funds, it is very likely that no formal agreement has been set on paper with clear goals and indicators since this collaboration type is more akin to a process or a dialogue platform where learning takes place. While in most cases, partnership objectives or goals were formulated, we found very little data concerning indicators (with the exception of the Anvil-Pact partnership).

At the company level, we found the following information. AngloAmerican and De Beer use a socio-economic impact assessment toolbox for all of their community supporting initiatives. Katanga's programs and investments have been developed through a data-driven, risk management framework. BHP-Billiton touches upon the necessity to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of their community investment programs and Metorex reports "continually improving community development and community investment programs through monitoring, measuring and managing our social and economic impacts". Nevertheless, these companies did not provide much details about their monitoring and evaluation methodologies. For those partnerships that were completed at the time of the writing, in most cases, some information was available on whether the immediate goals were attained or not: for example, 85 km of roads have been repaired (AAA-AGA), training sessions have been provided (Freeport-Pact), medicines have been distributed (Katanga-Cure), the conflict assessment has been done (CEP-Anvil), and consultations have been held (AGA-Pole). Typically, the information provided is at output level. Only in a handful of cases could we find information on outcome, such as villagers' access to local markets to sell their products or buy inputs (AAA, AGA), which led to a cost reduction and an improvement in their economic situation. What is systematically missing however, is information on outcome and impact, especially at the issue level: medicines were distributed, but there is no information whether this had an impact on decrease in mortality rates.

In development policy circles, evaluation methodologies typically use efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability as criteria to assess program impact. In the cases analysed in this paper, with regard to efficiency, little cost information was provided, which makes it difficult to make a cost-benefit analysis. Concerning effectiveness, goals were met at the output level, regardless of the type of partnership. The preference for transformative partnerships that emerges from this paper is based on relevance and sustainability rather than on effectiveness. Relevance refers to the extent to which the (planned) effects of the activities carried out within the partnerships contribute to the realization of the broader (developmental) goal, or impact. Philanthropic partnerships can be highly effective in meeting their goals at output level, without having a broader positive impact or bringing about positive changes in the broader conflict context. Other partnership studies also recommend taking the broader (development) context into account (Ashman, 2001; Kolk et al., 2008).

What this paper argues is that, despite its lack of verifiable indicators that would give an objective measurement of the effectiveness of the collaboration arrangements under scrutiny, in complex settings such as those in the DRC, transformative partnerships are best equipped to tackle root causes of conflict and bring about positive and sustainable change, thus ultimately serving the cause of peace. In the Central African context, collaboration agreements that do not take into account the conflict context, or do not address conflict-related issues such as ethnicity, identity, land, power and natural resources are less likely to be relevant or sustainable. Transformative partnerships are not constructed in a vacuum and aim at finding lasting solutions to problems directly related to conflict, whereas philanthropic partnerships are often 'one off', generic activities with no or little link to the (broader) conflict context.

Despite the limitations of our exploratory study, it can be said that partnership activities appear to have a clear potential in contributing to conflict reduction or resolution in regions where governance and institutional structures are in flux, and trust is low. This adds another dimension to the role of business in conflict countries, which has received increasing attention in recent years (e.g. Jamali and Mirshak, 2010; Kolk and Lenfant, 2009; Oetzel et al., 2007), as it helps to extend and involve a broader set of actors, that may together leverage more 'resources' for peace. While just one of the many steps needed, it may be a valuable contribution.

NOTES

[1] Likewise, while using ‘transformation’ as a noun, as adjective we do not use transformational but instead transformative, given that we focus much more on the process rather than the direct outcomes.

[2] <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/1/3/33760086.pdf>, last consulted 16 June 2010.

[3] <http://www.care.org/careswork/projects/ZAR040.asp>, last consulted 16 June 2010.

REFERENCES

Abramov, I. (2010). Building peace in fragile states. Building trust is essential for effective public-private partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*. DOI 10.1007/s10551-010-0402-8.

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

Andonova, L. B., Betsill, M. M., & Bulkeley, H. (2009). Transnational climate governance. *Global Environmental Politics, 9*(2), 52-73.

Ashman, D. (2001). Civil society collaboration with business: Bringing empowerment back in. *World Development*, *29*(7): 1097-1113.

Austin, J. E. (2000). Strategic collaboration between nonprofits and business. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *29*(1), Supplement, 69-97.

Bäckstrand, K. (2006). Multi-stakeholder partnerships for sustainable development: rethinking legitimacy, accountability and effectiveness. *European Environment*, *16*, 290-306.

Bäckstrand, K. (2008). Accountability of networked climate governance: The rise of transnational climate partnerships. *Global Environmental Politics*, *8*(3), 74-102.

Bais, K. & Huijser, M. (2005). *The profit of peace: Corporate Responsibility in conflict regions*. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.

Barnes, C. (2005). *CSOs, peace building and the power of partnerships.* Utrecht: Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict.

Bennett, J. (2002). Multinational corporations, social responsibility and conflict. *Journal of International Affairs*, *55*(2), 393-410.

Bowen, F., Newenham-Kahindi, A. & Herremans, I. (2008). *Engaging the community: A* *systematic review*. London, Ontario: Research Network for Business Sustainability, Knowledge Project Series, Vol. 1, Issue 1.

Braithwaite, J. & Drahos, P. (2000). *Global business regulation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brookings Institution (2008). *Index of State Weakness in the Developing World*. <http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2008/02_weak_states_index.aspx>

Calvano L. (2008). Multinational corporations and local community: A critical analysis of conflict. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *82*(4), 793-805.

Dahan, N. M., Doh, J. & Teegen, H. (2010). Role of nongovernmental organizations in the business–government–society interface: Special issue overview and introductory essay. *Business & Society, 49*(1), 20-34.

Eweje, G. (2006). The Role of MNEs in community development initiatives in developing countries. Corporate Social Responsibility at work in Nigeria and South Africa. *Business and Society*, *45*(2), 93-129.

Eweje, G. (2007). Multinational oil companies' CSR initiatives in Nigeria. The skepticism of stakeholders in host communities. *Managerial Law*, *49*(5/6), 218-235.

Forsyth, T. (2007). Promoting the 'development dividend' of climate technology transfer: Can cross-sector partnerships help? *World Development, 35*(10), 1684-1698.

Fort T. L. (2010). Peace through commerce : A multisectoral approach. *Journal of Business Ethics, 89*, 347-350.

Fort T. L. & Schipani, C. A. (2004). *The role of business in fostering peaceful societies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garvin T., McGee, T. K., Smoyer-Tomic, K. E. & Aubyn, E. A. (2009). Community–company relations in gold mining in Ghana. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *90*(1), 571-586.

Gerson, A. (2001). Peace building, the private sector role. *The American Journal of International Law*, *95*(102), 102-119.

Gerson, A. & Colleta, N. (2002). *Privatizing peace : From conflict to security.* Ardsley, NY: Transnational Publishers.

Goodhand, J. (2006). *Aiding peace? The role of NGOs in armed conflict.* Warwickshire: International Technology Publications.

Haufler, V. (Ed). (2002). *Case studies of multistakeholder partnerships*. New York: Global Compact.

Haufler, V. (2004). International diplomacy and the privatization of conflict resolution. *International Studies Perspectives*, *5*(2), 158-163.

Haufler, V. & Ballentine, K. (2005). *Economies of peace*. New York: Global Compact.

Holzer, B. (2008). Turning stakeseekers into stakeholders: A political coalition perspective on the politics of stakeholder influence. *Business and Society*, *47*(1), 50-67.

Hochschild, A. (1998). *King Leopold's Ghost*. London: McMillan.

Horton, D., Prain, G. & Thiele, G. (2009). *Perspectives on partnership: A literature review*. Lima, Peru: International Potato Center, working paper 2009-3.

Hudson, L.J. (2009). *The enabling state: Collaborating for success*. London: Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

Idemudia U. (2007). Community perceptions and expectations: reinventing the wheels of corporate social responsibility practices in the Nigerian oil industry. *Business and Society Review*, *112*(3), 369-405.

Idemudia U. & Ite, U. E. (2006). Corporate-community relations in Nigeria's oil industry: Challenges and imperatives. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *13*(4), 194-206.

International Alert (2005). *Conflict sensitive business practices: Guidance for extractive* *industries*. London.

IRC (2007). *Mortality in the Democratic Republic of Congo: An ongoing crisis*. International Rescue Committee.

Ite, U. E. (2004). Multinationals and corporate social responsibility in developing countries: A case study of Shell in Nigeria. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *11*(1), 1-11.

Ite, U. E. (2005). Poverty reduction in resource-rich developing countries: What have Multinational corporations got to do with it? *Journal of International Development, 17*(7), 913-929.

Ite, U. E. (2007). Changing times and strategies: Shell's contribution to sustainable community development in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Sustainable Development*, *15*(1), 1-14.

Jamali D. & Mirshak, R. (2010). Business-conflict linkages: Revisiting MNCs, CSR, and Conflict. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *93*, 443-464.

Johnson, M. (2010). A willingness to venture where oil majors fear to tread. *Financial Times*, 17 June.

Kolk, A., Van Dolen, W. & Vock, M. (2011). Trickle effects of cross-sector social partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, forthcoming.

Kolk, A. & Van Tulder, R. (2010). International business, corporate social responsibility and sustainable development. *International Business Review*, *19*(2), 119-125

Kolk, A., Van Tulder, R. & Kostwinder, E. (2008). Partnerships for development. *European Management Journal*, *26*(4), 262-273.

Kolk, A. & Lenfant, F. (2009). MNC reporting on CSR and conflict in Central Africa. *Journal of Business Ethics*. DOI 10.1007/s10551-009-0271-1.

Lund-Thomsen, P. (2009). Assessing the impact of public-private partnerships in the global

South: The case of the Kasur tanneries pollution control project. *Journal of Business Ethics, 90,* 57-78.

Manteaw, B. (2008). From tokenism to social justice: Rethinking the bottom line for sustainable community development. *Community Development Journal*, *43*(4), 428-443.

MSF (2005). Democratic Republic of the Congo: Another year of misery. *MSF Activity Report 2004/2005.*

Muthuri, J. N. (2008). Participation and accountability in corporate community involvement programmes: A research agenda. *Community Development Journal*, *43*(2), 177-193.

Muthuri, J. N., Chapple, W. & Moon, J. (2009). An Integrated Approach to Implementing 'Community Participation' in Corporate Community Involvement: Lessons from Magadi Soda Company. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *85*(2), 431-444.

Nelson, J. (2000). *The business of peace*. London: Prince of Wales Busines Forum.

Newell, P. & Frynas, J. G. (2007). Beyond CSR, business, poverty and social justice: An Introduction. *Third World Quarterly*, *28*(4), 669-681.

Nwankwo, E., Phillips, N. & Tracey, P. (2007). Social investment through community enterprise: The case of multinational corporations involvement in the development of Nigerian water resources. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *73*(1), 91-101.

Oetzel, J., Getz, K. A. & Ladek, S. (2007). The role of multinational enterprises in responding to violent conflict: A conceptual model and framework for research. *American Business Law Journal*, *44*(2), 331-358.

Oetzel, J., Westermann-Behaylo M., Koerber C., Fort T.L. & Rivera J. (2010). Business and peace: Sketching the terrain. *Journal of Business Ethics, 89*, 351-373

Reed, A. M. & Reed. D. (2009). Partnerships for development: Four models of business involvement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *90*, Supplement 1, 3-37.

Rein, M., & Stott L. (2009). Working together: Critical perspectives on six cross-sector partnerships in Southern Africa. *Journal of Business Ethics, 90,* Supplement 1, 79-89.

Selsky, J. W., & Parker, B. (2005). Cross-sector partnerships to address social issues: Challenges to theory and practice. *Journal of Management, 31*, 849-873.

UN (2010). Human Development Report. New York.

UN (2001). *Report of the Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo*. New York: United Nations.

Uvin, P. (1998). *Aiding violence: The development enterprise in Rwanda*. Bloomfield: Kumarian Press.

Van Huijstee, M. M., Francken, M. & Leroy, P. (2007). Partnerships for sustainable development: A review of current literature. *Environmental Sciences*, *4*(2), 75-89.

Visser, W. (2006). Research on corporate citizenship in Africa: A ten-year review (1995-2005). In W. Visser, M. McIntosh and C. Middleton (eds.). *Corporate citizenship in Africa: Lessons from the past; paths to the future*. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.

Ward, H. (2004). *Public sector's roles in strengthening CSR. Taking stock*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Wheeler D., Fabig, H. & Boele, R. (2002). Paradoxes and dilemmas for stakeholder responsive firms in the extractive sector: Lessons from the case of Shell and the Ogoni. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *39*(3), 297-318.

Warhurst, A. (2005). Future roles of business in society: the expanding boundaries of corporate responsibility and a compelling case for partnership. *Futures, 37*,(2/3), 151-168.

Wengler, A. & Mockly, D. (2003). *Conflict prevention: The untapped potential of the business sector.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Wolf, K.D., Deitelhoff, D. & Engert S. (2007). Corporate Security Responsibility: Towards a conceptual framework for a comparative research Agenda. *Cooperation and Conflict 42*(3), 294-320.

World Bank (1998). *Conflict prevention and post-conflict reconstruction: Perspectives and prospects*. Washington DC.

World Bank (2006). *Civil society and peacebuilding*. Washington DC.

World Bank (2010). *World Development Indicators*. Washington, DC.

Yaziji, M. & Doh, J. (2009). *NGOs and corporations. Conflict and collaboration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zandvliet, L. (2005). Opportunities for synergy: Conflict transformation and the corporate agenda. In Fischer, M., Gießmann, H., and Schmelzle, B. (eds.), *Berghof Handbook for conflict transformation*, Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.

TABLES

Table 1. Companies in the sample, sorted by 'conflict type', and peculiarities and sources of information

'Conflict' type	Company name	Turnover ($ million)	Country of origin	Industry	Report/site	Questionnaire returned
Avoidant	African metals	n/a	CAN	Mining	NO	NO
Avoidant	Avient limited	n/a	UK	Transport	NO	NO
Avoidant	Bollore	9,069	FRA	Transport	NO	NO
Avoidant	BRC Diamond - core	8	CAN	Mining	NO	NO
Avoidant	CHA Textile	n/a	CHI-HK	Textile	NO	NO
Avoidant	El nino ventures	n/a	CAN	Mining	NO	NO
Avoidant	Greenock resources inc	n/a	CAN	Mining	NO	NO
Avoidant	Groupe Blattner (GBE)	n/a	BE	Service and agro industries	NO	NO
Avoidant	Groupe Forrest International	n/a	BE	Mining and civil engineering	NO	NO
Avoidant	Hits Telecom	n/a	KUW	Telecommunications	NO	NO
Avoidant	Ics copper system	n/a	CAN	Mining	NO	NO
Avoidant	Rubamin	n/a	IND	Mining	NO	NO
Avoidant	Tiger Resources	1	AUS	Mining	NO	NO
Avoidant	ZTE Corporation	6,446	CHI	Telecommunications	NO	NO
Business as usual	Aden Services	10	CHI	Food services and facility	Yes Generic	Yes
Business as usual	African Rainbow Mineral	300	SAF	mining	Yes	No
Business as usual	Africo resources	n/a	CAN	Mining	Yes	No
Business as usual	Anglo American Plc	21,443	UK	Mining	Yes	Yes
Business as usual	BATA	n/a	SWI	manufacturing	Yes Generic	No
Business as usual	British American Tobacco	22,953	UK	Tobacco	Yes	No
Business as usual	Citigroup	112,372	US	Banking	Yes	No
Business as usual	Danzer Group	410	GER	Wood and wood products	Yes	No
Business as usual	DHL -Deutsche Post	66,19	GER	Transport	Yes	No
Business as usual	Engen	8,18	SAF	Oil and gas	Yes	No
Business as usual	ENRC	3,831	KAZ	Mining	Yes Generic	No
Business as usual	Finasucre	507	BE	Food and beverages	NO	Yes
Business as usual	First Quantum	1,903	CAN	Mining	Yes	No
Business as usual	Groupe Rawji	300	DRC	Food and soap	Yes Generic	No
Business as usual	Heineken	21,061	NL	Food and beverages	Yes	Yes
Business as usual	Heritage Oil	3	CAN	Oil and gas	Yes	Yes
Business as usual	Inpex Japan (Teikoku oil)	11,052	JAP	Oil and gas	Yes	No
Business as usual	JFPI Corp	2,7	ANG	Trade	NO	Yes
Business as usual	Land Rover	n/a	UK	Car manufacturing/trading	Yes	No
Business as usual	Mag industries	29	CAN	Mining	Yes Generic	Yes
Business as usual	Millicom International Cellular sa	3,373	LUX	Telecommunications	Yes Generic	No
Business as usual	Metorex	213	SAF	Mining	Yes Generic	No
Business as usual	Mwana Africa	12	CAN	Mining	Yes	No
Business as usual	ONA group	4,097	MAR	Trade	Yes Generic	No
Business as usual	Perenco oil	2,7	FRA	Oil and gas	Yes	No
Business as usual	PPR - CFAO Group	23,674	FRA	Trade	Yes Generic	No
Business as usual	PriceWaterHouseCoopers	26,171	UK	Consulting	Yes	No
Business as usual	ProCredit Bank Holding	533	GER	Banking	Yes	No
Business as usual	Randgold resources	338	UK	Mining	Yes	Yes
Business as usual	Rio-tinto	41,825	AUS-UK	Mining	Yes	No

‘Conflict’ type	Company name	Turnover ($ million)	Country of origin	Industry	Report/site	Questionnaire returned
Business as usual	Standard Bank	1,86	SAF	Banking	Yes	Yes
Business as usual	TAIHAN	2,13	KOR	Telecommunications	Yes Generic	No
Business as usual	Texaf	10	BE	Industrial investment/cotton	Yes Generic	Yes
Business as usual	Trust Merchant Bank	14.2	DRC	Banking	Yes Generic	No
Business as usual	Tullow Oil	940	UK	Oil and gas	Yes	Yes
Business as usual	Vodacom	7,3	SAF	Telecommunications	Yes	No
Business as usual	Celtel (Zain)	8,078	KUW	Telecommunications	Yes	No
Conflict resolution	AngloGoldAshanti	3,916	SAF	Mining	Yes	Yes
Conflict resolution	Anvil mining	49	CAN	Mining	Yes	Yes
Conflict resolution	Banro	n/a	CAN	Mining	Yes	No
Conflict resolution	BHP Biliton	54,661	AUS-UK	Mining	Yes	Yes
Conflict resolution	Chevron Texaco	159,387	US	Oil and gas	Yes	No
Conflict resolution	De Beer	3,84	SAF	Mining	Yes	No
Conflict resolution	Freeport /Tenke	15,04	US	Mining	Yes	Yes
Conflict resolution	Katanga Mining Ltd	140	CAN	Mining	Yes	No

Source (turnover, industry, nationalities): Company annual reports, 2009; 2010 largest 500 lists (FT Global, Fortune Global)

Table 2. Companies and partnerships, and peculiarities of these partnerships

Company name	Partner(s)	Activities	Domain	Type of collaboration	Response	Other/complementary information
Heineken	GTZ; Amo Congo; Ciel;	Rice development; HIV/ Aids testing;	Agriculture; Health	Philanthropic	Yes	Website
	Various local NGOs	Donations (medicine + food)	Health	Philanthropic	Yes	Website
Danzer Group	WWF	Tree conservation, planting, certification	Sustainable Forest Management	Engagement	No	Website + report
First Quantum	Pact	Literacy and farming	Community development	Engagement (1)	No	Website + report
AngloGoldAshanti	Pole, local government	Dialogue; consultation	Governance	Engagement	Yes	Website + various reports from company + NGO + interview NGO
	IKV Pax + HRW, CAFOD + local NGOs	Dialogue; consultation	Peace	Engagement	Yes	Website + various report from company
	Pact	Artisanal mining, capacity building, livelihood	Sustainable Community development	Transformative	Yes	Website + various report from company + NGO + interview NGO
	GTZ	Small business promotion	Economic development	Philanthropic	Yes	Website + various reports from company
	AAA	Road repair and maintenance	Infrastructure	Philanthropic	Yes	Website + various reports from company
Anvil Mining	CEP	Learning	Sustainable Community Development	Engagement	Yes	Website + various report from company + NGO + interview NGO
	Pact; USAID	Infrastructure, Health, Governance, Economic development, Water, capacity building	Sustainable Community development	Transformative	Yes	Website + various reports from company (Presentation) + NGO interview
Katanga	Pact	Infrastructure, Health, Governance, Economic Development, Water; education; capacity building	Sustainable Community development	Transformative	No	Website + report
	Cure	Medical shipment	Health	Philanthropic	No	Website + report
	PCI Rayon	Small business / literacy skills	Economic development	Engagement (1)	No	Website + report
	Gavi alliance	Community vaccination	Health	Engagement (1)	No	Website + report
	Arderi	Community farming	Agriculture	Engagement (1)	No	Website + report
Metorex	Direct assistance	School rehabilitation, water repair	Education; sanitation, infrastructure	Philanthropic	Yes	Website + report
Freeport – Tenke	Alba	School construction	Education	Philanthropic	Yes	Website + report
	Pact	Livelihood restauration; employment generation; capacity building	Sustainable Community development;	Transformative	Yes	Website + various report from company + NGO + interview NGO
	USAID; Pact; local NGO; Trust Merchant Bank	Loan fund guarantee	Economic development	Engagement (1)	Yes	Website + report
Africo Resources	Amocongo	HIV/Aids sensitization campaign	Health	Philanthropic	No	Website + report
	Arderi	Market gardening	Economic development	Philanthropic	No	Website + report
	Wheelchair for kids	Wheelchair donation	Health	Philanthropic	No	Website

Company name	Partner(s)	Activities	Domain	Type of collaboration	Response	Other/complementary information
Banro	BDD	Delivery Water supply	Sanitation	Philanthropic	No	Website + report
	Fondation Femme	HIV/Aids education	Health	Engagement (1)	No	Website + report
	Care International	Learning, needs assessment	Sustainable Community development	Engagement	No	Website + report(s)
	CRPL	Chimp rescue	Environment	Philanthropic	No	Website + report
	CAA	Protection of endangered primates	Environment	Philanthropic	No	Website + report
	David Smith Foundation	Medicine shipment	Health	Philanthropic	No	Website + report
	BDA Foundation	Development of commercial medicines + mobile health	Health	Philanthropic	No	Website + report
Perenco oil	Bunkete, Government	Pipe construction	Sanitation, waste management	Philanthropic	No	Website + report
Texaf	Don Bosco	Class construction, equipment provision	Education	Philanthropic	Yes	Website + presentation
	Chaine de l'Espoir	Surgeon mission	Health	Philanthropic	Yes	Website + presentation
Aden Services	Pact	Local business support	Economic development	Engagement (1)	Yes	Website
Celtel (Zain)	Nosha	Equipment donation	Sport; Education	Philanthropic	No	Website + report
JFPI	Various NGOs, UN agencies	Service delivery	Economic development	Philanthropic	Yes	Website + report
Anglo American	Care for Congolese Children	Donation	Education	Philanthropic	No (website referral)	Website + report
Vodacom	Cephephas	Purchase terrain	Health	Philanthropic	Yes	Website + report
	Cell life	Software development to provide info to patients	Health; HIV/Aids	Engagement (1)	Yes	Website + report

Engagement: exchange of knowledge, skills, without funds; Engagement (1): service delivery project with learning / skills exchange component with funds

Table 3. Some characteristics of the different types of partnerships

	Philanthropy	Engagement		Transformation
		with funds	without funds	
NGO type	Service Delivery	Service delivery	Watchdog	Service Delivery
Focus on conflict	Low	Low	Medium – High	High
Community involvement level	Low	Medium	Medium (indirect)*	High
Domain	Infrastructure / Health	Infrastructure / Health / Small business development	Learning / Assessment	Peace

*via organisational impact (company learning leading to improved practice with regards to company impact on community)