

氏 名	Bakhrom RADJABOV
学位の種類	博士（社会科学）
学位記番号	博 甲 第 9 3 2 8 号
学位授与年月日	令和元年12月31日
学位授与の要件	学位規則第4条第1項該当
審査研究科	人文社会科学研究科
学位論文題目	A Critical Analysis of UNDP-Supported ‘Social Innovation’ Projects in Governance: Case Studies of Uzbekistan, Ukraine and Armenia (ガバナンスにおける社会イノベーションを支援する国連開発計画の 批判的検討—ウズベキスタン、ウクライナ、アルメニアの事例—)

主 査	筑波大学 教授	博士（国際関係学）	ダダバエフティムール
副 査	筑波大学 准教授	博士（国際政治経済学）	タック川崎レズリー
副 査	筑波大学 助教	博士（文学）	塩谷哲史
副 査	筑波大学 非常勤講師	Ph.D.	キンホネイサンギルハート

論文の要旨

This thesis focuses on the notion of Social Innovation and attempts to critically analyze United Nations Development Program’s application of this term in its projects. The underlying dilemma of this thesis is rooted in well presented assumption that the notion of “innovations” in general and “social innovations” in particular are poorly defined, explained and under-analyzed. In addition, this notion has been abused in its usage by various agencies when any project aiming to introduce new practice is termed as “social innovation” and applauded without understanding of the outcomes of such practice and the consequences it brings. In this regard, this thesis attempts to critically approach UNDP social innovation projects in three post-Soviet countries and suggest a better understanding of these initiatives and their place in respect to the theoretical assumptions made in regards to “social innovations”.

Structurally, the thesis consists of eight chapters. Chapter one provides background information on ‘social innovation’ in Uzbekistan, Ukraine and Armenia. This chapter outlines the research problem and academic gaps, and formulates the research questions and the argument. Chapter two critically engages with the available literature on social innovations. It provides the historical overview of the literature on social innovations. This chapter demonstrates how differently the concept was understood and applied in various geographical locations. This chapter also critically discusses social sciences theories devoted to social innovations, namely, the ‘connected difference’ approach, structuration and structural function

theories, actor-network theory, social practice theory. Chapter three provides the theoretical outline of the work. This chapter clarifies how social practice theory explains the UNDP-supported ‘social innovation’ projects in post-Soviet Uzbekistan, Ukraine and Armenia. Additionally, it discusses human development theory and the UNDP’s perspective on governance for development, and developmental ‘social innovations’. Chapter four discusses the UNDP’s development work in developing countries and explains how the development assistance was organized. This chapter provides the background information for the further discussion of how and why delivery of development assistance provided by the UNDP has changed in post-Soviet republics. To explain how exactly the UNDP’s development work has changed in light of shifting to social innovations, the chapter specifically examines volitional and developmental approach of the UNDP to ‘social innovation’ projects in post-Soviet Uzbekistan, Ukraine and Armenia. Chapters five, six and seven critically analyze “social innovation” projects in Uzbekistan, Ukraine and Armenia by providing the details of these case studies and placing them both into comparative and theoretical frameworks outlined above. Chapter eight then summarizes and analyses the results of the research, and discusses perspectives of social innovation in post-Soviet republics.

In place of its argument, this thesis argues that the UNDP purposely framed the development projects in the three post-Soviet republics as ‘social innovation’ projects, in order to receive governmental support for the administrative-reform oriented projects which did not necessary have “social innovation” potential. The issues of ‘Good governance’ or ‘democratic governance’ focused in UNDP projects were too sensitive for post-Soviet governments to support. Thus, the UNDP chose to run ‘social innovation’ projects in governance, seemingly providing innovative technical assistance to local communities and governments. Governments perceived such framing as more acceptable and easier to support. The UNDP had to enlarge its definition of the social innovation in order to conduct these projects in post-Soviet environment successfully. It now views social innovation as something that can be aspired and worked for, and already refers to newly started projects as social innovations. Therefore, this dissertation argues that differently from the post factum application of the term in other countries, social innovation in the UNDP’s approach in post-Soviet republics is seen as something that can be volitional. Secondly, distinctly from social innovations in developed countries, the ‘social innovation’ projects in the three post-Soviet republics have been of a particular type – developmental – due in large part to the UNDP’s role in pushing for them. They are developmental in the sense that they have been designed to help local communities and governments in a developmental (or transitional) context find solutions to existing social problems.

The thesis provides the first hand information in a format of the primary data and the outcomes of the interviews and surveys which the author conducted in order to assist the growing number of scholars in this field with the access to the information and case studies. In this sense, this study aimed not only to critically engage with the UNDP projects but also enlarge the field of inquiry into social innovations by offering the primary data of the projects.

審査の要旨

1 批評

This study, through the parts indicted above critically evaluated the UNDP-supported ‘social innovation’ projects in post-Soviet countries of Uzbekistan, Armenia and Ukraine. This paper has

successfully engaged into discussion of the evolution of social innovation concept in these countries. It narrowed down on the ‘social innovation’ projects in governance that have been undertaken by three umbrella organizations, namely, the UNDP/UNV ‘Social Innovation and Volunteerism in Uzbekistan’ project (Uzbekistan), SocialBoost (Ukraine) and Kolba Lab (Armenia) with development assistance from United Nations Development Program (UNDP). This study contributes to the academic understanding of social innovations. In terms of the defining the problem, this study identified that the UNDP’s approach towards ‘social innovation’ is deficient to the extent that UNDP considers any projects to potentially have “social innovation” impact. In this regard, ‘social innovation’ projects mainly achieved four common features of social innovation, namely, human-centeredness, networking, localness and use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) but were still lacking two other features such as scaling up and making a social impact. Thus, ‘social innovation’ projects in these countries demonstrate signs of moving towards social change, but it is yet premature to assess their social impact.

In the process of current research, the study also faced certain challenges. In particular, the thesis attempted to collect the primary data from the three countries. The degree of the success of such endeavor is relative. There is a certain degree of imbalance of the data presented in the text. In certain cases, there is an excessive coverage of the cases while in some other cases, the coverage is limited. Despite such setback in data collection and analysis, this thesis contributes to the better understanding of the phenomenon of the “social innovation” both from empirical and theoretical perspectives.

2 最終試験

The final examination committee conducted a final examination on October 21, 2019. The applicant provided an overview of the dissertation, and addressed questions and comments raised during the Question-and-Answer session. All committee members reached a final decision that the applicant passed the final examination.

3 結論

Therefore, the final examination committee approved that the applicant is qualified to be awarded a Doctor of Philosophy in Social Sciences.