

Bronger, Dirk

Article — Digitized Version

The dilemma of developing country research

Intereconomics

Suggested Citation: Bronger, Dirk (1977) : The dilemma of developing country research, Intereconomics, ISSN 0020-5346, Verlag Weltarchiv, Hamburg, Vol. 12, Iss. 9/10, pp. 245-250, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02928807>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/139492>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

The Dilemma of Developing Country Research

by Dirk Bronger, Bochum *

Research in developing countries has so far suffered from a number of serious deficiencies regarding its applicability in practice. Professor Bronger analyses the various causes of this undesirable state of affairs and shows how developing country research can be more effectively attuned to its principal task of forming the scientific basis for development planning and development policy.

The discrepancy between what practical development planning and policy requires from developing country research and the results of that research is self-evident¹. This sweeping but undisputable statement calls for thought and clarification. These critical reflections on the current position of developing country research are intended

□ firstly to show the particular problems and difficulties confronting us in this scientific discipline which is orientated towards practical application but for which we have no standards as reference points, and thus also

□ to point out the combined effects of the various causes of this undesirable state of affairs.

Each is a precondition for how and by what means we can best remedy this obvious discrepancy.

Monodisciplinary Standpoints

The following ideas are prompted by and take as their point of departure the view that until now the difficulties have been discussed only as *separate* problems. Yet the crucial fact is that we are faced with them in *combination* in developing country research. Thus the problems must be considered as being closely interrelated.

The author is well aware that in any such summary exposition sweeping judgements are inevitable and, in addition, we must largely dispense with specific evidence. The criticisms are intended to induce a reconsideration of the positions which have hitherto been defended from monodisciplinary standpoints, and at the same time to provide a stimulus for starting the necessary interdisciplinary discussion of the problems.

The "dilemma of research in developing countries" can be summarized under the following five alternative arguments (A = intention/premise; B = reality). The theses discussed can be considered only under the view-point of research.

THESIS I

A: Research in developing countries must not be considered as an academic exercise of self-satisfaction but must, first and foremost, be of use for the developing countries. Developing country research must be better, i.e. more effectively attuned to its principal task of forming the scientific basis for development planning and development policy: *developing country research as applied research*.

B: So far no general agreement has been reached upon either the conceptual definition or the function, method and objective of "developing country research".

A distinctive feature of the present situation of research in developing countries is the very fact that so far no agreement has been reached upon the term used for this area of research which has been referred to as such for some 20 years: apart

* Ruhr University Bochum, Department of Geography.

¹ M. Böhnet, Wissenschaft und Entwicklungspolitik. Zur Frage der Anwendung von Forschungsergebnissen (Science and Development Policy. On the Question of the Employment of Research Results), in: IFO-Studien, 15 (1969), pp. 57-92; H.-A. Steger, Stand und Tendenzen der gegenwartsbezogenen Lateinamerikaforschung in der BRD (Situation and Tendencies of the Actual Latin America Research in the Federal Republic of Germany), in: Informationsdienst Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutsche Lateinamerikaforschung, 8 (1975), pp. 5-40; D. Bronger, Probleme regionalorientierter Entwicklungsländerforschung: Interdisziplinarität und die Funktion der Geographie (Problems of Regionally Orientated Developing Country Research: Interdisciplinarity and the Function of Geography), in: Deutscher Geographentag, Kassel 1973. Tagungsbericht und wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen (Conference Report and Papers), Wiesbaden 1974, pp. 193-215 et al.

from the term preferred in this paper, i.e. "developing country research"², the following expressions are employed: "development research", "development-policy research", "development-aid research", "research in the development process"³.

Theory versus Empiricism

In developing country research there are still two principal scientific (not political) directions which are themselves ascribable to the fundamental disparities in the understanding of the purpose and aim of this field of research. Although simplified, the two contrasting concepts definable as the theoretical versus empirical approach can most appositely be used to typify this situation. The two lines of research occupy very different positions not simply as regards their fundamental methodological approaches but also — and above all! — in relation to objectives they adopt. In the last analysis the "theorists" are primarily concerned with formulating a universal theory of the development process (or growth process) and development policy⁴ while the "empiricists" deal with the actual situation in one of those countries or in a specific region. As a direct result of the lack of any comprehensive concept of development (see thesis III), on the one hand, and the prevalent monodisciplinary/individual method of operation (see thesis IV), on the other, one must state as a general comment on both positions that so far only partial theories⁵ or partial aspects of the development process have been analysed. To be more precise: owing to a lack of integration between the divergent directions of developing country research it has so far been impossible to grasp the development process in its complex entirety.

A crucial element — and I feel this is a dangerous state of affairs, as regards the necessary progress in developing country research upon which every-

thing does depend in the last analysis — is the fact that these two approaches have hitherto co-existed with hardly any connection between them. Some people have indeed attempted to refer to a "polarization" which has certainly not yet been remedied. From the specific and practical aspect of research this means that one side devotes much too little attention to the other's arguments and research results — if indeed it takes any notice of them at all (example: see thesis II).

Comprehensive Dialogue Essential

I would at this point like to put forward the following in-principle viewpoint: in *theoretical* research in developing countries (which has hitherto been carried out mainly by economists) we should not be satisfied merely with formulating theoretical statements — or, better still, hypotheses of development theory — but should put them to the test empirically in the countries themselves — only then should we refer to "theories"⁶.

So theory and empiricism are interdependent in developing country research; only when the two are linked together can that research be aligned with its above-mentioned task of forming a basis for a development plan and development policy to be constructed upon its results.

As for the more *empirical* research in developing countries which has so far been carried out (mainly by geographers but also by sociologists), this should not be content with making structural analyses but must advance further right up to the investigation of the causes of poverty. Only by means of this causal analysis of "under-development" can research in developing countries be orientated towards its second main function, its *educational function* in the sense of producing a general awareness of the growing problems of the Third World countries⁷. From the point of view of practical research this can mean only that a rapid initiation of a comprehensive and intensive dialogue (Stage 1: an exchange of ideas

² See also D. Bronger (1974), p. 194 f.

³ A. Bodenstedt, *Entwicklungsforschung — Stiefkind der Bundesdeutschen Forschungspolitik* (Development Research — Stepchild of the Federal German Research Policy), (unpublished manuscript), 1973, p. 2.

⁴ See Br. Fritsch, *Die ökonomische Theorie als Instrument der Entwicklungspolitik* (Economic Theory as an Instrument of Development Policy), in: Br. Fritsch (Ed.), *Entwicklungsländer* (Developing Countries), Cologne 1968, in particular p. 429; J.-U. Meyer, D. Seul, *Grundlagenforschung in der Entwicklungsländerforschung* (Basic Research in Developing Country Research), Bochum 1972 (Materialien und kleine Schriften, No. 3, ed. by SFB 20: Entwicklungspolitik und Entwicklungsforschung — Entwicklungsstrategien [Development Policy and Development Research — Development Strategies]), p. 9.

⁵ H. Besters, *Theorien zur wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung* (Theories on Economic Development), in: H. Besters/E. E. Boesch (Ed.), *Entwicklungspolitik, Handbuch und Lexikon*, Berlin, Mainz 1966, p. 243 ff.; M. Bohnet, *Die Entwicklungstheorien — Ein Überblick* (The Development Theories — A Survey), in: M. Bohnet (Ed.), *Das Nord-Süd-Problem. Konflikte zwischen Industrie- und Entwicklungsländern* (The North-South-Problem. Conflicts between Industrialized and Developing Countries), Munich 1971, p. 49 ff.

⁶ On the theory concept see above all: H. Albert, *Theorie und Prognose in den Sozialwissenschaften* (Theory and Prognosis in the Social Sciences), in: *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft und Statistik*, 93 (1957), p. 60 ff.; H. Albert, *Probleme der Theoriebildung, Entwicklung, Struktur und Anwendung sozialwissenschaftlicher Theorien* (Problems of the Forming of Theories. Development, Structure and Employment of Sociological Theories), in: H. Albert (Ed.), *Theorie und Realität* (Theory and Reality), Tübingen 1964, p. 3 ff.

⁷ Included in the programme for "Mobilizing public opinion" in the strategic concept of the Second Development Decade of the United Nations; cf.: J.-U. Meyer, D. Seul, K. Klinger, *Die zweite Entwicklungsdzade der Vereinten Nationen* (The Second Development Decade of the United Nations), Düsseldorf 1971 (Bochumer Schriften zur Entwicklungsforschung und Entwicklungspolitik, Vol. 10), p. 179 f. — The necessity of stimulating such a consciousness of the problems already at school is rightly emphasized by Eppler, in: E. Eppler, *Entwicklungspolitik als Bildungsaufgabe* (Development Policy as Educational Task), in: Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit (Ed.), *Schule und Dritte Welt*, No. 39, 1972, p. 2 ff.

and experience between the disciplines concerned; Stage 2: interdisciplinary cooperation in the theory and practice of research and planning in developing countries) between the lines of research is now essential.

Ideologically Biased Discussion

The attempts so far made to produce cooperation between the disciplines have already brought to light the particular difficulties of any such dialogue. This not entirely self-evident realisation can be registered as an influential factor in the case of every failure. The causes of the slight success so far achieved by such collaboration lie on different planes: leaving aside the psychological (human) barriers, these causes must be looked for in the scientific tradition of the mono-disciplinary research or, and also, as a related factor, in our apprehension of scientific disciplines (for further details see thesis IV). Another obstacle is increasingly formed by conflicting fundamental political views. Owing to the particular importance attached to this aspect, it should be examined separately.

The need to achieve a greater consensus upon the methods and objectives of developing country research is made more difficult by the fact that in recent years the debate on the central question of the causes of poverty in the Third World countries has to a large extent been switched to politico-ideological ground. There is nothing new in attempting to explain the causes of poverty as being endogenous and exogenous (i.e. taking as a basis the past and present fabric of relations between industrialized and developing countries). While, until the second half of the 1960s, the endogenous determinants of development were firmly placed in the foreground of any considerations of the subject, the unilateral overemphasis on the exogenous factors restricting development and even as the sole cause of underdevelopment⁸ has helped to produce a polarization of opinions which for several reasons has certainly not been entirely beneficial, precisely with a view to the necessary further development of this field of research (on the other hand, we should by no means deny the stimulating effect of that line of thought; this is particularly true of the works of J. Galtung whose position and importance in this scientific field should be expressly mentioned at this point) for the following reasons:

⁸ See inter alia P. A. Baran, *Politische Ökonomie des wirtschaftlichen Wachstums* (Political Economy of Economic Growth), Neuwied 1952; C. Schuler, *Zur politischen Ökonomie der armen Welt* (On the Political Economy of the Poor World), Munich 1968; D. Senghaas (Ed.), *Peripherer Kapitalismus. Analysen über Abhängigkeit und Unterentwicklung* (Peripheral Capitalism. Analyses on Dependence and Underdevelopment), Frankfurt 1974 (edition Suhrkamp 652).

Unbridgeable Conceptual Disparity

□ A generally relevant answer to the question of whether and to what extent the causes of underdevelopment are largely (the dogmatic alternatives of "and/or" do not arise) endogenous or exogenous⁹ is impossible at present for the simple reason that we have no well-founded empirical surveys on this point for the large majority of those countries¹⁰ — even less have we any invitation addressed primarily to historians and geographers to take on such surveys.

□ The polarization of attitudes produced by an increasingly ideological approach has simultaneously led to a blinkered interpretation of the causal factors of underdevelopment — factors which in many cases have been subject to inadequate empirical investigation — and this interpretation is prejudicial¹¹ to scientific progress; as yet there has been hardly any discussion of the arguments¹². However, a dangerous element as regards the necessary further development of this line of research is,

□ above all, the fact that this ideologization has occasioned an apparently unbridgeable disparity in the conception of the actual central term of "development" and, as a corollary, of the crucial question of what in any case is the objective of "development" (revolution versus social reform). To prevent misunderstanding, it should be clearly explained at this point that research in developing countries cannot be carried out without political connotations¹³; in other words, *simultaneous* discussion of the *political* aims and strategy is also a *sine qua non*. Nonetheless, a one-sided *ideological* attitude to the whole range of problems impedes progress in the prime objective of developing country research, i.e. to provide the foundation for more effective development planning and policy based on the research results.

THESIS II

A: The developing country or one or more regions within it unarguably constitute the geographical field of research to which the development policy

⁹ Exemplarische Gegenüberstellung (Indien—Liberia) (Exemplary Comparison [India—Liberia]), in: J. Blenck, *Endogene und exogene entwicklungshemmende Strukturen, Abhängigkeiten und Prozesse in Ländern der Dritten Welt, dargestellt am Beispiel von Liberia und Indien* (Endogenous and Exogenous, Development-retarding Structures, Dependencies and Processes in Countries of the Third World, the Example of Liberia and India), in: *Heidelberger Geographische Arbeiten*, Vol. 40 (1974).

¹⁰ See also J. Galtung, *Eine strukturelle Theorie des Imperialismus* (A Structural Theory of Imperialism), in: D. Senghaas (Ed.), *Imperialismus und strukturelle Gewalt* (Imperialism and Structural Violence), Frankfurt 1973, p. 82 ff.

¹¹ Bohnet already pointed out this risk (M. Bohnet, *Das Nord-Süd-Problem*, op. cit., p. 10).

¹² Thus in the two recently published collected volumes, edited by D. Senghaas, concerning this subject the important contributions from the "other" side are not even included in the bibliography!

¹³ Thus also J. Blenck (1974), op. cit., p. 412.

aims which are to be formulated relate: *developing country research as a spatial science*.

B: So far no agreement exists concerning the inherent value of the empirical phase of developing country research (theoretical vs. empirical assessment) or the principles of the methods (macro-structural vs. micro-structural research).

Here again we must enquire further into the *causes* of this situation. The following two can be cited as the principal ones:

☐ All too often the traditional monodisciplinary method mentioned earlier produces a monodisciplinary way of thinking.

☐ The "theorists" repeatedly reproach the "empirists" with the fact that simply as regards the questions they are treating the large majority of their works ignore the direct relationship with development policy and are thus irrelevant from that aspect.

If we follow up this reproach, the following points will have to be mentioned as summary criticisms¹⁴:

Defects of Empirical Research

☐ Overall, too little value is attached to the quantification of the results; or at least statistical substantiation is frequently lacking — and this quite often relates precisely to the statements which are relevant for development policy. For example, in hardly any of the overall empirical expositions of a developing country we will find critically examined, regionally differentiated series of statistical data on matters which are important for development policy (the structure of farm sizes: agricultural population, irrigated land: cultivated areas, etc.). Yet are such data not the prerequisite for any statements with relevance for development planning and policy?

☐ Surveys with serious importance for developing country research are largely carried out in the form of analyses of individual regions; moreover, some of them have a (mono) sectoral approach. While such studies may be essential for regional planning, they can seldom be more than mere reference points for planning the development of the *entire* country in question.

In addition, the often idiographic arrangement of those works makes it difficult to transfer and thus apply the results to other areas/regions and to other disciplines. Consequently, the surveys seem to have no relevance to them. A further element on the same level is that

☐ the majority of the works deal with straightforward *structural* analysis (one should really say:

structural inventories). Yet in most cases the next step towards *practical application* is not taken, a step which is nonetheless decisive for development planning and which consists of examining the effects of the individual factors from the point of view of their combined influence on the current level of development and the development potential of the country in question (including its separate regions). Even more rarely do such studies contain planning proposals — even if they were only for specific sectors.

THESIS III

A: The term "development" must be considered the central concept of this line of research. It must *consciously* be made the nucleus of the research. The method(s) and aim(s) of the research project must be orientated towards it.

B: No comprehensive definition of the "development" concept has yet been produced.

As yet there exists no definition acceptable to all the disciplines involved in this function of research. For a long time and even nowadays the economists equated and, to some extent, continue to equate the concept of "development" with the idea of economic growth; in other words, they reduce the entire problem to the measurement and analysis of a few data indicating only quantitative changes. This alone inspires the comment that for the large majority of these countries such overall characteristic data such as the GNP, GDP or per-capita income are not available in a form showing the regional differentiation or broken down in line with the recipients and so these data provide no or only a little information regarding the actual distribution of the national income, especially since supporting surveys on the socio-economic strata of the population are entirely lacking¹⁵.

Reasons for the Lacking Definition

In my opinion, two important *reasons* for the lack of any satisfactory definition of the concepts are: (1) that any such "integrated definition" presupposes something which does not (yet) exist: a necessary level of interdisciplinary action linked with the surrender of an exclusive claim to a (monodisciplinary) "correct" definition; (2) the increasing ideologization of the "development" debate which can be observed in recent years involves the danger of making it all the more dif-

¹⁴ The following assessment seems particularly daring in view of the amount of literature available. Yet the attempt is made in view of the fundamental significance of this point of view and also in order to stimulate discussion.

¹⁵ This fact has been generally acknowledged for some time. (See K. Ringer, in: H. Besters, E. E. Boesch (Ed.), *Zur Begriffsbestimmung der Entwicklungsländer* (On the Definition of Developing Countries), op. cit., p. 6 f. And this makes the present investigations of this kind all the more incomprehensible.

difficult to find a definition because the necessary consensus on the central question of the kind of "development" we want will be increasingly harder to achieve.

R. F. Behrendt deserves special credit because, in a critical attack on the "growth fetishism" which had long been advocated by the economists at an early stage¹⁶, he showed with particular clarity the specific importance of the *social* factors as regards development, i.e. both the level of development and the development potential of the country in question. The pertinent observations contained in a paper on development strategy recently published by the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)¹⁷ still stress the particular topical value of this line of thought which was evolved 15 years ago.

If any such complex concept of development is to be adopted as a basis, this implies for both research and practical development planning/policy that it is not a matter of going for the purely economic aspect (growth of the national product). Instead "development" should be founded on a concept which also incorporates the anthropological, sociological and psychological dimensions¹⁸ and requires a much more differentiated armoury of extremely diversified and synchronized measures than has been accepted for many years.

Need for Interdisciplinary Cooperation

THESIS IV

A: The function and aim of developing country research presupposes interdisciplinary cooperation.

B: Our training and research do not prepare us for interdisciplinary methods – indeed our scientific style and understanding may conflict with interdisciplinary views.

If we revert to the central question of *why* it has so far been possible to bring developing country research so little in line with the requirements of development planning and policy, the discrepancy becomes self-evident between:

□ the need to obtain by *interdisciplinary* action and cooperation between the individual specialist fields a comprehensive causal analysis – which is acknowledged to be urgent – of the present

level of development and the development process¹⁹ and

□ the fact that, on the one hand, the large majority of research projects continue to be carried out by individual persons and, on the other hand, at least on the empirical level, only a very few of the small number of projects designed for interdisciplinary action are carried beyond the multidisciplinary²⁰ stage by researchers and, in addition, this research is also largely carried out by individual persons. As a result, in contrast to the required situation, developing country research has so far been largely designed and carried out on a *sectoral* basis, by which we mean investigation of partial aspects.

Inadequate Training and Research System

Enquiry into the *causes* of this fundamental dilemma produces a general combination of circumstances which can briefly be defined as a divergence between the research and training requirements, on the one hand, and, on the other, the scientific mind and practical usages; the need and indeed the absolute compulsion for an approach aiming at a synthesis and thus for interdisciplinary research is diametrically opposed to our traditional training and research system with its emphasis on and alignment towards individual research.

In the present context²¹ only brief mention can be made of the increasingly serious consequences of this orientation of teaching and research with its monodisciplinary emphasis. The following – and increasingly worsening – vicious circle must be noted: the constant expansion of scientific enterprise with its increasingly stronger orientation towards specialization in teaching and research is bound to cause: (1) negation of the research results of other disciplines and, simultaneously: (2) incapsulation of its specialist trains

¹⁶ R. F. Behrendt, *Gesellschaftliche Aspekte der Entwicklungsförderung* (Social Aspects of Development Promotion), in: Br. Fritsch (Ed.), op. cit., p. 101.

¹⁷ UN/ECOSOC (Ed.), *Report on a Unified Approach to Development Analysis and Planning*, Geneva, printed in D. Nohlen, Fr. Nuscheler (Ed.), *Handbuch der Dritten Welt*, Vol. 1, Hamburg 1974.

¹⁸ R. F. Behrendt, op. cit., p. 101.

¹⁹ Thus already B. F. Hoselitz, *Wirtschaftliches Wachstum und sozialer Wandel* (Economic Growth and Social Change), Berlin (Schriften zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte 15, original text 1969); Br. Knall, *Die interdisziplinäre Zusammenarbeit in der Entwicklungsländerforschung* (The Interdisciplinary Cooperation in Developing Country Research), Heidelberg (reproduced manuscript 1971); P. Meyer-Dohm, *Interdisziplinarität und Partnerschaftlichkeit in der Entwicklungsländerforschung* (Interdisciplinarity and Partnership in the Developing Country Research), Bochum 1971 (Materialien und kleine Schriften No. 1, ed. by SFB 20: Entwicklungs politik und Entwicklungsforschung – Entwicklungsstrategien [Development Policy and Development Research – Development Strategies]), et. al.

²⁰ Ref. the individual concepts of "multidisciplinary" and "interdisciplinary", etc., see: M. Lipton, *Interdisciplinary Studies in Less Developed Countries*, in: *The Journal of Development Studies*, 7, 1970, p. 5; H. Heckhausen, *Disciplinarity and Interdisciplinarity*, Bochum (reproduced manuscript), 1970; Br. Knall, op. cit.; Meyer-Dohm, op. cit.

²¹ Ref. this complex of problems an extensive literature is already available; particularly critical contributions are published in: H.-A. Steger, op. cit.; J. Rösel, *Bemerkungen zur interdisziplinären Entwicklungsländerforschung* (Comments on the Interdisciplinary Developing Country Research), in: *Internationales Asienforum*, 5, 1974, pp. 243-253.

of thought, methods and language²² which in turn produces a serious obstacle to access by other disciplines. Yet, in the long run, this combination of circumstances leads to increasing fragmentation into other sub-disciplines²³.

Problems Caused by Alien Environments

THESIS V

A: Particular problems and difficulties regarding both the theory and the empiricism of developing country research are caused by the fact that the problems confronting us arise in environments which are entirely or largely alien to us.

B: Whether from the point of view of general intentions (Thesis I A) or for special tasks, there is a disproportionate ratio between the preparation and the period spent in the foreign culture. From this angle alone the aim of many research projects must be considered utopian.

If finally we consider these problems and difficulties in conjunction with the fact that the surveys (in the applied sense used above) have to be carried out in environments which are entirely or largely alien to us, this reveals further causes for the discrepancy between the intention and actual results of developing country research. We can justify this assertion more fully as follows:

Developing country research in countries whose culture is alien to us, especially as regards their customs and manner of thinking, requires first of all that we are familiar with the circumstances obtaining in the relevant country or region to such an extent that we can be (and must be!) confident of understanding its *practical problems*²⁴. This in turn assumes intensive concern with the individual regions, including their inhabitants who will be responsible for any development.

Intercultural Cooperation

If we intend to march up to this very high aim, this again means:

□ that the interdisciplinary team prepares itself for and develops a basic response to the foreign culture, including the consequences deriving therefrom (starting with the climate and ranging right up to the barriers caused by a foreign language, manner of thinking, etc.). For one person this process takes a correspondingly longer period. Simply because any such theoretical prepa-

ration must always be incomplete, it should be self-evident that

□ any such surveys can be planned and carried out only by cooperation with members of the foreign culture, each side having the same standing. "Cooperation with the same standing" implies: (1) that the foreign colleagues are involved from the beginning in establishing the problem, discussing the methods and also in organizing the research, and not merely at the data-collection stage²⁵. A genuine *interculture interdisciplinary operation* entails: (2) that the results are made freely accessible not only to the scientific institutions but also to the public and especially the planning authorities of the country in question.

The real situation regarding both of the above points is often very different: On the one hand, six months of (empirical) research already pass for an above average period and, on the other, as a rule the foreign colleagues neither take part in the initial phase, i.e. the definition of the problems and the discussion of methods, nor in the final phase, i.e. the evaluation of results, but only at the stage of data collection. Moreover, the complete passage of the research results to the scientific institutions as well as to the authorities does not take place.

The fact that effective intercultural cooperation faces manifold problems which recently also include the increasingly reserved attitude towards each other on the part of the politicians responsible for such surveys²⁶ must *not* be considered as a *cause* of the failures; instead, it is primarily an effect of our training and research policy!

To sum up, the disciplines involved in developing country research are enjoined to achieve a consensus on the fundamental questions of that research *before* they actually begin the research, i.e. a consensus on the function and aim (Thesis I), concepts (III), methodological problems and requirements, including the organization of the research and the demands on the researchers themselves (II, IV, V). Only under these conditions is it possible to meet the demands imposed upon us (I A) and thus to overcome the obvious discrepancy between the results hitherto obtained from developing country research and the expectations and requirements of practical development policy²⁷.

²⁵ Chr. Rieger, *Entwicklungsländerforschung ohne Entwicklungsländer?* (Developing Country Research without Developing Countries?), in: *Entwicklung und Zusammenarbeit*, 12, 1971, p. 12; D. Bronger, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

²⁶ M. Bohnet, *Das Ende der traditionellen Entwicklungsländerforschung* (The End of the Traditional Developing Country Research), in: *Internationales Asienforum*, 2, 1971, p. 106 ff.; Chr. Rieger, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

²⁷ See in particular: M. Bohnet (1969), *op. cit.*, and *Problems of Regional Analysis and Regional Planning in Developing Countries*, in: *Philippine Geographical Journal*, 21 (1971), pp. 30-31.

²² Further details in: D. Bronger, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

²³ See above all: H.-A. Steger, *op. cit.*, p. 11 f.

²⁴ D. Kantowski, *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen regional-spezialistischer Grundlagenforschung: Das Dhanbad-Projekt als Beispiel* (Possibilities and Limits of Regionally Specialized Basic Research: The Dhanbad-Project as Example), Bochum 1972 (reproduced manuscript), p. 3.