CORPORATE SOCIAL INVESTMENT AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES: A CASE STUDY OF COCA-COLA'S COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN NIGERIA'S FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY

BY

GLORIA IKIBAH

AND

DR. SAMMY ADRIAN AJUFO

ABSTRACT

This study explores the potential of Corporate Social Investment as a strategic approach that not only addresses community development outcomes but also enhances competitive advantage. By examining Coca-Cola's community engagement initiatives in selected Area Councils of Nigeria's Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, it highlights the concept of mutual value creation where Corporate Social Investment creates simultaneous benefits for the corporation and the communities they engage.

For decades, multinational companies have increasingly used Corporate Social Investment CSI as a strategic component of their operations in emerging economies, often making this initiative of mutual benefit for the sustainability of business and host communities.

Despite the importance of these programmes, verifiable evidence on their visible contributions to the community's socio-economic development remains limited and most often informal.

While some stakeholders view Coca-Cola's engagement as a genuine contribution to social progress, others see these initiatives as brand-led exercises with limited structural significance.

This research bridges this gap by critically assessing the scope, design, and perceived impact of Coca-Cola's CSI activities in the FCT, with a particular focus on access to water, youth empowerment, education support, and environmental stewardship. In doing so, the study aims to prioritize these dimensions by closely analyzing which single outcome most effectively embodies the potential for community development. Access to water is posited as the central theme, given its immediate impact and sustainability challenges, and is followed by evaluations of youth empowerment, education support, and environmental stewardship. Ranking these aspects provides a clear evaluative focus, streamlining subsequent discussions.

A qualitative case study was adopted, drawing on a combination of semi-structured interviews with members of the community, traditional leaders, and project managers, as well as analysing documents of company reports, project briefs, and independent evaluation reports.

To maximise developmental impact, the research recommends a shift towards participatory planning models, stronger collaboration with public sector agencies, and adoption of independent impact assessment processing.

The study concluded that CSI can contribute meaningfully to local development when projects are co-designed with beneficiary communities, embedded within the existing institutional system, and supported by mechanisms for accountability and capacity building.

The research recommends a shift towards participatory planning models, strong collaboration with public sector agencies, and adoption of impact assessment processes that are independent.

Keywords: Corporate Social Investment, Local Development, Community Engagement, Coca-Cola, Nigeria, Stakeholder Theory, Sustainable Livelihoods.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of Study

Corporations do not operate in isolation. Like individuals, they inhabit environments by interacting with and influencing the social, economic, legal, cultural, ecological, technological, and political spheres. As corporate citizens, they must comply with laws and engage positively with their surroundings to operate efficiently and achieve long-term objectives. This compels them to act responsibly within the societies where they function.

Ibrahim and Hamid (2019) note that companies were once seen as solely focused on profit maximization, with improving living standards viewed as the government's duty. However, evolving social policies now drive public expectations beyond financial results to include corporate responses to societal needs. To meet these expectations and stand out amid competition, modern businesses increasingly exceed legal requirements by engaging in corporate social responsibility.

1.2. History of Corporate Social Investment

The history of Corporate Social Investment in the oil and gas companies dated back to the early 20th century when companies started to see the need to address social and environmental issues in relations with their linked with their operations. At the onset, the focus was on philanthropic activities like donations to local communities and charities. But as the industry grew and its impact became more tangible, organisations began adopting more strategic approaches to CSI.

In the 1960s and 1970s, with the increase in environmental awareness and the emergence of corporate social responsibility (CSR) as a concept, oil companies commenced formalisation of their CSI efforts. They were able to achieve this by developing policies and programmes to mitigate the negative impacts of their work and contribute to the well-being of host communities. At this time, the focus was on promoting ethical business practices.

Between the 1980s and 1990s, there was a movement to more integrated and holistic approaches to CSI in the oil and gas industry. Corporations began to see CSI as a fundamental part of their business strategy, rather than a different activity. They started to place their CSI initiatives with the core objectives of their business, paying particular attention to areas where the impact will be evident and create share value for both the organisation and community.

In 2000 and beyond, there has been a growing concern about transparency, accountability, and stakeholders' engagement in CSI. The expectation that organisations report on their CSI activities and show the outcomes of their investments. There is also a greater recognition of the need for collaboration and partnership with governments, NGOs, and local communities to address complex social and environmental challenges (Anoke, et. al., 2023; Ans, u-Mensah, et. al., 2021; Billedeau, 2019).

In all of this, the history of Corporate Social Investment (CSI) shows a growing awareness of the importance of corporate social responsibility and sustainable business practices. More than ever, companies are increasingly recognising that CSI is not only about doing good, but also about creating value and managing risk in a rapidly changing world.

Communities may view corporate projects as compensation for environmental, social, or economic disruptions caused by business operations, while companies may perceive them as strategic tools for reputation management, regulatory goodwill, and market stability. Local governments or area councils in the rescue may regard CSI as a harmonising resource, notwithstanding one that operates outside direct public control. Understanding how these perspectives converge or fail to converge is essential to assessing the effectiveness of corporate interventions.

1.3 Statement of Problem

This study takes Coca-Cola's community engagement in Nigeria's FCT as a focused case through which to interrogate the link between CSI and the area councils. By combining field-level insights with documentary analysis, it seeks to move beyond promotional narratives to provide a balanced, evidence-based account of the outcomes and limitations of such initiatives. In doing so, it contributes to a growing body of scholarship that questions not only "what" corporations do in the name of social investment, but also "how" and "why" they do it, and with what lasting implications for the communities they engage.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

In sub-Saharan Africa, the globally accepted term - Corporate Social Investment (CSI)- is often used interchangeably with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), which has become the most preferred channel through which multinational corporations attempt to legitimize their presence in host communities, particularly within emerging economies (Amao, 2008; Idemudia, 2014).

Unlike philanthropic giving, CSI is framed as a strategic investment that creates mutual benefits for corporations and society, aligning social outcomes with business sustainability objectives (Porter & Kramer, 2011).

Within governance systems in Sub-Saharan Africa, where predominantly weak institutional frameworks frequently stifle communal or state-led development, CSI has emerged as a complementary mechanism for addressing gaps in infrastructure, education, healthcare, and youth empowerment (Eweje, 2006; Hamann, 2019).

Despite this, several schools of thought have raised critical questions regarding the extent to which CSR/CSI genuinely contributes to structural development and, in extension, socio-economic growth. Blowfield and Frynas (2005) argue that CSI/CSR initiatives often operate at the margins of development, producing localized benefits but do little or nothing as it pertains to dealing with systemic governance and institutional challenges.

Other scholars believe that while most private sector-led CSI programmes enhance corporate legitimacy and brand reputation, their true effects on poverty reduction and sustainable development cannot be substantiated by any verifiable data. (Idemudia, 2011). In other words, most CSI efforts – even with the best intentions are more cosmetic than skin-deep.

2.1. CSI in Nigeria: Contextual Dynamics

With a population expected to hit half a billion in just under a decade, Nigeria poses a complex environment for CSI efforts due to its governance deficits, socio-economic inequalities, and heavy reliance on extractive and consumer-based multinational industries.

The societal and governance institutions have built their expectations of private sector support on thriving industries and businesses. Previous research indicates that multinational corporations often position CSI as a tool for maintaining a “social license to operate” (Amaeshi et al., 2006; Idemudia & Osayande, 2016). However, the gap between corporate rhetoric and community experiences is well documented. Idemudia (2009) explains how communities in the Niger Delta often perceive CSI interventions as tokenistic, unevenly distributed, and lacking participatory design, thereby fuelling mistrust.

In the nation’s capital - Abuja, multinational firms such as the Nigeria Bottling Company – owners of Coca-Cola, as well as leading national telecommunications giant MTN, and Nestlé have been known to roll out several community development programmes, with their Social Investment efforts purposefully targeting areas in need of access to safe drinking water, education support, youth training, and environmental management. While these initiatives align with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), empirical studies reveal mixed outcomes. Adebayo and Olukoya (2019) found that water access projects initiated by beverage companies produced immediate relief but were challenged by sustainability issues such as maintenance and community ownership – two critical issues commonly bedeviling infrastructure projects in Nigeria. Similarly, youth skills programmes were applauded for their empowerment potential yet were limited in scalability and integration with broader employment systems (Onyishi & Okeke, 2020).

2.2. Debates on Impact and Sustainability

The literature presents divergent perspectives on the legitimacy and effectiveness of CSI, especially within the operative environment in West Africa. On one hand, stakeholder theorists opine that a well-designed, targeted CSI fosters trust, reinforces corporate-community relationships, and contributes to long-term development (Freeman, 1984;

Jamali & Karam, 2018). On the other hand, scholars with leanings towards critical development perspectives warn that CSI risks reproducing dependency and undermining state responsibility for public service provision (Frynas, 2005).

Experimental findings also highlight that post-project impact assessments of CSI are often conducted internally by corporations, raising concerns about bias and the absence of independent verification (Hamann & Kapelus, 2004). Furthermore, the short-term orientation of many CSI projects has been criticized for neglecting structural capacity building, with benefits often dissipating once corporate funding is withdrawn (Moon, 2007); therefore, a need for more independent evaluations.

2.3. Research Gap

While extensive literature exists on CSR and CSI activities of the extractive industry players, operating in resource-rich regions such as the Niger Delta, little to nothing has been documented to consumer-driven sectors like the beverage industry and their role in shaping development in urban and non-urban communities. To be specific, it is near impossible to spot broader empirical evidence on the effects of private-sector led CSI initiatives and its influence on social outcomes and impact in Abuja and its environs. The near-minuscule studies often are lacking in considering the perception of the beneficiary communities vis-a-vis the narratives drawn by the organizations. This casts thick shadows of doubt on both present and future evaluation metrics, sustainability, authenticity, and the long term structural impact of CSI programmes within the FCT.

This study responds to these gaps by examining NBC's Coca-Cola's CSI activities in Abuja, with a particular focus on water access, youth empowerment, education, and environmental stewardship. By connecting NBC's corporate reports with community testimonies, the research provides a more holistic understanding of the potential and limitations of CSI as a tool for sustainable community development in Nigeria.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative case study approach, which was considered suitable for exploring the complex relationship between corporate social investment (CSI) and local development outcomes in Nigeria's Federal Capital Territory (FCT). This study is designed to provide the flexibility to capture not only Coca-Cola's stated objectives and programme documentation, but also the experiences and observations of community members and stakeholders directly affected by its enterprises. This aligns with Yin's (2018) argument that case studies enable the investigation of real-life social phenomena in context, while allowing the researcher to capture multiple perspectives.

3.2. Study Area and Case Selection

The research was conducted in the Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC), in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). AMAC was chosen on purpose because it houses a number of Coca-Cola's top CSI projects, including water access schemes, youth empowerment programmes, educational support interventions, and environmental awareness campaigns. FCT was also chosen because it combines both urban and peri-urban communities, thereby offering a varying environment for measuring corporate–community engagement.

Coca-Cola (through the Nigeria Bottling Company) was carefully chosen as the central case for its detectable impression in Nigeria's consumer goods sector and its sustained investment in CSI initiatives across the FCT. Unlike oil and gas firms often studied in Nigerian CSR/CSI scholarship (Idemudia, 2009; Frynas, 2005), Coca-Cola's interventions reflect the practices of consumer-driven multinationals operating outside extractive industries, thereby filling a significant empirical gap in existing literature.

3.3. Data Collection Methods

A combination of primary and secondary data sources was employed.

1. Interviews:

- Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key stakeholders, including Coca-Cola's sustainability managers, project officers, and implementing partners.
- At the community level, interviews were held with beneficiaries, including local leaders, school administrators, youth trainees, and household members who had access to Coca-Cola's water infrastructure.
- Interviews were carried out in the Abuja Municipal Area Councils, and explored themes such as the significance of the programme, supposed benefits, sustainability, challenges, and in line with community needs.

2. Documentary Analysis:

Secondary data were obtained from Coca-Cola's official sustainability reports, project briefs, press releases, independent evaluation reports commissioned by the company,and relevant academic literature.

Triangulation of these sources strengthened the credibility of findings and helped mitigate bias associated with relying solely on corporate self-reporting (Hamann & Kapelus, 2004).

3.4. Sampling Technique

Purposive and snowball sampling techniques were adopted. Coca-Cola's sustainability department provided initial contacts, while community leaders recommended further participants based on involvement in or knowledge of CSI projects. Care was taken to ensure inclusion of diverse voices, including women, unemployed youth, and marginalised groups, whose perspectives are often overlooked in corporate-led community engagement assessments (Blowfield & Frynas, 2005).

3.5. Data Analysis

All interviews were recorded with informed consent, transcribed, and coded using thematic analysis. Following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step framework, transcripts were read repeatedly to identify recurring patterns. Codes were developed inductively from the data and grouped into broader themes such as access and equity, sustainability, community participation, and alignment with local needs. NVivo 12 software was employed to support coding and manage large volumes of textual data.

Secondary data from corporate reports were evaluated through content analysis, with attention paid to language framing, project narratives, and reported outcomes. The comparison between documentary claims and community testimonies enabled the researcher to critically interrogate the convergence or divergence between corporate narratives and ground-level realities.

3.6. Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to established ethical standards for social research. All participants gave their informed consent after being given guarantees of anonymity and confidentiality. Sensitive data were securely stored, and participants had the right to withdraw at any stage of the study. Permission was also sought from relevant Area Council authorities before conducting community-level fieldwork.

3.7. Limitations of the Study

The research faced limitations typical of qualitative case studies. First, the findings are context-specific and may not be generalised to all CSI interventions in Nigeria. Second, access to some corporate documents was restricted, limiting full transparency. Third, while steps were taken to minimise bias, the involvement of Coca-Cola in facilitating initial contacts may have influenced the openness of some respondents. Nonetheless, triangulation of sources and inclusion of critical community voices provided a balanced and credible analysis.

4.0 RESULT

4.1. Products and production

Nigeria Bottling Company Plant at Idu Industrial layout in Abuja, makers of Coca-Cola, has the following brands and products:Coca-Cola, Fanta, Sprite, Schweppes (tonic, bitter lemon, Chapman, ginger, etc); Eva Premium Water, Five Alive Juice (Orange Juice and

Berry Blast), Monster Energy drink, and Predator Energy drink. Nigeria Bottling Company operates 8 plants in Nigeria, located in Ikeja, Lagos state; Maiduguri in Borno state, Port Harcourt in Rivers state, Asejire Plant in Oyo State, Abuja Plant, Challawa plant in Kano state, Benin plant in Edo state, and Owerri plant in Imo state.

Volume of production NBC - produces and distributes more than 2 billion unit cases of products annually to 600 million consumers across its territories (29 countries). Nigeria is its most southerly market. The supply chain plays a central role in managing this responsibility, making sure that in all its processes, environmental impact is minimised and sustainability is sustained in their value chain - from sourcing to raw materials and manufacturing the end products to distribution to customers.

In June 2022, Sidel installed the Africa region’s first Sidel Super Combi line for carbonated soft drinks (CSD) at the NBC plant in the northern city of Challawa. Capable of bottling speeds of 65,000 bottles per hour, this high-speed combined line was the perfect solution for NBC to meet Nigeria’s booming CSD market. Described by the Engineering Group Manager, Theodoros Kappatos, as the ideal project, in honour of its smooth performance, this is the fifth line that Sidel has installed, building on a relationship that has gone from strength to strength since 2017, when Sidel planned and executed a line in Abuja that has performed strongly for the bottling company ever since.

Carbonated soft drinks are very popular in Nigeria, with consumption higher than the regional average at 17 litres per head per year. As more Nigerians adopt healthier eating habits, sales of low-calorie and low-sugar products are booming. CSD is one of the best-performing soft drinks segments, with growth of 6.7% between 2019-2020. Premium brands dominate CSDs, led by Coca-Cola with a 38.7% volume share.

Profitability - While exact figures on profitability are not public, the most popular and likely most popular products for Coca-Cola in Nigeria are Coca-Cola, Fanta, and Sprite, which form the core of their offering. Other significant products include Eva water and Five Alive juices, which tap into the growing demand for healthier alternatives.

4.2. What Coca-Cola is saying about its investments

Coca-Cola System has invested over N9 billion in Nigeria in the last 10 years and plans to inject another $1 billion in the next five years. "We have invested over N9 billion in the last ten years and will invest another $1 billion (N560 billion) in the next five years," stated Alfred Olajide, Managing Director of Coca-Cola Nigeria. As of 2019, we have spent N88 billion on local sourcing and paid N223 billion in taxes over the course of five years. We also paid N154 billion as salaries and taxes in five years. The Coca-Cola System also unveiled its Socio-Economic Impact Report for 2015–2019, which provides an overview of the system's effects, contributions to the Nigerian economy, and community investments. Along its value chain, the Coca-Cola system has also helped to create 58,000 job opportunities in the past five years".

5.0 DISCUSSION

The findings of the study here unveil the opportunities and limitations in Coca-Cola's Corporate Social Investment (CSI) initiatives in Abuja. The research, on the one hand, points towards the fact that the company's investments in access to water, youth development, educational support, and environmental responsibility have imparted welcome relief to individuals in nearby communities. Beneficiaries described gratitude for the tangible benefits of having access to clean drinking water, greater prospects for youth through training schemes, and support to schools. These outcomes validate stakeholder theorists' contention that properly planned CSI fosters trust, corporate–community relations, and corporate legitimacy in operating in challenging environments.

However, the study also establishes critical sustainability and inclusiveness deficits. For example, water schemes continued to face recurring maintenance and repair problems that raised concerns about sustainability. Similarly, despite youth training programs being trendy, their low scalability and weak connections with broader employment systems undercut their transformative potential. These results are consistent with criticisms in the literature that CSI tends to produce localized and fleeting outcomes without addressing root-systemic issues such as unemployment, weak institutions, and infrastructure deficits.

A further crucial remark is the disconnect between corporate reporting and community experience. While Coca-Cola's reports place its CSI on a platform of being efficacious and aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), community statements reveal that the majority of initiatives were selected and implemented with little consultation with beneficiaries. Such a disconnect questions how much CSI is truly community-driven versus brand-oriented or reputation-driven.

Yet, where projects were co-designed with communities or located within local institutional frameworks, there was greater acceptance, ownership, and sustainability. This underlines the importance of participatory planning and local involvement to ensure that CSI contributes value to development outcomes. In conclusion, the discussion shows that while Coca-Cola's CSI activities generate impressive short-term social value, they must be structurally redesigned in design, delivery, and monitoring if it is to deliver lasting developmental dividends.

6.0 CONCLUSION

This study has shown proof that Corporate Social Investment has immense possibilities for supporting local development if strategically aligned with the interests of communities and supported by sound governance mechanisms. In the case of Coca-Cola's initiatives in Abuja, Corporate Social Investment programs have proved effective in generating goodwill, strengthening corporate–community relations, and addressing proximate shortages of water, youth capacity, education, and environmental awareness. These findings determine the role private-sector investment plays in addressing development conundrums in Nigeria's Federal Capital Territory.

Nonetheless, the study also reveals that the current CSI model is plagued by weak sustainability, weak participatory planning, and weak integration into existing public institutions. Measures taken with little public participation are likely to be viewed as tokenistic and may fail to offer considerable or lasting change. Moreover, weak independence of impact assessments undermines transparency and erodes trust in reported outcomes. Therefore, while Coca-Cola's CSI has shown promise to aid government-led development, it has not yet reached its full potential as a sustainable community development transformation tool. To achieve this, CSI must transition from being short-term charitable activities to participatory, responsible, and system-enabling processes that empower individuals and build long-term resilience.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Adopt Participatory Planning Approaches:** CSI programs should be co-created with the target communities to incorporate real needs. Engaging local leadership, women, and youth groups in decision-making would enhance ownership and sustainability.
- **Strengthen Coordination with Government and Civil Society:** Corporations should collaborate more intensively with local councils, government ministries, and local NGOs to mainstream CSI programs in overall development schemes.
- **Institutionalise Independent Impact Assessments:** Independent evaluators must be commissioned to assess the impacts of Corporate Social Investments, with findings made public to promote transparency and accountability.
- **Build Sustainability Mechanisms:** Water and infrastructure schemes must have a community management committee with capacity development programmes to ensure sustainability after funding is withdrawn.
- **Increase the Scalability of Youth Empowerment Initiatives:** Youth training should be linked to broader national employment strategies to guarantee that skills translate into livelihoods.
- **Boost Transparency and Accountability:** Firms ought to provide easy-to-read reports on CSI programs, such as progress, issues, and next steps.
- **Break Through Philanthropy to Co-Creation of Shared Value:** CSI should be a venture for corporate benefit and community capabilities development for long-term sustainability.

References

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

Amao, O. (2008). Corporate social responsibility, multinational corporations and the law in Nigeria: Controlling multinationals in host states. Journal of African Law, 52(1), 89–113.

Adebayo, A., & Olukoya, O. (2019). Water access and corporate social responsibility in Nigeria: An evaluation of beverage sector initiatives. African Journal of Sustainable Development, 9(2), 45–62.

Blowfield, M., & Frynas, J. G. (2005). Editorial: Setting new agendas – critical perspectives on corporate social responsibility in the developing world. International Affairs, 81(3), 499–513.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.

Eweje, G. (2006). The role of MNEs in community development initiatives in developing countries. Business & Society, 45(2), 93–129.

Frynas, J. G. (2005). The false developmental promise of corporate social responsibility: Evidence from multinational oil companies. International Affairs, 81(3), 581–598.

Hamann, R. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and development: Institutional perspectives. Business Strategy & Development, 2(1), 1–9.

Hamann, R., & Kapelus, P. (2004). Corporate social responsibility in mining in Southern Africa: Fair accountability or just greenwash? Development, 47(3), 85–92.

Idemudia, U. (2009). Assessing corporate–community involvement strategies in the Nigerian oil industry: An empirical analysis. Resources Policy, 34(3), 133–141.

Idemudia, U. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and developing countries: Moving the critical CSR research agenda in Africa forward. Progress in Development Studies, 11(1), 1–18.

Idemudia, U., & Osayande, N. (2016). Assessing the effect of corporate social responsibility on community development in the Niger Delta: A corporate perspective. Community Development Journal, 51(3), 436–451.

Jamali, D., & Karam, C. (2018). Corporate social responsibility in developing countries as an emerging field of study. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(1), 32–61.

Moon, J. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to sustainable development. Sustainable Development, 15(5), 296–306.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. Harvard Business Review, 89(1/2), 62–77.

Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). Sage.

https://nairametrics.com/2021/10/08/coca-cola-invests-over-n9-billion-in-nigeria-in-the-last-10-years-to-inject-another-1-billion-in-5-years/

https://www.coca-colacompany.com/content/dam/company/us/en/reports/coca-cola-business-sustainability-report-2022.pdf

https://www.coca-colacompany.com/media-center/coca-cola-reports-fourth-quarter-and-full-year-2024-results

https://ng.coca-colahellenic.com/en/our-24-7-portfolio/explore-our-24-7-portfolio#accordion-7bb1b302f0-item-7533c75b85

https://ng.coca-colahellenic.com/en/local-impact/our-plants

https://bhmng.com/coca-cola-nigeria-receives-top-brand-and-most-valuable-honours-in-the-top-50-brands-in-nigeria-report/

https://ibadanadulteducationjournals.com.ng/media/2021/08/Chapter-Twenty-Three-Corporate-Social-Responsibilities-and-Sustainable-Community-Development-in-Nigeria.pdf

https://www.spersocial.com/blog/corporate-philanthropy-vs-strategic-csr-finding-the-balance#:~:text=While%20corporate%20philanthropy%20can%20have,term%20relief%20to%20specific%20causes.

Appendices

APPENDIX A: Semi-Structured Questions (For Coca-Cola Employees Only)

Section A: Role & Experience

1. What is your job in Coca-Cola and how is it connected to CSI/CSR activities?
2. For how long have you been directly working on Coca-Cola's CSI activities in Abuja?

Section B: Strategy & Objectives

1. What are the most important objectives of Coca-Cola in engaging in Corporate Social Investment (CSI) in Nigeria?
2. How are CSI activities incorporated into Coca-Cola's international and local corporate strategy?
3. How do you think these projects balance business goals and community needs?

Section C: Project Design & Implementation

1. What is the decision-making process for implementing which CSI projects (e.g., water, education, youth empowerment, environment)?
2. How do you determine target communities or beneficiaries?
3. To what extent are communities or local stakeholders consulted in the design and planning process?
4. What is the implementation role played by partnerships (with government, NGOs, schools, community leaders)?

Section D: Monitoring, Evaluation & Sustainability

1. How does Coca-Cola track the success or impact of its CSI projects?
2. Can you give examples of key performance indicators (KPIs) used in evaluation?
3. What are the arrangements for ensuring the sustainability of projects when Coca-Cola's direct involvement stops?

13. What have been the challenges you've faced to ensure continuity or community ownership of these projects?

Section E: Perceptions, Communication & Branding

1. In your view, how are Coca-Cola's CSI projects perceived by beneficiary communities?
2. How is corporate reputation or brand image considered in planning CSI projects?
3. How does Coca-Cola have its CSI initiatives conveyed to the public (e.g., reports, media campaigns, community meetings)?
4. How do you balance the dual objectives of corporate reputation and real community development?

Section F: Reflections & Recommendations

1. From your experience, what have been the most successful aspects of Coca-Cola's CSI in Abuja?
2. What were the constraints or challenges in implementing these projects?
3. If you were able to redesign Coca-Cola's CSI strategy, what would you propose to change to maximize impact and sustainability?

APPENDIX B

List of Interview Participants

- Sustainability Manager, Coca-Cola Nigeria
- Youth trainees (4 male, 3 female) from AMAC
- Community leader, Karu District
- School administrator, Nyanya Primary School