



Title	The Infrastructure Sector in the International Development Agenda : A Comparison between the DAC Standards and Japan's Official Aid
Author(s)	Bringas, Moreno Carla Aurora
Citation	大阪大学, 2015, 博士論文
Version Type	
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/52220
rights	
Note	やむを得ない事由があると学位審査研究科が承認したため、全文に代えてその内容の要約を公開しています。全文のご利用をご希望の場合は、大阪大学の博士論文についてをご参照ください。

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

Abstract of Thesis

Name (Carla Aurora Bringas Moreno)	
Title	<p>The Infrastructure Sector in the International Development Agenda: A Comparison between the DAC Standards and Japan's Official Aid</p> <p>(国際開発アジェンダにおけるインフラセクター：グローバルスタンダードと日本のODAの比較を通じて)</p>
<p>Abstract of Thesis</p> <p>Global norms and global standards in international development cooperation have shifted over the course of the years reflecting changing perspectives among bilateral donors regarding the appropriated method to achieve development effectiveness and poverty reduction through foreign aid. These changes can also be observed in the patterns of financial transfers from bilateral donors to recipients. Multiple factors have influenced the financial allocation of foreign aid, but are global standards the result of donors' consensus over the use of appropriated methods to achieve development effectiveness? If they are not, then how do aid discourses become a powerful tool in shaping global standards and channeling aid sector allocations? Directly or indirectly, donors have particular interests, which are incorporated in their bilateral aid programs and reflected in their discourses towards development. Those different discourses are, in fact, competing among each other to influence the construction of a global agenda in development and frame international debates.</p> <p>This thesis compares DAC's patterns of aid allocation to economic infrastructure sector with Japan's patterns of aid allocation from 1950s to the present time. Three phases has been identified: (i) The Hard Infrastructure Phase or Modernization Paradigm; (ii) The Soft Infrastructure Phase or Limits to Donors Commercial Motives; and, (iii) Multi-dimensional Phase. The findings show that the global agenda has fluctuating among the main aid sectors -economic infrastructure, social and productive sectors- starting with an agenda that mainly focuses on infrastructure and technical assistance (modernization paradigms) to the current agenda that has a stronger focus on social sectors. This trend is also reflected in the patterns of aid disbursements.</p> <p>Amid fluctuating trends at global level that currently emphasizes social sectors as an appropriated method, Japan's aid disbursements over time have been focusing consistently and steadily on economic infrastructure sectors. Despite Japan's adherence to international commitments, it has managed to maintain particular features in its aid model, such as an emphasis on economic infrastructure, but has failed to convey a clear message that reflects its own approach to aid and development. This dissertation concludes that in a context where competing discourses define appropriated methods and standards, persuasion and discourses are crucial tools in framing norms and standards. In this regard, aid methods have a strong political component shaped by predominant discourses rather than by a consensus among donors.</p>	

論文審査の結果の要旨及び担当者

氏 名 (BRINGAS MORENO CARLA AURORA)			
	(職)	氏 名	
論文審査担当者	主 査	准教授	Hawkins, Virgil
	副 査	教授	星野 俊也
	副 査	准教授	山田 浩之
	副 査	教授	松野 明久

論文審査の結果の要旨

This thesis presents an analysis of the formation and shift in global norms pertaining to the international development agenda, with a particular emphasis on the infrastructure sector. It uses a comparison between the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and Japan's official aid to demonstrate the fluctuations in the international discourse surrounding the preferred sectors through which aid should be channeled.

Chapter one, the introductory chapter, provides an outline of the international development agenda, breaking it down into two major sectors, economic infrastructure and social sectors, as well as providing background information on the issues of donor interaction, norm building and agenda-setting in the aid sector. It goes on to set the scope of the research, laying out the terminology, concepts and methodology. Chapter two historically traces the trends and agendas of the donors in the aid system, exploring the evolution of notions about how development aid should be implemented, including the ebb and flow of the importance bestowed on the infrastructure sector.

Chapter three applies the literature on norm creation and its life cycle (norm emergence, norm cascade and norm internalization) to development aid. It shows how the donor priorities shifted from infrastructure in the post-World War II environment to the social sector (with as much as 40 percent of official aid allocated to this sector), as it became the norm among most DAC countries for infrastructure development to be seen as something best left to the private sector. In this chapter we also see a discussion of the conflicting ideas on what development means and how it should be pursued. The question is that of whether aid should be geared towards further the economies of underdeveloped countries as a whole, or towards dealing with poverty and reducing the gap between the haves and the have-nots. The answer bears on the allocation of aid in this regard.

Chapter four examines the allocation Japan's development aid, particularly by sector. As a country with a far greater proportion of aid going to the infrastructure sector than any other donor since the 1970s, Japan is frequently criticized by other DAC countries. This chapter provides an analysis of the trends in Japan's aid, the criticism and Japan's response (from both scholars and government officials) to this criticism. It shows that while Japan is defensive about its aid allocation, the proportion of its allocation to the social sectors has risen over the years, partly to remain in line with the DAC norms.

Finally, chapter five provides an analysis on the key issues facing the development agenda and how it is evolving, with a particular focus on the infrastructure sector. It shows that, despite criticism of Japan's focus on infrastructure, the opinions on how aid should best be focused in the interests of effectiveness remains divided, and that apart from the issue of effectiveness, there remain other important issues that have been largely neglected in the discourse on aid allocation, most notably the issue of sustainability. It also notes the rise of new donors in the aid system, such as China and India, and discusses how their inputs will affect the discourse surrounding aid allocations.

The authors argues that notions of how development aid should be allocation at a global level is determined by the development and shift in norms, and that the ability of countries to propel their agenda and shape these norms is critical in attaining legitimacy for aid approaches. This is an academically solid thesis offering an original and convincing argument that questions the notion of a consensus on aid allocation, and applies the literature on norm creation and shift to the discourse and practices surrounding development aid. We believe that this thesis qualifies at a level required for that of a Ph.D. thesis.