

Comprehending the nature of mine-community relationships from the locals' unspoken viewpoints in Geita, Tanzania

*Albert Tibaijuka*¹

Abstract

As it is widely observed, the operations of Multinational Mines (MMs) in rural communities like those in Africa have been generally opposed and sometimes causing violent conflicts. Exploration of the patterns of the relationship between the two sides is increasingly attracting attention of scholars. Public relations researchers are at the forefront, looking not only at the nature of such relationships but also means of gaining mutual understanding and partnership. Different strategies in addressing the relationship between the two parties have been embraced. Of recent, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programs have been championed by MMs as part of a solution. Although studies in the field of public relations and beyond have documented discourses and practices in CSR, a need to know how local communities perceive CSR initiatives aiming at addressing misunderstandings between them and MMs, remains central. Focusing on the interactions between a mining company and communities surrounding it in Geita, Tanzania, this study examines the accounts of community members in the area, to illuminate how their unspoken viewpoints on CSR practices reveal the nature of their relationship with the mining firm. Inspired by a critical theorization of social capital, and employing qualitative approaches (semi - structured interviews, and discourse analysis), the study depicts how community members' accounts, implicitly, point to a grieved community which considers the mining firm as one which distances itself from its neighbours. The study, therefore, serves as a quest to awaken the overseers of the country's mining laws and policies.

Keywords: Corporate social responsibility, local communities, multinational mines, public relations

¹Saint Augustine University of Tanzania, Mwanza, Tanzania
Email: tibaijuka76@gmail.com

Introduction

Since the countries of the so-called Third World reformed their mining sectors in the late 1970s and 1980s, communities in this region have become a host to enormous new sites of mineral exploration and development, operated by multinational mining companies (Bebbington et al., 2008; Haselip and Hilson 2005; Laplante and Spears, 2008; Szablowski, 2002). Despite the recorded third world's mining sector growth, the role of MMs as an essential component of new economic policies in developing countries has lately become a subject of intense academic debate. A rapidly growing body of research from political scientists, economists, business pundits, sociologists, anthropologists, public relations researchers, and so forth, dispute (a few convinced) the positive impact of the MMs on the economies of the third world as purported by the International Financial Institutions, which were behind the mining sector reforms in the region (Omeje, 2005; Rodrick, 2006). The scholars are as well criticizing MMs on their operational adversaries to the environment and communities of developing countries like Tanzania. Due to such circumstances, the global mining industry is increasingly being pressurized to address the implications of what Hilson (2011) calls MMs' "scramble for minerals in developing countries". The pressure, from NGOs, human rights and environmental activists, international business watchdogs, national governments and local communities demand mining companies to become more responsible within the localities where they operate. The extractive industry is being called upon to direct attention and resources to social problems far removed from its central economic mission (Ostlund, 1977).

The mentioned influence from pressure groups takes place at a time when MMs are also reported to have been more aware of a number of risks that may arise due to opposition from communities or other interested parties. MMs are progressively becoming conscious of being vulnerable, particularly to community opposition, which at times causes breakdowns or delays in parts of the integrated chain of investment, as a result of blockades, work stoppage, lawsuits, and the like (Laplante and Spears, 2008). Such awareness is said to be part of the reasons why MMs are increasingly seen assuming responsibility in local and national development (Vintro et. al., 2012). Since the early 1990s, the mining industry has shown increasing interest in social and environmental issues

and it has been seeking ways to enhance its sustainability levels. In this way, 'sustainable development' and 'ethical management' are now part of the agenda of the mining industry, as well as of the national and international monitors (Cowell et al., 1999; Hilson and Murck, 2000). It is from the above-stated influence from pressure groups and MMs' awareness of the mentioned risks, where the latter resorted into embracing CSR ideals (Anguelovski, 2011; Hilson, 2011; Walker and Howard, 2002).

Among the notable purposes of MMs' adoption of CSR initiatives, is that of developing programs and activities which assist in improving and managing community relations (Sethi, 1979). A number of scholars, including public relations researchers studying the operational behaviour of MMs, to societies and environment, seem to agree that CSR provides a suitable ground for studying the patterns of MMs' relations with local communities. Studies in the field of public relations and beyond have documented discourses and practices in CSR which are instrumental in creating, managing and improving relations between MMs and local communities. However, there appears to be limited attempts aiming at examining how local communities perceive the contribution of CSR on the same. The intention of this study therefore, was to examine the accounts of the communities surrounding GGM (a mining company owned by AngloGold Ashanti) in Geita, in order to illuminate how their unspoken viewpoints on CSR practices, draw our attention to (in)abilities of CSR in improving and managing relations between the two parties.

Defining public relations and Corporate Social Responsibility

This study understands Public Relations (PR) practices of MMs from the perspective of Cutlip, et al., (1994)², who regard PR as an organization's activity which aims at establishing and maintaining mutually beneficial relationships with all stakeholders (including the local communities). Such relationships, as

² Professor Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center published the first text book on the field of public relations in 1952 with the title "Effective Public Relations". It introduced the "Seven Cs of communication"- completeness and cooperation; conciseness; consideration; concreteness; courtesy; clearness; correctness

Ihlen (2005) notes, are the social capital³ of an organization. To be more specific, this conceptualization serves well in explaining why public relations should be studied as a social phenomenon - especially when organizations, through CSR activities, seek for a social license to operate. Historically, the practice of public relations, as Brunig and Ledingham (1999) clarify, has been grounded in a journalistic approach, and initially the field was concerned almost exclusively on generating publicity through the use of press agency. As the field evolved, the practice expanded to include activities such as publicity, advertising, public affairs, issues management, lobbying, investor relations, and development (ibid). Recently, examination of the relationship that exists between an organization and its critical publics has emerged as an intriguing and fruitful area of public relations scholarship (Sallot, 1999; Swart, 2012). PR practices today are more focused on issues such as social responsibility, environmental scanning, customer care and the like, because these activities help organizations to address their relational issues with stakeholders in a more direct way. It is opposite to promotion, propaganda, publicity etc., which were previously done to 'persuade', 'win' or sometimes 'trick' stakeholders.

Scholars such as Kent and Taylor (2002) also seem to agree with the above observation given their contention that "building, nurturing, and maintaining relationships" is the new emphasis of PR (cited by Brunig et al., 2004). The same perspective is shared by Brunig and Ledingham (1999) who argue that for public relations to be valued by the organizations it serves, practitioners must be

³Social capital is a theory that has extensively been used by scholars across disciplines. Since it was defined by its principle theorists (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1990; Portes, 1998; Putnam, 1993), Putnam's conceptualization has widely attracted public relations scholars into using the concept. Putnam, generally, understood social capital as "the potential benefits social actors derive from the nature of their relationships with others". Several scholars following Putnam's understanding of social capital, agree with him that such relationships lead to positive and cooperative behaviours since they create a psychological environment conducive to collaboration and mutual support (Kostova and Roth, 2003; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). Others such as Adler and Kwon (2002) say that the core intuition guiding social capital research is that the goodwill that others have toward 'us' is a valuable resource. Agnitsch (2006), contends that although principle theorists differed, slightly, in defining the concept, they all agreed that 'social relations are an important resource' (Agnitsch, 2006).

able to demonstrate that their efforts are contributing to the goals of these organizations by building long-term behavioural relationship with strategic publics.

Since the emphasis of putting 'relationships' at the centre stage of PR was observed by PR scholars such as the ones cited immediately above, a growing body of research emerged acknowledging its prominence and suggesting what should constitute organization-public relationship (OPR). Smith (2012), for example, proposes that "relationship" in public relations should be "a system of mutual interdependence around common interest toward which resources (stakes), attitudes, and behaviours are contextualized. He considers a relationship as a system of linkage, featuring overlapping interest, and relationship staked (and stakeholders). In this sense, organizations' relationship with stakeholders, for instance the local communities, has to be centred around building trust, demonstrating involvement, investment, mutual legitimacy, mutual satisfaction, mutual understanding, and commitment (Bruning and Ledingham, 1999). Such relationship, as Brunig and Ledingham (1999) hint, should provide economic, social, political, and/or cultural benefits to both parties, and exist in a mutual positive regard.

The same has been noticed by Kraus (2008) who states that given the present turbulent times (for example the one facing MMs and local communities), efforts in building and maintaining relationships, by encouraging trust and transparency, proactive dialogue and managing multi-stakeholder relationships, are important for the survival of both parties. Organizations' focus on the relationships and communication of its activities with stakeholders, as Ledingham and Brunig (1998) acknowledge, can engender loyalty. Culbertson and Chen (1997) add that flexible relationships based on mutual understanding and trust build a (reliable) community. The ability to attain such relationships is considered to be the strength of the discipline of public relations. They even took Brunner (2008), in the words of Ledingham (1998), to suggest a conceptual change of the field, by defining it in terms of what it is relationship management; and not what it is perceived to do, i.e. management (manipulation) of public opinion (Bruning and Ledingham, 1999).

Perhaps the most pertinent regard of PR, in the context of the present study, is that provided by Kruckeberg and Starck (1998) who see PR as a strong field in restoring and maintaining a sense of community. The authors aptly argue that public relations today is best practiced as community relations, an essential

function for a company interested in preserving a good reputation (Clark, 2000). This perspective serves public relations from being understood as a field of publicity or 'puffery' (Benn et al., 2006); it also counters the derogatory terms describing the field's programs as cosmetic, and designed to make the organization look better without substantially affecting the way it acts (Leeper, 1996). In concrete terms, it explains the discipline's unique contribution to organizations' strategies, i.e. the provision of broader societal views (in this matter the views of local communities), or an outside perspective (Van Ruler and Vercic, 2005, in Benn et al., 2010). Whether public relations, through CSR, is bearing the expected fruits or not (in terms of considering 'societal views') is the subject which interests this study. Moreover, the above observed link between relationship outcomes and corporate reputation (e.g. of the MMs), has generated considerable interest in public relations, and indeed are part of the reasons why organizations incorporated CSR in their operations.

Corporate Social Responsibility

Corporate social responsibility is basically understood as “a balanced approach for organizations to address economic, social and environmental issues in a way that aims to benefit people, communities and society” (IISD as cited by Imbun, 2007). This understanding is largely drawn from Carroll's (1979) observation that businesses have four basic responsibilities to society- economic, legal, ethical and discretionary. Hendrix (2004) puts it in plain words that it is of interest to organizations to take responsibilities for the impact of their operations to customer, employees, shareholders, communities, and the environment, insisting that organizations' involvement in CSR is supposed to "comply with legislation, be accepted in the contracts and work to improve the quality of life for stakeholders (such as local communities), voluntarily" (294).

While the above definitions are generally accepted by scholar studying the concept, the understanding and practice of CSR seem to differ between and within countries. Its complexity, therefore, has been a subject of endless scholarly debates. Among these debates, the question of CSR as an effort towards improving mine - community relations, has a substantial presence in the literature. Scholars like Prahalad and Hammong (2003), Frederick (2006), Hirshland (2006), Frynas and Pegg (2003), and Kotler and Lee (2005), give CSR

practices a possibility of addressing the misunderstandings embedded in the interaction between MMs and local communities. On the other hand, Friedman (1970), Calvano (2008), Ngomba-Roth (2007), Miles et al., (2006), Kapelus (2002), Jeurissen (2004), argue that there are far more issues to be considered in attaining a favourable relationship between the two parties. The former group of scholars believe that CSR practices may help MMs to build trust and hence mutual relationship with local communities. This is through returning back part of MMs' profits to support communities' socio-economic activities and hence improve their living standards, purchasing power and in a long run turn them to be customers of MMs' products. The latter group however, sees a glitch on CSR practices. For example, Calvano (2008) draws attention to how CSR programs are at times used as a "divide and conquer" strategy when corporations face resistance from host communities, or as a mechanism to distract communities' attention from the negative outcome of corporation activities. Moreover, she argues, they might be rendered useless due to a "perception gap"- host communities perceiving them as "western, Anglo-saxon ideas underpinned by western notions of economic rationality" (Banerjee, 2003; Blowfield and Frynas, 2005; Munishi and Kurian, 2005 as cited by Calvano, 2008). Kapelus (2002) also sees the implementation of CSRs as MMs' counter reaction to what he termed as 'globalisation of opposition', as well as an adherence to international conventions, treaties and declarations on businesses overseas.

Apart from the above points, there are a number of PR scholars and practitioners who hold a positive regard on the call for incorporating CSR in organizations' activities. L'Etang (1994) for instance points that CSR offers organizations an opportunity to build good will by promoting the benefits of the company to its stakeholders. The author views CSR as a good example of business responding to society needs, and in fact arguing that PR facilitates both, the activity and the process of communication and understanding to the benefit of all (1994). In the same vein, Clark (2000) contends that because corporations are increasingly becoming concerned about their image, CSR idea gains prominence. After Grunig and Hunt introduced a "two way symmetrical communication model" in public relations, in 1984, a number of scholars in the field came to an agreement that CSR serves well in exercising the model. They argue that CSR is a potential example of symmetrical public relations, as it provides a suitable platform for communication between organizations and their stakeholders.

Putting it differently, the agreement shared among PR scholars studying CSR, which is also followed by the this study, seems to accept that organizations' involvement in CSR practices has positive effects in addressing relationships with stakeholders and it plays a great role in facilitating PR practices. Some of these scholars even consider CSR as the major reason for organizations to have public relations function, arguing that "public relations (of organizations) is the practice of social responsibility" (Clark, 2000: 364 - 376). This notion is probably what made L'Etang (1994) argue that PR and CSR are not two different actions but rather two different types of public relations taking place (L'Etang, 1994), and Frankental (2001) viewing CSR as an invention of PR. Nonetheless, it is largely agreed in literature that PR contributes to CSR by striving to be socially responsible through influencing corporate behaviour.

Thus, as it is argued in this study, CSR, through the works of PR practitioners, has the potential of influencing the way that management perceives both the environment and the social issues as well as the salience of various stakeholder groups. It serves as a guideline for corporations' activities in the neighbouring communities and beyond. Given this perspective, if a firm assumes a proactive CSR approach, it listens to the members of these communities (even those relatively 'weak'), and in that way becomes able to anticipate potential or delicate issues and act before such issues develops into a conflict or misunderstanding. In such a practice, issues of stakeholders such as local communities, are treated with respect, and cooperation becomes a possibility (Lotila, 2010).

Methods and procedures

The effort of examining the nature of mine - community relations, through the unspoken viewpoints of local communities, demanded a particular methodological approach. This methodological requirement is addressed by employing qualitative research methods, particularly a case study approach and discourse analysis as a tool for analyzing the accounts, views and perspectives of the mentioned community members, in order to make sense of what these social actors express, implicitly, in connection to their relationship with the mining

firm. The study looked at GGM's CSR practices⁴ (see figure no. 1) as a case study of mine - community relations. It intended to collect social facts, i.e. to unveil the shared norms and values- the way these people make sense of the world they are in- and in this way be able to contribute to the understanding of CSR's intervention on mine - community relations.

Thus, the study used multiple sources of information, namely, semi-structured interviews, observation, secondary sources, and informal conversation. From the semi-structured interviews, the author was attentive to grasp the unspoken viewpoints of the participants, drawn from the accounts, feelings and actions made during the interviews. The observation helped to confirm or disprove views, claims, complaints and activities mentioned by the participants. More so, the author used secondary sources to get other relevant information, for instance, statistical reports and other information on GGM's operations in the area, as well as the socio-economic profile of Geita. Informal conversations were conducted to get additional information and viewpoints from other stakeholders who are direct or indirectly involved in the relational issues of the two parties.

The main aim of using multiple source of information was to get what Charmaz (2006) calls “rich data”- referred by Yin (2003) as data triangulation. In this way the author collected different views and information from key informants, namely, officials from the mine and community members in Geita,

⁴Among the notable GGM CSR projects in Geita include, construction of Nyankumbu Secondary school; construction of classrooms at Nyakabale and Nyamalembo primary schools; and financial support to Secondary schools in Busolwa, Bukwimba, Kamena, Katoro and Kamhanga. Other projects are scholarships to talented young people in Geita; establishment of Nyankumbu brick project; construction of new operating theatre and maternity ward at Geita District Hospital (GDH); renovation of wards and the mortuary at GDH; support to HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria control programs; and fundraising activity (The Kilimanjaro Challenge) for HIV/AIDS project in Tanzania. More so, GGM also constructed and repaired various roads in Geita; funded a water project in Geita town, and supplies water to the neighbouring villages through its 22 km pipeline from Nungwe Bay. It also sponsors sports activities such as bicycle race; constructed a football field and athletic sport facility; and supports a football team (Geita Gold star). Likewise, GGM also supports Moyowa Huruma Orphanage Centre in Geita, owned by the Roman Catholic Dioceses of Geita; and it has been funding surgical treatment at Bugando Hospital, to people in Geita who were born with cleft palate- famously known as “Operation Smile”.

particularly those living in Nyakabale- the closest village to GGM (see table no. 1). The most important aspect considered in choosing the key informants was their ability in providing the most useful

Fig No. 1: GGM’s CSR communication at its main entrance



Source: Author, 2015

information needed to produce pertinent answers to the study. As the author explains in detail below, the need of capturing the views and perspectives of the participants is what necessitated the use of discourse analysis as a tool for data interpretation in the present study. In essence, the study dealt with the collected data through a holistic analysis of the nature of the relationship between the two parties as it emerged from their involvement on CSR practices. Nyakabale

village was chosen as the area of study because there are more dynamics (with regard to the engagement of the two parties) in this village as compared to other villages which come close to GGM's concession (other villages include Nyamalembo, Mpomvu and Mgusu). Nyakabale village is about 4 km north of the core mining activities, 1.2 km west of a tailings pond and 1.5 km southeast from tailing piles. Its proximity to the mine, the engagement and disengagement that takes place between GGM and community members in Nyakabale village informs us more on the mine - community relations. The selection of Nyakabale village was key because community members in this village experience the immediate effects of GGM operations on their livelihood, socio-cultural aspects, environment and security. Moreover, given the effects on the village, CSR practices are more visible in Nyakabale than in other villages which come close to the mine's concession.

Table No. 1: The categories of key informants

No.	Category	Description of the category	Interviews
1	GGM Officials	This group included GGM's officials from Community Relations and Sustainable Development (CRSD) department.	02
2	Cattle keepers	The group was comprised of four cattle keepers	04
3	Waste rocks collectors	This involved five waste rock collectors	05
4	Small scale miners	Five small scale miners were selected	05
5	Other villagers	Four villagers, identified through the guidance of the village's hamlet leaders, were interviewed	04
Total Number of Key Informants			20

Source: Author 2016

Coming to the analytical framework, the study follows Gee's (2011) discourse analysis, as it focuses on studying how language can be used to do things in the world. Gee provides five theoretical tools that inform discourse analysis from a

linguistic perspective. These tools are (a) situated meaning, (b) social languages, (c) figured worlds, (d) intertextuality, and (e) 'Big D' discourse. The study was specifically interested with the first three tools. It employed the three tools particularly because they offer a unique chance of using the accounts made by the research participants to show how they use words, phrase and statements to explain their life realities and/or social worlds. In other words, the tools enabled the author to demonstrate how villagers use their expressions to show identities, to make sense of their actions and validate their norms and values. The analysis focused on the accounts of community members to illustrate how they project certain identities, actions, norms and values, which, implicitly, point to the nature of their relationship with the mining firm.

Based on Gee's 'situated meanings' and 'social languages', the study attempted to reconstruct, from the words and statements made by the villagers in Nyakabale, to show how social actors see and construe their worlds. Gee argues that social actors ascribe meanings to other people, to relationships, to systems of knowledge, etc. People construe the world they live in, and they are at the same time placing themselves in the position of producing those same worlds. Moreover, Gee's figured worlds is another tool used in the present study. It refers to 'a socially and culturally constructed realm of interpretation in which particular characters and actors are recognized, significance is assigned to certain acts, and particular outcomes are valued over others' (Gee 2011: 170). In more specific terms, figured worlds refer to 'narratives and images that different social and cultural groups of people use to make sense of the world' (ibid.). Here the narratives function as simplified models of how things work when they are 'normal' and 'natural' from a particular social and cultural group. The author employed the figured worlds tool to demonstrate how the accounts of community members in Nyakabale, on their interaction with the mining firm, point to the said normalcy, and how they intelligibly speak of their relationship with GGM.

Findings and discussion

Nyakabale villagers' perspective

Drawing from the accounts made during field interviews, the nature of the relationship between GGM and the villagers in Nyakabale can be understood based on Gee's (2011) three analytical tools: situated meanings, social languages and figured worlds. Looking at the accounts made by the community members in Nyakabale, it becomes clear that these individuals were using certain words to convey certain meanings which are clear to them in their specific milieu. These meanings tell us how they see their local situation and most likely that they see it differently from the way others (e.g., officials from the mine) see it.

For example, the words presented below were frequently mentioned by the villagers in Nyakabale and they convey certain expressions which villagers used to make sense of their situation. The way the words *mgodi* (the mine) and *mgodini* (in the mine) were used by the villagers, did not only refer to GGM as a mining firm, they also meant to describe this gigantic two - faced entity, which on one hand the villagers thought to have abilities to improve their lives but refrain from doing so; and on the other hand, has interrupted their lives and made everything complicated. The words were used in situations where villagers expressed their unattainable wish to reach out to this colossal body which they think could somehow solve their problems and does not want to. Likewise, these terms were also uttered as a vivid explanation as to why their present life is difficult and insecure, as well as why their environment is damaged. So, the words were uttered in reference to something which could have been useful to them, in terms of improving their living standards, but unfortunately turned out to be problematic.

More so, the word *mzungu* (white man), or sometimes *wazungu* (white men), which was also frequently used by the villagers, did not only refer to *mzungu* as the owner of the mine, it also conveyed that sense of someone who is different (someone unlike themselves). The use of the word *mzungu* meant to describe this privileged person, a foreigner, sort of a stranger, who came to their localities but did not take enough effort to understand their way of life or did not want to interact with them. Again, the term refers to someone who looks at himself as special, bossy, and who, for the most part, looks upon the villagers as people having little contribution and/or impact to *mzungu's* life or business. The use of

the word *mzungu* at certain times also suggested this person (a new comer) who has the ability to change situations. By considering him influential, particularly to local and national government leaders, the villagers used the word *mzungu*, referring to someone aloof, somewhat unfriendly, but who should understand that their life situation is difficult.

In addition, the use of words like *wawilayani* (referring to government officials at the district level), and *wamahusiano* (public relations officers at GGM's CRSD department), also conveyed multiple meanings about how the community members consider their situation, and how they regard these officials in terms of their positions in that community, and the way they treat the villagers. The words *wawilayani* and *wamahusiano*, in a way were uttered in reference to these individuals, who happen to be their fellow Tanzanians, but living a different life, people benefitting from the presence of the mine, at the expense of the villagers' social well-being. The words were used when villagers were conveying a sense of being betrayed, scorned or disregarded; an example would be "...we are being mistreated by our fellow Tanzanians simply because they want to please the *mzungu*". To a certain extent, the villagers referred to *wamahusiano* (GGM's public relations officers), as people who are undecided, who say what they don't mean, who perform their work superficially, and mostly to please the owners of the mine.

Looking at the above stated utterances, two things become indicative, first is that despite being displeased by the way the mentioned groups of people treat them, the villagers still perceive these people as individuals who can help them (and are supposed to) change their life situations. Secondly, with their utterances, the villagers indirectly express the wish of bringing these people closer, of finding ways to meet and tell them about their life situations because they regard them as people who can help. In other words, their articulations express a sense of wanting to bridge with people who are unlike themselves- of improving relations amongst themselves and therefore attaining social capital. At least this can be drawn from the mentioning of the obligations they think these people have to them. More importantly, the above statements demonstrate, in more visible terms, that GGM's CSR practices have fallen short to bridge- to reach out to these community members and be able to build mutual relations.

Apart from the above discussed situated meanings, the way Nyakabale villagers consider their local situations, particularly their relationship with the

mining firm, can also be illustrated based on the social languages drawn from their expressions. Looking at the accounts made by Nyakabale villagers, a certain 'social language', representing a particular cluster of marginalized people, also come to light. The use of statements such as the ones discussed below can help us draw that picture. During the interviews, statements such as *serikali imetusaliti* (the government has betrayed us), and *tumeuzwa* (we have been sold) were often used by the villagers and they conveyed a sense of desperation. The statement *serikali imetusaliti*, for example, was used by the villagers to explain their disappointment on the way the national (even regional) government entered into a mining contract with GGM without considering their well-being, interests and lives. More importantly, villagers used this statement to show how they are dissatisfied by the government's decision to enter into such a contract without consultation with the villagers. In other words, it sends the message that the villagers consider their own government as one which has ignored them- even rejected them. The same is conveyed by the use of the term *tumeuzwa* (we have been sold) - the villagers made this statement referring to this situation where they claim no one is there to listen to their grievances, no one to validate their opinions and viewpoints. So, the term *tumeuzwa* conveys a sense of lacking freedom of expression and decision-making power and of lacking self-determination. A literal meaning here being that they consider themselves as commercial objects, which have been sold to someone (*mgodi*), who is now the one defining their destiny.

Other statements which depict a social language of this community in Nyakabale are *tunakandamizwa* (we are being oppressed) and *tunapigwa mabomu ya machozi* (we are bombed with tear gas). The villagers used *tunakandamizwa* when pointing to situations where they once stood up for their rights, objected injustice, or demanded to be heard, but the mine, in collaboration with the district government used excessive force to stop them. The statement was also used to refer to situations in which villagers tried to work out their living, for instance through grazing cattle, small scale mining and collecting waste rocks, but were interrupted by the authorities on the grounds that the activities were performed in the mine's concession. This inference is similar to the one used for the statement *tunapigwa mabomu ya machozi* (we are bombed with tear gas). This account was specifically used to refer to incidents where police officers working for GGM, used tear gas to disperse community

members who dare to continue using the company's lease area despite the announced restrictions.

Based on the statements discussed above, community members in Nyakabale are painting a picture of being a particular social group which is grieved and which looks upon itself as being suppressed or maltreated and disadvantaged by a social system. Their statements show us how they see the world and indeed how they make sense of their world amongst themselves. The language tells us that the way the villagers see things is different from the way those who command authority see them. They frame things and events which surround them differently from the way the mining firm and government leaders do. The statements speak volumes on the nature of the existing relationship between GGM and these community members.

Phrases like *kwenye kiyoyozi* (in an air conditioner), *kwenye magari yao* (in their cars- meaning GGM's big cars- mostly Toyota land cruisers), and *kula raha* (living luxuriously), could be another set of words which illuminate the way the villagers in Nyakabale filter things which surround them. The above phrases were used by the villagers when describing the officials from the mine. They perceive them as privileged people who live a different life- working and living in air-conditioned places, driving expensive cars, indulging themselves in leisure and affluence-and what makes things even more disappointing, is that it is 'their own gold' (*rasilimali yetu*), which enrich these officials who end up mistreating or disrespecting them. So, all of the above statements attribute a certain social language which is used by the villagers to show us that they are a particular group of people who see the world in certain ways which are different from other groups, particularly the officials from the mine and government leaders.

The other way we can understand how community members in Nyakabale perceive their relationship with GGM, is through Gee's (2011) figured world perspective, which can be drawn from their statements. Here this means that the statements made by the villagers in Nyakabale enunciate the norms and values which they use to frame things and understand issues. Going through the accounts of community members, their expressions seem to indicate that the villagers are somewhat puzzled- sort of not being able to comprehend the things happening in their locality. This context is largely communicated when the villagers spoke about eviction, resettlement and their role as parents and members of this community. Statements from the villagers communicate a sense

that individuals in this community are wondering why this mining firm is installing itself in their territory (without their consent), and left free to interrupt their way of doing things.

The villagers' statements such as *ardhi yetu imechukuliwa* (our land has been taken) and *hatuwezi kuchimba tena* (we can't dig anymore) can be used here to show how individuals in this community censure the mining firm for interrupting their norms and values. Land is an invaluable asset to these community members. In their understanding, it cannot be replaced with anything. It is a treasured asset used for mining activities, cultivation, grazing, and settlement. Seeing someone taking away 'our land' (*ardhi yetu*), is a terrible experience. This can be attested to by their comments about compensation and resettlement schemes done after they were evicted and which they consider unrealistic. *Wamechukua ardhi nzuri na kutuleta kwenye miamba* (they have taken the fertile land and placed us on these rocks), *hakuna nafasi hapa* (there is no space here), *ardhi yote imekwenda na hatuwezi kuitumia tena* (the entire land is gone and we can no longer use it). Statements like these, clearly show how the villagers are saddened by the fact that they can no longer continue with their normal activities because the mine has taken away the land. This is similar to the statement *hatuwezi kuchimba tena* (we can't mine anymore), meaning that they are denied an opportunity to do that what they were used to do (mining). It seems these statements are referring to issues of entitlement: land belongs to the villagers, so they consider themselves as the ones having the right to decide its use. Seeing someone coming to take their land, and even force them not to step their feet on it, is something difficult to comprehend (or accept).

More statements that can help us understand the 'figured worlds', i.e. how the villagers use their norms and values to frame the way they see their local situation include: *vijana wetu wanahangaika* (our children [the youth] are struggling), and also *sisi wazazi wao hatukusoma, tunashindwa kuwasaidia* (we, their parents, did not go school, so it's difficult to help them). The statements were used by a number of parents in Nyakabale to explain a situation where their children struggle to get something to do in order to earn a living, i.e. a situation where they attempt to keep on mining, grazing cattle, or trading the wasted rocks, but discouraged by the authorities. Those engaging in these activities put themselves at risk of being reprimanded or taken to a primary court to answer charges of trespassing the mine's property. Thus, the parents are aggrieved by the situation. They witness all the troubles facing their children and

they cannot intervene. Their statements convey a sense of obligation. As parents, they are supposed to help their children, but the situation does not allow them anymore.

The statements *sisi hatujazoea vurugu* (we are not used to confrontations) and *mahusiano ni muhimu* (literally meaning relationships are good), can also be used here to demonstrate the villagers' norms and values. These accounts were often made when community members were expressing their resentment on confrontations, police charges, penalties and the like, which happen and/or face the villagers in their dealing with the mining firm. The statements communicate the message that the villagers perceive disputes as something uncommon in Nyakabale. It is implying that individuals in this community are accustomed to tranquility and good relationships. The use of the phrase *mahusiano ni muhimu* (relationships are good), speaks volumes about this perspective. The villagers seem to use this phrase not only to indicate that there is a soaring relationship between them and the mining firm, but also to point out the importance of having good relationships- sort of saying it is not normal for them to be in a situation where people scorn or maltreat each other. It is at this point where the idea of social capital becomes more pertinent. What the villagers' statements bring to the open, is that they wish to see things changing in their community, i.e. to have a good relationship with the mining firm and improve their social ties.

Conclusion

Based on Gee's (2011) three analytical tools, namely situated meaning, social languages and figured worlds, the author illustrated in this study that community members' norms, values, interests, as well as the way they make sense of their local situations, are key issues to consider when we attempt to make sense of what constitutes CSR practices and all efforts employed to address mine - community relations. The accounts made by community members during the interviews were used to show how their social world, norms and values, help us understand why at certain times CSR practices fail to deliver the expected outcomes and indeed why the community members like those in Nyakabale end up perceiving it as something impracticable. In other words, the author tried in this work to illuminate how the viewpoints derived from the accounts of the

locals, can be useful in ascertaining the priorities and expectations of MMs' stakeholders.

The study has observed that it will be more meaningful, and even quite engaging, if commitments and agreements to CSR, in the case of MMs and local communities, will be determined by the negotiating capacity of the community members - also, if the exercise will strive to address key issues in the perspective of the said group. Such a wish will probably happen if there is a strong commitment and a close participation of the regional (or central) government in the said interactions, and in serving the interests of the majority of the population- particularly those most affected by the operations of the extractive industry. Seeing such practices happening will attest to the MMs' (and the government) efforts in reaching out communities and improving the relationship of the two sides. To put the above in more precise terms, the primary focus for CSR practices is supposed to be on the creation of social capital, before even thinking of the material gains which MMs can offer local communities and vice versa. The priority on negotiations and discussions should be that of gaining favourable relationships between mining firms and communities, instead of only dwelling on the operational challenges or the 'benefits' (i.e. CSR initiatives) brought, or expected to be provided by the companies to neighbouring communities.

Thus, this study demonstrates that the above stated scenario offers a productive lens through which a deeper understanding of corporate-community relations, particularly through CSR practices, can be developed. It considers the unspoken viewpoints of the locals not necessarily a problem, but a subject which can offer a further understanding of what constitute mine - community relations. The analytical approach employed by the study, illustrates that a closer scrutiny to the views and perspectives of local communities, particularly the meanings, identities and norms attached to their expressions, is useful in getting locally grounded constructs of what really matters in the relationship between MMs and their neighbouring communities.

References

- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S. W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of management review*, 27(1): 17-40.
- Agnitsch, K., Flora, J., & Ryan, V. (2006). Bonding and bridging social capital: The interactive effects on community action. *Community Development*, 37(1): 36-51.
- Anguelovski, I. (2011). Understanding the dynamics of community engagement of corporations in communities: the iterative relationship between dialogue processes and local protest at the Tintaya copper mine in Peru. *Society and Natural Resources*, 24(4): 384-399.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2003). Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature. *Organization Studies*, 24(1): 143-180.
- Bebbington, A., Hinojosa, L., Bebbington, D. H., Burneo, M. L., & Warnaars, X. (2008). Contention and ambiguity: Mining and the possibilities of development. *Development and Change*, 39(6): 887-914.
- Benn, S., Todd, L. R., & Pendleton, J. (2010). Public relations leadership in corporate social responsibility. *Journal of business ethics*, 96(3): 403-423.
- Calvano, L. (2008). Multinational corporations and local communities: A critical analysis of conflict. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(4): 793– 805.
- Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4): 497-505.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative research*. Sage Publications Ltd, London.
- Clark, C. E. (2000). Differences between public relations and corporate social responsibility: an analysis. *Public Relations Review*, 26(3): 363-380.
- Cowell, S. J., Wehrmeyer, W., Argust, P. W., & Robertson, J. G. S. (1999). Sustainability and the primary extraction industries: theories and practice. *Resources Policy*, 25(4): 277-286.
- Cutlip, C., & Center, A. (1994). *Effective Public Relations*. Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.

- Haselip, J., & Hilson, G. (2005). Winners and losers from industry reforms in the developing world: experiences from the electricity and mining sectors. *Resources Policy*, 30(2): 87-100.
- Hendrix, J. (2004). *Public relations cases*. Canada: Wadsworth.
- Hilson, G. (2011). 'Inherited commitments': Do changes in ownership affect Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) at African gold mines? *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(27): 10921-10939.
- Hilson, G., & Murck, B. (2000). Sustainable development in the mining industry: clarifying the corporate perspective. *Resources policy*, 26(4): 227-238.
- Ihlen, Ø. (2005). The power of social capital: Adapting Bourdieu to the study of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 31(4): 492-496.
- Ihlen, Ø., & van Ruler, B. (2007). How public Relations works: Theoretical roots and public relations perspectives. *Public Relations Review*, 33: 243-248.
- Imbun, B. Y. (2007). Cannot manage without the 'significant other': Mining, corporate social responsibility and local communities in Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 73(2): 177-192.
- Kapelus, P. (2002). Mining, CSR and the "community": The case of Rio Tinto, Richards Bay Minerals and Mbonambi. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 39 (3): 275-296.
- Kostova, T., & Roth, K. (2003). Social capital in multinational corporations and a micro-macro model of its formation. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2): 297-317.
- Laplante, L. J., & Spears, S. A. (2008). Out of the conflict zone: The case for community consent processes in the extractive sector. *Yale Human Rights and Development Law Journal*, 11(69).
- Leeper, K. A. (1996). Public relations ethics and communitarianism: A preliminary investigation. *Public Relations Review*, 22(2): 163-179.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2): 242-266.
- Omeje, K. (2005). Oil conflict in Nigeria: Contending issues and perspectives of the local Niger Delta people. *New Political Economy*, 10(3): 321-334.

- Ostlund, L. E. (1977). Attitudes of managers toward corporate social responsibility. *California Management Review*, 19(4): 35-49.
- Rodrick, D. (2006). *Goodbye Washington consensus, hello Washington confusion*. Harvard university
- Sethi, S. P. (1979). A conceptual framework for environmental analysis of social issues and evaluation of business response patterns. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(1): 63-74.
- Szablowski, D. (2002). Mining, displacement and the World Bank: A case analysis of Compania Minera Antamina's operations in Peru. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 39(3): 247-273.
- Vintró, C., Fortuny, J., Sanmiquel, L., Freijo, M., & Edo, J. (2012). Is corporate social responsibility possible in the mining sector? Evidence from Catalan companies. *Resources Policy*, 37(1): 118-125.
- Walker, J., & Howard, S. (2002). Voluntary codes of conduct in the mining industry. In *Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development Project (MMSD)*, IIED.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). Case study research: Design and methods (3rd ed.). *Applied Social Research Methods Series*, Vol. 5.