

**博士論文審査結果報告**  
**Report on Ph.D. / Doctoral Dissertation Defense**

政策研究大学院大学  
教授 木島 陽子

審査委員会を代表し、以下のとおり審査結果を報告します。

On behalf of the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee, I would like to report the result of the Ph. D. / Doctoral Dissertation Defense as follows.

学位申請者氏名 Ph.D. Candidate	Makanga Benedict		
学籍番号 ID Number	PHD15404		
プログラム名 Program	GRIPS Global Governance Program (G-cube)		
審査委員会 Doctoral Thesis Review Committee	主査 Main referee	木島 陽子 KIJIMA, Yoko	主指導教員 Main advisor
	審査委員 Referee	山内 慎子 YAMAUCHI, Chikako	副指導教員 Sub advisor
	審査委員 Referee	道下 徳成 MICHISHITA, Narushige	博士課程委員会委員長代理 Acting chairperson of the Doctoral Programs Committee
	審査委員 Referee	黒崎 卓 KUROSAKI, Takashi	外部審査委員 Referee from outside institutions
	一橋大学 教授 Professor of Hitotsubashi University		
論文タイトル Dissertation Title	Essays on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Preferences: Evidence from Rural Northern Uganda		
(タイトル和訳)※ Title in Japanese	武力紛争が選好に与える影響：北部ウガンダ農村部における事例		
学位名 Degree Title	博士（政策研究）Ph.D. in Advanced Policy Studies		
論文提出日 Submission Date of the Draft Dissertation	2018年 6月6日	論文審査会開催日 Date of the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee	2018年 7月17日
論文発表会開催日 Date of the Defense	2018年 7月17日	論文最終版提出日 Submission Date of the Final Dissertation	2018年 8月15日
審査結果 Result	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 5px;">合格 Pass</span> <span>不合格 Failure</span> </div>		

※タイトルが英文の場合、文部科学省に報告するため、和訳を付してください

If the title is in English, please translate in Japanese in order to report MEXT.

## 1. 論文要旨 **Thesis overview and summary of the presentation.**

Violent armed conflicts remain an obstacle to development for developing countries, and the occurrence of such conflicts since the early 1980's has been concentrated in low-income countries. Recent studies have found that armed conflict affects individual preferences which influence important economic decisions. If indeed exposure to armed conflicts affects preferences, post-conflict reconstruction programs need to take individual preferences into consideration so as not to hinder the progress of reconstruction programs or trigger long-term welfare consequences for those exposed to conflict. Northern Uganda experienced an armed conflict for almost twenty years where the rebels were responsible for various atrocities including loss of lives, abductions, displacement of households and destruction of property. This dissertation empirically examines the impact of conflict exposure on preferences (risk, time, and trust/trustworthiness) and real-life behavior in northern Uganda. The author combines questionnaire-based survey data of households to measure their real-life behavior and lab-in-the-field experimental data to measure their preferences. The methodology is relevant and empirical findings are highly interesting. As rigorous empirical work on this subject is limited, this dissertation contributes to the development economics literature with solid evidence. The dissertation consists of two main chapters. Both chapters are publishable in international journals and currently being prepared for submission.

The first chapter examines whether exposure to armed conflict affects risk and time preferences, and whether exposure to armed conflict affects real-life behaviors related to risk and time preferences. We find that exposure to armed conflict induces higher loss aversion and discount rates, but has no effect on risk aversion and present bias. Individuals who were abducted during the conflict and those who resided in counties with higher number of deaths during the conflict (severely affected counties) show higher loss aversion, while households who were displaced to internally displaced people's camps and those who were in severely affected counties are more impatient. We show that the effect of the violent conflict that ended 10 years prior to the experiments is not mediated by recent other negative shocks affecting agricultural income and land conflicts. In terms of real-life behavior related to risk and time preferences, we further demonstrate that those who were in severely affected counties (who show higher loss aversion and impatience) and those displaced to internally displaced camps tend to avoid behavior requiring patience (investment in health inputs) and loss (hiring labor for agricultural production). In contrast, we do not find any evidence that conflict exposure decreases risk-taking behavior such as the adoption of crops with higher risk (exports and oil crops) and increases hyperbolic discounting behavior such as alcohol consumption which is a temptation good.

The second main chapter investigates the long-term effects of exposure to armed conflict on trust, trustworthiness, and real-life pro-social behaviors using trust measures elicited from incentivized lab-in-the-field experiments. We do not find that trust is fostered by exposure to armed conflict either at the individual-level (whether one was abducted by a rebel group) or household-level (whether one was displaced to an internally displaced peoples' camp). However, we find a heterogeneous impact among former abductees: those who were abducted when young exhibit less trust and trustworthiness. Furthermore, those who were abducted seem to show greater mistrust when playing with partners from the northern region than with partners from other regions. In terms of real-life behavior related to social capital, our results show that those who were abducted during conflict are more likely to engage in the pro-social behaviors of political participation and collective action. We find that assistance received after the conflict, and the experience of holding a leadership position while with the rebels are the main channels that foster pro-social behaviors of formerly abducted subjects. The findings from the studies have important implications for public policy efforts to address post-conflict reconstruction programs.

## **2. 審査報告 Notes from the Date of the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee (including changes required to the thesis by the referees)**

The committee members were satisfied with the originality and contribution of the thesis and agreed that once main adviser confirms that Mr. Makanga incorporates comments made by the referees in the revised version of the thesis, it should be accepted as the final version. The major comments are as follows:

- Professor Kurosaki of Hitotsubashi University pointed out the following: (1) In Chapter 3, theoretical discussion is weak regarding why only some of these preferences are affected by the conflict exposure but others are not. If a convincing interpretation of the contrast across preference measures is added, based on behavioral economics theories, the contribution of this dissertation would have been larger. (2) In Chapter 4, the author needs to discuss more about the contrast of results between the effect of conflicts on trust/trustworthiness elicited from experiments and the effect of conflicts on real-life pro-social behavior found in the survey data. The empirical results robustly show that the effect of conflicts on trust/trustworthiness is almost zero on average and negative on some subsets of abductees. On the other hand, the empirical results robustly show that the effect of conflicts on pro-social behavior in real life is positive (political participation and collective actions were higher among abductees). If trust/trustworthiness is the key parameter that

enhances pro-social behavior, these two findings are contradictory. Nevertheless, the author does not give his interpretation of this seemingly contradictory result. Readers will be confused because of this silence. Probably, the author needs to discuss more about the determinants of pro-social behavior in real life. Trust and trustworthiness are only one set of social preferences that affect pro-social behavior. In this sense, the author should expand the discussion and empirical analysis of altruism in Chapter 4. Fortunately, the author conducted dictator games to measure altruism. Did conflict exposure affect altruism? According to a footnote on p.66, the answer is no. As this is highly important information, it should be put in the main text, not in a footnote. But the lack of impact refers to the impact on average. Is there any subset of individuals whose altruism was affected by conflict exposure? It is worth analyzing this. Furthermore, in regression analysis with trust/trustworthiness as the dependent variable, vector X in equation (4.1) includes the measure of altruism in some specifications. This point needs to be explicitly discussed around p.63. In addition to altruism, social norms and information asymmetry could be other important determinants of pro-social behavior in real life. Did conflict exposure affect these aspects? (3) Chapters 3 & 4: It is better to provide cross tables of real-life behavior variables analyzed in each chapter and key preference measures elicited from experiments in each chapter. As preference measures could have changed due to conflict exposure, we cannot interpret the comparison results as causal. But it is informative to check whether the risk (loss) aversion measure elicited from experiments is negatively correlated with risky behavior in real life; whether discount rates (present bias) elicited from experiments are positively correlated with impatient behavior in real life; whether the trust (trustworthiness) measure elicited from experiments is positively correlated with pro-social behavior in real life.

Professor Yamauchi made the following comments. (1) Literature review: It is reviewed, but it is still somewhat unclear how the paper contributes to the whole literature. It might be worthwhile to discuss a little more about the contribution of previous studies in relation to your paper, and then explain how you build on to it. At the moment, it is discussed how your paper is different from the previous papers but it is difficult to figure out the importance of each difference without knowing how those previous papers have been important in the literature. (2) IV: Is it true that households were more likely to be attacked near the camps? This is stated in footnote 42 in reference to Global IDP Database 2003. It is usually the case that you introduce uninteracted dummies when you include the interaction term. Why is one left out?

Professor Michishita pointed out that it is better to clearly state how this paper is related to the main research project and how this paper contributed to it.

Kijima's comments are as follows: (1) Identification strategy: As you note, several papers have argued that abduction and displacement were plausibly exogenous. However, a number of years have passed since the conflict. To convince readers that the conditional unconfoundedness assumption is reasonable, you will need to demonstrate that individuals in your sample were residing in the same districts prior to the conflict, and that there has not been differential out-migration over the years since. Present that analysis as part of your discussion of identification. (2) Apply multiple test corrections (Michael Anderson's JASA 2008 paper).

**2. 最終提出論文確認結果 Confirmation by the Main Referee that changes have been done to the satisfaction of the referees**

Benedict Makanga has revised his thesis by incorporating the comments of the committee members and provided clear explanations of the revisions. Major adviser judges that the revisions are satisfactory.

**3. 最終審查結果 Final recommendation**

We recommend that the degree of Ph.D. in Advanced Policy Studies be awarded to Mr. Benedict Makanga.

GRIPS Global Governance Program (G-cube) 総合審査委員会 結果報告

総合審査委員会 General Assessment Committee	主査 Main referee	木島 陽子 KIJIMA, Yoko	主指導教員 Main advisor
	審査委員 Referee	山内 慎子 YAMAUCHI, Chikako	副指導教員 Sub advisor
	審査委員 Referee	道下 徳成 MICHISHITA, Narushige	博士課程委員会委員長代理 Acting chairperson of the Doctoral Programs Committee
	審査委員 Referee	田中 明彦 TANAKA, Akihiko	学長 President
	審査委員 Referee	名取 はにわ NATORI, Haniwa 日本社会事業大学 理事長 Chairperson of Board of Directors, Japan College of Social Work	学外の有識者 External Expert
	審査委員 Referee	黒崎 卓 KUROSAKI, Takashi 一橋大学 教授 Professor of Hitotsubashi University	外部審査委員 Referee from outside institutions
総合審査課題 Question	<p>Prepare 40 mins presentation to address the following question. You may use power point and/or prepare handouts.</p> <p>Refugees leave their home countries, which fail to provide them with basic human needs, to neighboring countries, where they believe that they can receive better supports. The support a host country offers would unintentionally invite a greater number of refugees, which is likely to bring a feeling of tension to residents. Xenophobic populists might gain supports and threat to political stability in the host country. Suppose that you are the leader of the host country. How would you define the interest of the country? Who should be responsible for the refugees? If the host country neglects the problem, what can the neighboring countries and/or international society do? What is your view on economic and political impacts of refugees? What can you say and do to those who like to argue that humanitarian relief ends up socio-political instability in the host country?</p>		
総合審査口述試問 Presentation	2018年 7月17日	総合審査委員会 General Assessment Committee	2018年 7月17日
審査結果 Result	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 5px;">合格 Pass</span> <span>不合格 Failure</span> </div>		