

12

Beyond Friend or Foe: Foreign Investment, Responsible Business and Local Development in Africa

Guus van Westen and Annelies Zoomers

Introduction

In a paper co-written with Peter Knorringa in 2008, Bert Helmsing advocated a rethink of the role of the private sector in development. Especially among civil society representatives, views tended sometimes to hostile simplifications that did not do justice to the rather more nuanced realities on the ground. Instead, the authors stressed the diversity of motivations and behaviours of entrepreneurs in issues of local development, and perceived a move away from charity towards more active engagement in development initiatives. In view of the renewed emphasis on the private sector as agent for development in international cooperation and development policy, the importance of this subject has only increased since Knorringa and Helmsing published their paper. Heeding their advice to both welcome and critically engage the role of business, this paper examines the role of foreign investors (predominantly Dutch SMEs) in agribusiness in six African countries: Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda, South Africa and Zambia. Based on surveys and interviews in these countries, the CSR performances of these investors are examined in order to assess to what extent and how these foreign entrepreneurs actually contribute to local development. How responsible are these foreign businesses? And what actually is the link between responsible business and local development?

Background: shifting positions

A key characteristic of contemporary globalization is the blurring of traditional dividing lines in society. As government gives way to 'governance' involving multiple stakeholders, so the roles of different stakeholders become more fuzzy: government agencies claim to be entrepreneurial ('the entrepreneurial city') (Hall and Hubbard 1998), NGOs are more

business-like (and need to generate more market revenue), and businesses cultivate a profile of social and responsible entrepreneurship (Andrew and Goldsmith 1998, Castells 1996, Sassen 2006). The trend is only logical against the backdrop of steady neo-liberalization of societies around the world. Public sector withdrawal from direct intervention in a range of fields has resulted in governance gaps that have to be filled by civil society organizations, or taken up by companies if either their interests are at stake or if they held accountable for negative spill-overs in the eye of the public. One of these fields, obviously, is that of economic and social development (Newell and Frynas 2007). The private sector has a clear role in development and poverty reduction, as it generates jobs and income for people to support their livelihoods. The private sector is also a key source of innovation, and it links people and places in networks of mutual interest. The importance of private sector development is not much contested. Development policies and international cooperation for development have steadily put more emphasis on the role of the private sector, often employing inspirational language, such as a report titled, 'Unleashing entrepreneurship: Making business work for the poor' (UN Commission on the Private Sector and Development 2004). The increased interest in the role of the private sector is evidenced in policy papers of donors such as the UK's DfID (2011) or the Netherlands (IOB 2014, Verwer et al. 2014).

Underlying assumptions

Two assumptions seem to underpin the approaches to making private sector growth work better for development. One is that private sector development in the global South (and not just there) should be undertaken with support from public funds, i.e., the budgets earmarked for development cooperation. This is a fairly widespread view, although it does not follow automatically from the perceived importance of private business in fostering development goals. Yet one may argue that if a little help from the public purse can unleash market forces to bloom and bring prosperity, then this is money well spent. The other assumption about the private sector and development is that commercial interests can very well merge with the broader development agenda, combining the roles of 'merchant' and 'vicar', to paraphrase the common expression used in Dutch development cooperation.

Of course, trade interests have never been far removed from international development efforts, but they have traditionally been perceived as separate policy containers in the tradition of many Western donors. At present, the rise of emerging and newly emerged economies, such as China, that pursue a much more integrated aid-and-trade agenda, has prompted Western donors to also reconsider the separation (real or

pretended) between commercial interest and ethical support. Moreover, the stagnation of Western economies since 2008, compared to the dynamism in parts of the developing world, adds further pressure to pursue commercial ends when doing good.

Responsible business

So all eyes are on the private sector, and the question of what it might be expected to do to solve societal problems. What makes a firm responsible? There are no generally accepted criteria. In fact, there is a range of terms and ideas that try to conceptualize the societal role of entrepreneurs (Lee 2008). CSR (corporate social responsibility) is often used to express the view that a business's responsibility extends beyond the boundary of the firm, and thus that entrepreneurial decisions should also consider the interests of other stakeholders. Beyond this, there is a diversity of opinions about the extent of a private businesses responsibility vis a vis society.

Carroll (1991) distinguished a classic sequence of priorities in his pyramid of CSR. In this view, after profitability, which is necessary for a business to survive, compliance with regulations is the highest priority of responsible business, followed by ethical considerations (i.e., desirable behaviour), and philanthropy (doing good). Others have constructed alternative models, sometimes based on cultural or contextual factors. Wayne Visser (2006), for instance, argued that in African contexts, where the legitimacy of the state is more in doubt, legal compliance may be considered less of a priority than meeting urgent humanitarian needs that would elsewhere be seen as philanthropic cherries on the cake. It follows from this that the content of responsible business is context-specific, and hence varies between different societies and communities (see also Idemudia 2011).

Notions of responsible business partly overlap with the concept of 'sustainable' business, but they are not the same. While most CSR approaches focus on social and ethical issues, sustainable business adds the dimension of time (Bansal and DesJardine 2014). Although the triple bottom line of sustainability in principle encompasses social and economic concerns, most sustainable or green business approaches tend to narrow this down to a strict 'do no harm' principle that falls short of the pursuit of positive developmental outcomes. 'Inclusive business', on the other hand, is often used in a development context. The International Finance Corporation (2015) describes it as 'businesses that offer goods, services, and job opportunities to low-income communities'. They may offer tailor-made products to a low-income public, and/or provide gainful employment to poor people by integrating them in the value chain as suppliers or workers, as advocated in the base of the pyramid approach Prahalad proposed (2004).

Responsibility dilemma

The inclusive business approaches make perfect sense from a development perspective, but they are also somewhat problematic. Most companies need to compete, and the compelling logic of competition is to internalize business advantages and limit inclusiveness. If overcoming an initial hurdle can make inclusive business models competitive, then a real contribution to development is made, but if the business case for inclusiveness is lacking, its sustainability is in question. Porter and Kramer (2006, 2011) have attempted to overcome this dilemma by means of their concept of 'shared value creation'. This refers to an entrepreneurial outlook that first seeks to optimize the entire value chain, and only then to define the position of the individual firm within the chain; the idea is that this yields efficiency gains that benefit both society and entrepreneur. In other words, it would create a win-win situation in which there is extra profit in doing better. This approach differs from the notion of social entrepreneurship, where contributing to the solution of societal problems becomes the core of the business proposition (Tan et al. 2005), in the important sense that overcoming societal problems is viewed as a source of extra profit by Porter and Kramer (2011) and similarly minded authors (see also Visser 2011). This would certainly add an incentive, but it is not likely to be feasible in many situations.

This summary review of responsible business approaches illustrates how ideas about the private sector are shifting, in the sense that their responsibilities should extend beyond the immediate business interest – how far beyond is a matter of debate. It also suggests that different approaches to CSR make different contributions to development and poverty alleviation (Newell and Frynas 2007). Actually, under the umbrella of CSR, aims can be pursued that are in conflict with one another, as in the cases of environmental sustainability vs. income growth, or inclusiveness vs. quality standards. This implies that there is no unified framework to assess performance and outcomes of responsible business in a development context. A further point to note is the essentially voluntary and discretionary nature of CSR (Sagebien and Whellams 2010). It is voluntary, in the sense that it is up to entrepreneurs to decide how far they will venture into desirable behaviour beyond legal compliance, and discretionary in that they decide what field of interest to pursue. Contributions to charities, protecting environmental values, inclusiveness of the poor, community projects, or perhaps support for workers and their families: there is a rich menu to choose from. In view of all of this, it is not surprising that much of the literature on responsible business and development takes a critical view, recognizing contributions but emphasizing their partial nature (e.g., Blowfield and Frynas 2005, Idemudia 2011, Jamali and Mirshak 2007, Lund-Thomsen and Nadvi 2010, Merino and Valor 2011, Newell and Frynas 2007, Sagebien and Whellams 2010).

The remainder of this paper will review the CSR performance among Dutch and Dutch-related¹ agribusinesses in six African countries: Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda, South Africa, and Zambia. The objective is to see how they work with CSR ideas in practice, and what this means for local development. Data are drawn from several sources. One is a study undertaken on behalf of MVO-Nederland by several researchers and students of IDS Utrecht in 2013 on Dutch-affiliated agri-food companies in the first five countries mentioned (Van Westen et al. 2013).² This is complemented by data on other agribusinesses in Kenya (Heemskerk 2012) and Zambia (Dengerink 2013) using similar survey and interview protocols. Due to the composite nature of the database, and adaptation to conditions in different countries in terms of sampling techniques and sample size, we do not claim that data are representative of Dutch-related entrepreneurs in sub-Saharan Africa. It does cover a fair share of Dutch-related businesses in the countries in question, though: in all, 190 enterprises have been surveyed, which is complemented by interviews with different stakeholders in each of the countries involved, as well as by consultation of secondary sources. The survey covered CSR practices with respect to the following issues: product quality and safety standards, labour conditions, natural resource use and waste treatment, chain relationships (suppliers and clients), and community relations.

The descriptive analysis that follows glosses over differences that obviously exist between the different African countries. For instance, in South Africa, Dutch farms do not stand out as much from their neighbours as in most other countries; there are also differences between long-established enterprises (Zambia) and recent Dutch investments in countries like Kenya and Ethiopia. All of this imposes limitations, as does the fact that we need to rely here essentially on self-reporting by the businesses.

Dutch agribusinesses in sub-Saharan Africa

Dutch agribusiness investment in Africa comprises a wide range of activities, among which a few industries stand out. Floriculture is one, comprising 26.5 per cent of our survey population, with important clusters in Kenya and Ethiopia that have become icons of Dutch agribusiness in Africa (see Melese and Helmsing 2010 on the Ethiopian cluster). Also important are food crops (32.3 per cent), often horticulture. Livestock is next (19.6 per cent), with dairy slightly more prominent than meat production, followed by poultry. Over one-fifth of surveyed firms are not involved in production, but offer support activities, such as providing seeds and seedlings, equipment, fertilizers and pesticides, as well as processing and manufacturing, packaging, logistics, R&D – including laboratory services – consultancies, and trading. The activity profile is less clear-cut than suggested here, as 27.5 per cent of businesses have a mix of activities. They may be involved in

different value chains (combining, say, livestock with food crops), or they combine different links in the chain (e.g., farming with processing, and packaging), sometimes because of a lack of local support services.

An important feature is the export orientation of many of these firms: slightly over half of sales are in the domestic market, and some 47 per cent is exported, much of it to European markets, but also beyond. Similarly, over 40 per cent of supplies are sourced from abroad, mostly from Europe, although cheaper Asian suppliers are making inroads in items such as chemicals and equipment. The share of inputs sourced from Europe (31.5 per cent) exceeds the share of the European market as a destination for products (26 per cent), suggesting that Dutch agribusiness in Africa is indeed good for Dutch (and other European) businesses at home. The role of other African countries as suppliers and destinations is limited, indicating that there is, as yet, little integration of African markets in these industries. A further interesting feature that deserves to mention here is that some 22 per cent of the surveyed agribusinesses had benefited from public sector subsidies or grants, usually from Dutch sources. In this sense, merchant and vicar have already met.

Responsibility performance

The businesses report an overall satisfactory level of compliance and effort in support of social and environmental objectives. This is not surprising in a study that has to rely on self-assessment of respondents. Nor is there much reason to doubt a reasonable degree of compliance with accepted standards. Talks with independent experts on agribusiness in the countries involved show that Dutch businesses are, by and large, seen as decent players, often somewhat more inclined to adopt good practices than on average in the country in question. This may be explained by the businesses being rooted in normative frameworks from home, and a corresponding awareness of, for instance, environmental standards. It likely also reflects a higher degree of professionalism and advanced technology that marks their operations (Van Westen et al. 2013). Let us briefly explore findings in some key fields of responsible business behaviour.

Standards and certification

Responsible business usually entails the production of a good and safe product or service, using good and safe methods while minimizing negative spill-overs and environmental problems, and offering decent working conditions for workers. Norms are either set by government, through laws and regulations, or by collective self-governance in industry standards that are often safeguarded by means of independent certification agencies or companies. Certification schemes can thus make complex markets 'legible',

offering a degree of security to buyers and consumers that a set of product and process standards have been respected.

What now is the performance level of the Dutch agro-food investors in Africa? Beyond government regulations, voluntary certification appears by no means the norm. A bit over half of the firms confirm making use of certification of compliance with industry standards, and half state that certification is a factor in their selection of suppliers. Certification schemes are used in particular by the exporting firms that would have difficulty accessing international markets without them. In domestic markets in Africa, certification still plays a minor role, and since it is relatively costly, competitive pressures actually work against it. Thus, certification is generally imposed by market demands and fear for reputation risk; intrinsic motivation for quality control exists, but is not much in evidence at the aggregate level.

Employment and labour conditions

The creation of jobs is a prime reason for attracting foreign investment. The number of jobs created in the surveyed firms varies from 0 to 6550. Some industries, like floriculture, are labour intensive and employ many people on relatively modest plots. The downside is that these are mostly low-skill, low-pay jobs that offer few perspectives for learning or career development (although three-quarters of workers do receive some training). Moreover, only about one-quarter of these jobs are permanent positions, so the bulk of work is temporary, often seasonal or casual. Such jobs are still welcome in contexts, as in parts of Ethiopia, where there is hardly any alternative employment, and they can mean the difference between having a daily meal or not. Yet their meaning for development is limited. Work conditions on Dutch-related firms often appear somewhat better than average. Sixty-nine per cent of survey firms claim to pay higher than average wages, and this is more or less confirmed by circumstantial evidence. They may be seen as responsible employers, but here, too, clear limits are in evidence. For instance, for over one-third (thirty-seven per cent) of their workers, Dutch-related agribusinesses do not offer arrangements for medical insurance, according to their own statements. Asked about provisions for social services, their most common answer is that they comply with laws and regulations, i.e., they take the narrow approach to responsible business (Actually, thirty firms even stated they did not fully comply with employment regulations.) Competitive pressure may well compel employers not to walk much ahead of the pack. But this leads us to conclude that the quality of working conditions essentially depends on the institutional environment, more than on self-governance and ideas of responsible entrepreneurship. In other words, especially public sector regulations set the benchmarks by which private operators define what they consider responsible. Foreign investors

with better access to capital and technology often intend to perform a little better than what is prescribed.

Chain relations

In addition to employment, foreign investment may stimulate local development by creating linkages with local firms: offering new market opportunities for some or possibly new sources of inputs for others. Exchanges between foreign and local firms may also be an important channel for learning and innovation. Indications are that this does indeed take place: Twenty-eight businesses told us they were involved in training supplier staff, twenty-one mentioned technology transfer, eight had staff placed with a local supplier (often a good opportunity for learning effects), and fourteen offered financial support to suppliers. These are relatively small numbers among the 190 Dutch-related businesses surveyed, but nevertheless suggest an impact in terms of knowledge. The main limitation here is that local SMEs are not very prominent in the value chains of the Dutch investors: some two-third of suppliers are large firms, often foreign. Here, a development paradox presents itself: the very characteristics that make African governments interested in attracting agribusiness investments – i.e., their advanced technology and the opportunities they offer for inclusion in attractive value chains – also reduce the scope for local linkages. The more advanced horticulture and animal husbandry activities require very specific inputs, from chemicals to machinery and seeds, that cannot be sourced locally. Even with good intentions, this creates foreign agribusiness enclaves (especially when they are also producing for export), that have few links with the local economy beyond some employment and the use of local natural resources – in which they may actually compete with the livelihood means of local communities.

Natural resource use

FDI in agribusiness involves the use of the natural resource base – which is inevitable with direct involvement in production. Two areas of business responsibility warrant attention here: environmental impacts and possible competition for access to natural resources. Survey results show that the Dutch-related enterprises consider themselves to behave responsibly in terms of environmental practices, as can be expected. Still, in some 39 per cent of cases involving use of land and water resources, no environmental impact assessment was conducted prior to investment. Social impact had not been appraised in 48 per cent of cases. However, 80.5 per cent kept records of use of pesticides and other chemicals, all according to statements by the surveyed firms.

Independent opinions tend to depend on the perspective taken. Foreign agribusinesses are criticized for introducing fertilizers and pesticides with negative environmental consequences, including human health issues (Gebhardt 2014). On the other hand, technical studies, while confirming the environmental risks, also show that foreign farms tend to be more careful in applying chemicals than similar domestic operations. This may be due to more environmental awareness, as well as more sophisticated farming technology (Adriaanse et al. 2011). Moderate use of chemicals in contexts without modern water management and purification systems can over time produce significant risks. In environmental standards, as in employment conditions, the foreign entrepreneurs tend to comply with regulations. In a setting of low environmental standards and weak controls, as it is in many African countries, practices will correspondingly be lower than in more demanding environments. In some cases, questions arose about whether the move to a more lenient African location actually entailed a transfer of intensive production of a type no longer welcome in its country of origin because of its environmental consequences. This could indicate a race to the bottom in environmental terms.

Natural resource competition, notably arable land and water, is a separate issue. This is a matter of increasing concern. Contrary to popular perceptions, there is very little unused land left in sub-Saharan Africa that is suitable for agriculture. However, a lot of land is underutilized from the perspective of modern agribusiness. This has triggered a rush for land by corporate producers, and especially by speculators, who, in contexts of weak land governance, risk dispossessing smallholders (Borras and Franco 2012, Evers et al. 2013, Kaag and Zoomers 2014).

The vast majority of Dutch-related agro-investment does not involve large-scale land acquisitions, but direct engagement in production inevitably involves the use of local land and water resources. In several countries, the state makes land available for investment projects they are eager to attract, rather than the investor making land deals directly with local land users and other rightsholders. A consequence is that many foreign-operated farms do not feel responsible for land conflicts that result when local people feel their claims have not been respected. Against this background of the 'land grab' debate, whether foreign investors should actually acquire control of land and water resources in contexts where these are necessary for the livelihoods and needs of local people is an open question (Van Westen et al. 2013). Other, more inclusive business models that enable fresh investment in agriculture without jeopardizing essential existing land rights are called for. Several initiatives aim at establishing different models of outgrower systems (contract farming), linking smallholders to commercial value chains. This is often not easy, and the record of these inclusive approaches is mixed, to say the least (Prowse 2012), because of the difficulty

small operators have complying with standards required by buyers, and the high transaction costs of dealing with many small producers.

Community relations

The evidence seen so far suggests that businesses are responsible in context, i.e., they measure their responsibilities in terms of local practices, norms and regulations. While large transnational corporations have strong normative guidelines directed from their headquarters (Dicken 2002), most of the Dutch-related agribusinesses are SMEs without explicit centralized CSR policies defined at home. This translates into more locally embedded responsibility practices. This may also explain the enthusiasm for community projects among the foreign agribusinesses. They support local schools and health clinics, donate sports and other recreational facilities, and contribute to local festivals and celebrations. There is also active involvement in provision of infrastructure, such as making water available for neighbouring communities, construction of local roads, and more. Typically, such community projects involve one-off interventions, like construction, more than responsibility for operations. Considering the lack of community infrastructure, giving more attention to community projects than is usual in Western settings is understandable. Even so, roughly half of surveyed agribusinesses said they did not engage in community projects.

Dutch-related agribusiness and local development

When reviewing the effects of foreign agribusiness on local development, we can roughly distinguish four types of business models within the survey population:

1. High-tech, capital and labour-intensive horticulture for international markets: Floriculture is at the heart of this model, but there are also examples from other value chains. Firms in this business model contribute to production and foreign exchange inflows, and provide a considerable number of employment opportunities, but at low levels of pay and skills development. The scope for local linkages is limited due to the specialized input requirements, often resulting in enclave development. In the longer run, the potential for technological learning is substantial, but it is difficult to realize, considering the high barriers to entry. Sustainability issues arise around waste disposal and the industry is also vulnerable for external shocks such as market price fluctuations.
2. Chain organizers using outgrower systems for export and domestic markets: Its inclusive nature makes this business model favourable for local development, as it integrates many smallholders in value chains, and upgrades their operations, often via certification. It consists of production

for niche export markets (e.g., nuts, fruits, and organic produce), but also for mainstream domestic markets of grains, maize or cassava for beer brewing, sometimes as substitutes for imports. This model offers scope for learning and innovation. However, outgrower systems may have high transaction costs, as they handle large numbers of small suppliers. When dependent on the NGO sector or donor support, the model's economic sustainability is questionable.

3. Capital-intensive production for domestic markets: Import substitution of relatively valuable agro-commodities, such as dairy, meat and poultry production are typical examples. They tend to involve transplanted agribusiness models from Europe, typically catering to upscale urban markets (hotels, restaurants, supermarkets). Local linkages are limited due to specialized requirements, and job creation is more limited than in the first and second models. Impact on technological learning is more likely, though, as there is scope for dissemination to local farmers. Sustainability issues involve considerable waste production and competition for natural resources with local users.
4. Agro-support industries: This is a diverse group of activities that do not directly involve agricultural production. Ranging from advisory services to logistics, and suppliers of inputs such as equipment, chemicals, seeds, animal feed, etc., their contribution to local development is in the deepening and technological upgrading of the agricultural sector in the country. They can produce more effective value chains through clustering effects. An advantage is that they do not compete with local people for land and water resources, although they may compete with local firms – possibly fostering innovation. This would make them more likely to contribute to local development, although the heterogeneity of this model defies easy generalizations.

Discussion and conclusion

As stated, responsible business entails the production of a good and safe product or service, using good and safe methods while minimizing negative spill-overs, environmental problems and decent work conditions for workers. Conventional CSR is essentially 'a public relations tool, a way to deflect criticism, engage critics and potentially capitalise on emerging business opportunities associated with doing, and being seen to be doing, good' (Newell and Frynas 2007: 670). What's more, most companies, especially small and medium-sized ones, are not in a position to reach far beyond their immediate stakeholders. As such, responsible business cannot be considered a sufficient tool for equitable and sustainable development. Voluntary governance is not going to solve development issues. The voluntary nature of commitments beyond that of compliance with regulations makes for a checkered landscape of initiatives and impacts, where individual firms

and entrepreneurs choose from a wide range of possibilities. Their efforts are welcome contributions to social and environmental goals, but cannot replace a more systematic development policy.

And yet, Knorringa and Helmsing (2008) were right to advocate a more nuanced view. There is indeed a move towards a more social and responsible entrepreneurship, and new business models are being developed that take a more holistic view of the position of private businesses in society. This is especially so among larger firms exposed to the public view through conventional and social media, but more responsible business models are also found among smaller firms, where the personal motivation of the entrepreneur and community embedding may play a larger role.

An important finding in our survey is that responsible business behaviour is encouraged by three main sources. One is the generally accepted leverage mechanism of consumer pressure through fear of reputation risk (Lee 2008). In our survey, this is reflected in the certification schemes used for products destined for sensitive (export) markets, among other examples.

Two other channels for furthering responsibility performance are less well covered in literature. One that clearly emerges from our study is the role of finance. This is leveraged in the case of public development support schemes offering subsidies or loans for business projects on condition of compliance with a set of standards beyond legal requirements. Examples are the PSI and ORIO programmes in the Dutch cooperation framework (now being replaced by new arrangements).³ If regular financial institutions would adopt similar conditions for commercial credit, this could have significant positive impacts. A trend in this direction is slowly emerging in the last decades, as banks are more likely to have to defend their selection of investment projects. But this advance is limited to some countries and some industries: in particular, in markets with high standards, anyway, and in industries exposed to public view.

A third major channel is the public sector, a source of guidance occasionally overlooked in the age of neoliberalism. It is clear that entrepreneurs perform better in terms of environmental standards, workers relations, etc. when this is promoted by the public sector of the host country – or of the country of origin, in cases when establishing the business supported by foreign aid.

Conclusion

The role of public sector pressure may therefore play a key role in promoting more responsible business performance. This public sector may take the form of legislation or regulations, incentives and support activities. What matters, though, for really responsible business behaviour is a governance framework that answers to local needs, requires good behaviour, and is conducive for such. Optimal private sector behaviour is, to a large degree, linked with

high levels of responsibility and performance in the public sector, and a strong civil society monitoring the activities of both. The important point to take from this is that the public sector, the private sector and civil society are not alternatives for each other, as they are often presented in policy documents and media reports, but to a large degree, they complement each other. For real progress on a road to equitable and sustainable development, they need to proceed hand in hand.

Notes

1. When selecting a survey population of Dutch businesses in Africa, classification issues quickly arise, as some of them are, in fact, owned by people of different nationalities. In some cases, management is Dutch, but equity ownership has been transferred to nationals of other countries, or vice versa, and in other cases, a firm has benefitted from Dutch development funding (which means its operations have to comply with conditions imposed by Dutch policies).
2. Esmée Avenhuis, Gemma Betsema, Ine Cottyn, Sanne van Laar, Juliana Marquez Mancini, Filipe Di Matteo, Femke van Noorloos, Michelle McLinden Nuijen, Marlise van der Plas, Joëlle van der Pol, Ioannis Repapis and Joris Schapendonk all contributed to this study.
3. Several policy instruments for private sector development in the South are being integrated into a comprehensive Dutch Good Growth Fund (DGGF). This restructuring is part of the merging of the international trade and development cooperation portfolios of the Netherlands government (Verwer et al. 2014).

References

- Adriaanse, P., B. Teklu, G. Assafa and A. Woldeamanual (2011) *Inventory of Agro-environmental Characteristics and Existing Environmental Standards in Ethiopia*. Wageningen/Addis Ababa: Alterra/Ethiopian Ministry of Agriculture.
- Andrew, C. and M. Goldsmith (1998) 'From local government to local governance – and beyond?', *International Political Science Review* 2: 101–17.
- Bansal, P. and M.R. DesJardine (2014) 'Business sustainability: It is about time', *Strategic Organization* 1: 70–8.
- Blowfield, M. and J.G. Frynas (2005) 'Setting new agendas: Critical perspectives on corporate social responsibility in the developing world', *International Affairs* 3: 499–513.
- Borras, S. and J. Franco (2012) 'Global land grabbing and trajectories of agrarian change: A preliminary analysis', *Journal of Agrarian Change* 1: 34–59.
- Carroll, A.B. (1991) 'The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders', *Business horizons* 4: 39–48.
- Castells, M. (1996) 'The Rise of the Network Society', *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture* (Vol. I). Cambridge, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Dengerink, J. (2013) 'Dutch investors in agribusiness in Zambia'. Unpublished research report.:Utrecht University.
- DfID (UK Department for International Development) (2011) 'The engine of development: The private sector and prosperity for poor people'. Accessed 19 September 2014 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67490/Private-sector-approach-paper-May2011.pdf.

- Dicken, P. (2002) '“Placing” firms – “firming” places: Grounding the debate on the “global” corporation', paper presented at the Conference on Responding to Globalization: Societies, Groups, and Individuals, University of Colorado, Boulder (April).
- Evers, S., C. Seagle and F. Krijtenburg (eds) (2013) *Africa for Sale? Positioning the State, Land and Society in Foreign Large-Scale Land Acquisitions in Africa*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gebhardt, A. (2014) *Holland Flowering: How the Dutch Flower Industry Conquered the world*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Hall, T. and Ph. Hubbard (1998) *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime, and Representation*. Oxford: Wiley.
- Heemskerk, L. (2012) 'How responsible is responsible business? An analysis of the drivers and effects of the responsible business practices of Dutch enterprises operational in Kenyan agribusiness', Master's thesis, Utrecht University.
- Idemudia, U. (2011) 'Corporate social responsibility and developing countries: Moving the critical CSR research agenda in Africa forward', *Progress in Development Studies* 1: 1–18.
- International Finance Corporation (2015) 'Inclusive business models'. Accessed 12 March 2015 http://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/AS_EXT_Content/What+We+Do/Inclusive+Business.
- IOB (Policy and Operations Evaluation Department) (2014) 'In search of focus and effectiveness. Policy review of Dutch support for private sector development 2005–2012'. The Hague: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands.
- Jamali, D. and R. Mirshak (2007) 'Corporate social responsibility (CSR): Theory and practice in a developing country context', *Journal of Business Ethics* 72: 243–62.
- Kaag, M. and A. Zoomers (eds) (2014) *The Global Land Grab: Beyond the Hype*. London: Zed Books.
- Knorringa, P. and A.H.J. Helmsing (2008) 'Beyond an enemy perception: unpacking and engaging the private sector', *Development and Change* 6: 1053–62.
- Lee, M.D.P. (2008) 'A review of the theories of corporate social responsibility: Its evolutionary path and the road ahead', *International Journal of Management Reviews* 1: 53–73.
- Lund-Thomsen, P. and K. Nadvi (2010) 'Global value chains, local collective action and corporate social responsibility: A review of empirical evidence', *Business Strategy and the Environment* 19: 1–13.
- Melese, A.T. and A.H.J. Helmsing (2010) 'Endogenisation or enclave formation? The development of the Ethiopian cut flower industry', *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 1: 35–66.
- Merino, A. and C. Valor (2011) 'The potential of corporate social responsibility to eradicate poverty: An ongoing debate', *Development in Practice* 2: 157–67.
- Newell, P. and J.G. Frynas (2007) 'Beyond CSR? Business, poverty and social justice: An introduction', *Third World Quarterly* 4: 669–81.
- Porter, M. and M. Kramer (2006) 'Strategy and society: The link between corporate social responsibility and competitive advantage', *Harvard Business Review* 12: 78–92.
- Porter, M. and M. Kramer (2011) 'Creating shared value', *Harvard Business Review* 1–2: 62–77. Accessed 22 March 2015 <http://pantanova.nl/wpcontent/uploads/2012/08/MichaelPorter_SharedValue.pdf>.
- Prahalad, C.K. (2004) *Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid: Eradicating Poverty Through Profits*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: FT Press.
- Prowse, M. (2012) *Contract Farming in Developing Countries – A Review*. Paris: Agence Française de Développement (AFD).

- Sagebien, J. and M. Whellams (2010) 'CSR and development: Seeing the forest for the trees', *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 3–4: 483–510.
- Sassen, S. (2006) *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tan, W.L., J. Williams and T.M. Tan (2005) 'Defining the "social" in "social entrepreneurship": Altruism and entrepreneurship', *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 3: 353–65.
- UN Commission on the Private Sector and Development (2004) 'Unleashing entrepreneurship: Making business work for the poor'. New York: UNDP.
- van Westen, A., G. Betsema, I. Cottyn, F. van Noorloos, M. McLinden Nuijen, J. Schapendonk and A. Zoomers (2013) *Corporate Social Responsibility in the Agro-Food Sector. The Contribution of Dutch and European Agro-Entrepreneurs to Sustainable Development and Food Security in Africa*. Utrecht: IDS Utrecht/MVO Nederland. <[http://www. mvonederland.nl/system/files/media/csr_in_the_agro-food_sector.pdf](http://www.mvonederland.nl/system/files/media/csr_in_the_agro-food_sector.pdf)>.
- Verwer, S., L. Schulpen and R. Ruben (eds) (2014) *Hoe nu verder? 65 Jaar Nederlandse ontwikkelingssamenwerking*. Arnhem: LM.
- Visser, W. (2006) 'Revisiting Carroll's CSR Pyramid: An African Perspective', in E.R. Pedersen and M. Huniche (eds) *Corporate Citizenship in Developing Countries*, pp. 29–33. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Visser, W. (2011) 'The age of responsibility: CSR 2.0 and the new DNA of business', *Journal of Business Systems, Governance and Ethics* 3: 7–22.