2021 年 10 月 6 日

博士論文審査結果報告
Report on Ph.D. / Doctoral Dissertation Defense
National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies (GRIPS)

Professor Koichi Sumikura

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 Doctoral

Dissertation Defense as follows.

学位申請者氏名 Ph.D. Candidate	MANGRIO, Wahid Bux		
学籍番号 ID Number	DOC16151		
プログラム名 Program	科学技術イノベーション政策プログラム Science, Technology and Innovation Policy Program		
審査委員会 Doctoral Thesis Review Committee	主査 Main referee	隅蔵　康一 SUMIKURA, Koichi	主指導教員 Main Advisor
	審査委員 Referee	林　隆之 HAYASHI, Takayuki	副指導教員 Sub Advisor
	審査委員 Referee	角南　篤 SUNAMI, Atsushi	主指導教員 Main 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	原山　優子 HARAYAMA, Yuko 東北大学名誉教授	外部審査委員 External Referee
論文タイトル Dissertation Title (タイトル和訳)※ Title in Japanese	Influence of Systemic Analytical Capacity on Policy-relevant Knowledge Production and Utilization: Case of Science of Science and Innovation Policy 政策関連の知識生産と利用に関する組織的分析能力の影響：科学イノベーション政策の科学の事例		
学位名 Degree Title	博士（公共政策分析）Ph.D. in Public Policy		

論文提出日 Submission Date of the Draft Dissertation	2020 年 11 月 24 日	論文審査会開催日 Date of the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee	2020 年 12 月 22 日
論文発表会開催日 Date of the Defense	2020 年 12 月 22 日	論文最終版提出日 Submission Date of the Final Dissertation	2021 年 10 月 6 日
審査結果 Result	（合格） Pass	不合格 Failure	

※ 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

Please add a Japanese title that will be reported to MEXT.

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

Evidence-based policy has been on the main agenda on policymakers and research scholars in advanced countries for several decades now. However, weak policy capacity in a general, and weak analytical capacity, have been identified as significant hurdles to implementation of evidence-based policy. Scholars have explored individual and organizational analytical capacity from a demand perspective (government) to explore underlying issues. To date there have been no studies of system-level analytical capacity in terms of interaction or collaboration between knowledge producers and users. This dissertation examines systemic analytical capacity in science and innovation policy, using the concept of co-production of knowledge in a transdisciplinary approach.

The science of science and innovation (SciSIP) policy program was selected as the setting for analysis of the influence of collaboration between policy-makers and practitioners and the research community on the production of policy-relevant knowledge. The mixed method research approach is used in the analysis of collaboration and its influence on policy-relevant knowledge production and utilization in the United States, Japan and Europe.

His major finding are as follows. Systemic analytical capacity influences policy-relevant knowledge production and utilization in SciSIP program. It's rather likely that the policy and practice communities exert considerable influence on the production of policy-relevant knowledge in the science of science and innovation policy. The involvement of policy-makers and other government officials is likely to enhance the production of funding agency relevant knowledge. Moreover, the involvement of industry administrators and NPO administrators is likely to produce relevant knowledge for use by policy-makers and funding agencies, respectively. On the other hand, when collaborators with background in applied science (engineering, IT) are involved, research is more likely to produce knowledge relevant to the needs of policy-makers and funding agencies. The involvement in research of scholars with

public policy background is likely to produce enhance the production of knowledge relevant to the needs of policy-makers. Similarly, the collaborations of researchers with humanities background in science of science policy research is likely to enhance the production of university relevant knowledge.

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

Among the members of the doctoral thesis review committee, there was a general consensus about the adequacy of the topic. However, at the stage of initial defense, the members also shared the same impression that the dissertation had several points to be improved.

The members made several critical questions and comments as follows:

1. The research questions and hypotheses should be defined more clearly.

2. The key terms, such as "policy relevant knowledge," "policy knowledge" or "knowledge used for knowledge utilization," should be clearly defined.

3. In both of the quantitative and the qualitative analysis, more explanations on his interpretation of the results should be described. The author must provide more analysis based on the result of calculation/regression.

4. Linguistic problems in the dissertation should be fixed.

5. Limitation of his work and future research agenda should be improved.

6. References list should be modified.

The members of the committee reached conclusions that revisions should be made following these comments, and that the members would check a revised version within about a week after its submission.

3. 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

About seven weeks after the defense, the revised version submitted by the candidate was sent to the committee members. They checked the new version and found that the revisions were made but still insufficient. Especially, they considered that the terms and concepts should be more clearly defined. The members of the committee reached conclusions that more revisions should be made, and that the members would check a revised version within about a week after its submission. About seven months later, the revised version submitted by the candidate was sent to the committee members. They checked the third version and found that the revisions were adequately made. Thus, they left the final check entirely to the main adviser. The main adviser checked the revised version, together with the result of the plagiarism check by Turnitin, and told the candidate to add a few minor revisions. On October 6, 2021, the final version was submitted; and the main adviser found it satisfactory.

4. 最終審査結果 Final recommendation

The doctoral thesis review committee recommends that GRIPS award the degree of Ph.D. in Public Policy to Mr. Wahid Bux Mangrio.