

論文の内容の要旨

論文題目

Impartiality in Japan's International Development Community: A Discourse Analysis of Development Aid Evaluations

(日本の国際開発における不偏性 ～事業評価の談話分析を例に～)

氏 名 マエムラ ユウ オリバー

By providing stakeholders in the international development community with opportunities to assess the performance of their initiatives, evaluations are a key component of the development aid process. The effectiveness and credibility of an evaluation hinges upon its impartiality, which can facilitate authentic improvements to the efficacy of aid and ensure that relevant stakeholders are held accountable for the results of development programs and projects. An important question is thus raised: what exactly does it mean to be impartial, and what constitutes behaviours or decisions that are a product of impartiality?

The objective of this research is to provide an in-depth analysis of these questions, by observing and analyzing institutional evaluation practices that are designed to reflect principles of impartiality. The institutional context that has been examined for this research is the evaluation of projects by stakeholders in Japan's international development community. Publicly-funded bilateral aid-agencies such as the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) conduct evaluations to ensure that tax-payer funds are being used effectively and appropriately – a concern for accountability that makes the impartiality of evaluations all the more an important issue.

Major international development stakeholders such as the OECD's Development Assistance Committee argue that independence is a prerequisite for the impartiality of

third-parties in the context of monitoring and evaluations. Although such policy-making bodies argue strongly for the need of independence in maintaining impartiality, current practices in Japan reveal that a surprisingly large proportion of development project evaluations are conducted internally as JICA-led initiatives – an unexpected practice in terms of an accountability mechanism.

Arguments supporting the closed-impartiality of such internal evaluations have been compiled and analyzed to reveal how development professionals construct understandings of impartiality. Discourse analytic approaches have been applied within a grounded theory framework to code and analyze a wide range of qualitative data from multiple sources, such as: interview notes with development professionals in Japan; domestic and international evaluation policy documents and guidelines; JICA's project evaluation reports; as well as conversational interaction among interview subjects.

An exploration of project evaluations as a professional genre in the current situational context reveals a group-centered, consensus-based model of interdependence that clashes with existing conceptualizations of impartiality that are linked to independence. This model of interdependence can be used to explain the situated language-use of institutional actors that has been observed. The analytical observations that can be framed with the model of interdependence include: defining and discussing impartiality as a procedural construct; discussing evaluations as a group-oriented and consensus-based process; utterances that are perceived as adversarial amongst development professionals in natural interaction; and perhaps most notably, the hierarchical concept of evaluations as a cognitive linguistic category. The current analysis has found that the structure of “evaluations” as a cognitive linguistic category is conceptualized utilizing vertical schemas to place “evaluators” above “evaluatees” within a spatial hierarchy, suggesting that an evaluator's impartiality can be closely linked to her perceived authority within a spatial hierarchy, as opposed to her independence. Evidence of the noticeable hierarchical structures and the importance of interdependence within the development discourse are presented from user-level language amongst Japanese subjects, as well as higher-level policy documents within Japan and from the international community.

Utilizing a combination of analytical discussions – from the perspectives of discourse analysis, pragmatics, and cognitive linguistics – the current research attempts to add contextual depth to existing scholarly discussions concerning the theoretical and philosophical concept of impartiality, as well as cross-cultural insights into the institutional practices of Japanese organizations that operate in the global arena. The discussion aims to generate a better understanding of the concept of impartiality itself, as well as the institutional practices that can construct social understandings of the concept. A better contextual understanding of impartial evaluations in Japan’s development community also holds the potential to strengthen the institutional learning and accountability mechanisms of the respective organizations involved in international development. This dissertation has used an analytical discussion grounded in the observations of the Japanese development community to argue that a markedly distinct social construct of impartiality has been observed within the institutional context of project evaluations in the Japanese development community.