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ABSTRACT
How can one characterize the relationship between political scientists and practitioners? How and with what goal does the exchange between practitioners and scholars in the area of foreign policy and security take place? These questions are discussed at the theoretical level and analyzed empirically. First, the relationship is analyzed based on the analogy of the relationship between producers and consumers. Subsequently a review of empirical studies is provided. Finally, results are presented from an exploratory study of the Security Policy Working Group, which has been in existence since 1981 and includes members from both communities. The study shows that both sides have differentially profited from the exchange.
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1 Practitioners and scholars - two worlds in one

The transition from class conflict centering around distributional issues to a risk society has been diagnosed by the German sociologist Ulrich Beck (1986) as the core feature of the contemporary society. Risk has become the property of a collective good in that it is indivisible. Risks, in turn, are not limited to particular societies but extend beyond national borders. Risk in that sense has been a regular feature of the international system, if we think about modern warfare. As a consequence of modern technology, weapons of mass destruction no longer discriminate between soldiers and civilians. A more recent type of risk relates to ecology. The ozone hole, for example, transcends national boundaries.

Among others, science (and scientists) bears responsibility for the cumulation of risks, domestically and internationally. 'Progress' has been achieved in the name of science and with it risks have increased. As a consequence science and scientists need to confront the problem of risk reduction. Whether risk reduction strategies will ever be successful is quite another matter. But it is clear that the concept of risk society implies interdependence between the world of science and the world of politics or practice.

The German term "Verwissenschaftlichung des Alltags" (the scientification of daily life) best captures this phenomenon. The world has become so complex that scientific insights have become an integral part of the political decision-making process even if this may not be directly apparent (cf. Caplan/Morrison, 1975). Starting from this basic assumption the following analysis will focus on a small segment of these two worlds. The scientific world we will talk about is the international relations community of scholars; the world of practice we will focus on are foreign policy specialists. The country dealt with is Germany.

Following the risk society notion the normative premise is that these two worlds need each other. This implies furthermore that both worlds are complementary. The complementarity notion is a corollary of their distinctiveness. The one may be characterized as the world of scientific knowledge, the other as the political-administrative world of knowledge application. The concept of complementarity, as we will show, needs to be specified. If complementarity is to materialize, this presupposes an exchange relationship between the two worlds. But this raises the question with regard to a) the desirability of this exchange relative to b) how it should be structured, c) how it can be conceptualized in theoretical terms, and d) how it actually operates. The first two issues are the most general ones and normative in nature. The third issue is a theoretical one in that the relevant variables and relationships need to be identified to describe and explain this exchange relationship. The fourth issue, finally is an attempt to give an empirically grounded answer as to how the exchange relationship actually operates.
The following analysis will address each of these issues by using the market analogy from economics, the emphasis however being on the conceptual and empirical dimensions. The first two issues will only be discussed in summary fashion, the third issue by first identifying a number of conceptual formulations of the science-practice relationship, the fourth by summarizing the empirical evidence available on the particular German situation and by presenting the results from an exploratory study on the Working Group on Security Policy in Germany. This case study draws upon the results from a survey conducted among the former and present members of this group, in existence since 1981. It includes members from the scientific community, the Foreign and Defense Ministries in Bonn, i.e., members from both worlds.

The basic proposition guiding the analysis is that a simple demand model would unduly restrict the exchange relationship to a one-way-street concept, even if structured in terms of the market analogy. We believe that the exchange relationship needs to be conceptualized as a two-way-street. This presupposes that in order to work properly a necessary condition is the diffusion of information as to the needs and capabilities on both the supply (science) and the demand (practice) sides.

2 The German discussion - a summary overview

Even though the general history and theory of the exchange relationship between science and practice still needs to be written for Germany, there are two particular aspects which have played an important role in the conceptualization and analysis of the science-practice relationship. The first has been the highly politicized fight for the adequate epistemological foundations of the discipline. The second focused directly on the exchange relationship between science and practice in the context of the debate about reform of, and planning in, the public sector.

The first aspect addressed in a fundamental way the function of science in society and the role of knowledge. The so-called "Positivismusstreit" which began between Adorno and Popper focused initially on the role of values in research. As a consequence this led directly into the fundamental debate as to the possibility of dissociating facts from values and from there to the problem as to the role of science in society. The cleavage became apparent between those arguing that science as well as any other social activity is partisan, and those rejecting the political apriori of scientific research. If science is partisan, the debate is not one whether exchange should take place or not and whether it is meaningful, but only with whom to establish an exchange relationship. As is well-known, this debate fueled the student protest movement later on in this decade.

The second aspect of the German discussion relevant to our topic is related to the reform-optimism which became a constituent component of Willy Brandt’s first social-liberal government in 1969. This was the heyday of social reform optimism in which political scientists such as Fritz Scharpf were involved. The major topic was not only one of reforming the public sector, but also the professed need to introduce planning as a central element of government decision-making. Following
the studies on public administration (see Friedrich, 1970) German political science witnessed the coming into being of a new "paradigm", policy science (cf. Hartwich, 1985; Klages, 1985). As von Beyme (1985) reminded its proponents, it was a new field of study albeit not completely new.

This development raised the fundamental issue of the exchange relationship between science and practice. Two extreme positions may help to demonstrate the broad spectrum of arguments relating to the desirability of the exchange relationship. On the left side of the spectrum, Offe (1977) took the position that (social) scientists should abstain from any exchange with practice. Scholars should demonstrate how practitioners suppress reality. At the right end of the spectrum, the sociologist Tenbruck (1984) argued that social sciences were totally irrelevant for the resolution of any major social problems. Instead of contributing to problem solving social scientists created additional problems with their social construction of reality.

Offe assumes that political science can supply valuable goods but that these goods should not be delivered. Tenbruck, in contrast, states that nothing can be supplied by the social sciences other than problems. The implication of both extremes is that the problem of structuring the exchange relationship is a non-issue. In between these two extremes we find the policy science advocates (cf. Greven, 1985). They postulate that they can make a substantive contribution to policy formulation, policy implementation, and policy evaluation. Policy science is capable of satisfying related demands. By logical implication the exchange-relationship is desirable.

Indicative of the scholarly interest in the exchange relationship we find, not unexpectedly, that there is no single answer but many, each having its own virtue. Habermas (1978:44-46) went a step further by bridging the prescriptive dimension - how should the exchange relationship be structured - and the conceptual dimension. For that purpose he developed three general models, the decisionist model, the technocratic model, and the pragmatic model. He describes each of them in terms of two core variables, strategic behavior and instrumental behavior.

Strategic and instrumental behavior differentiate between the value and the informative dimensions. Strategic behavior is defined as rational choice behavior based upon analytical knowledge, preference rules, and general maxims or norms of conduct. Instrumental behavior refers to the application of technical rules, based upon empirical evidence and allowing for conditional predictions or forecasts in the physical or social domains. Strategic behavior then defines the domain and the conditions within which instrumental behavior is applied. Each of the three models differs with respect to these two critical variables.

In the decisionist model the scientist provides the value neutral answer in terms of instrumental behavior. Strategic behavior takes place in the political arena where interests confront technical results. The technocratic model is characterized by the delegation of problem specification and solution by the practitioner to the scientist. Both strategic and instrumental behavior characterizes the scientist's role. Whether his product will be accepted in the world of practice in the end is an open question. The pragmatic model is based on the explicit recognition of the inseparability of
values and facts. Depending on the conflict at hand, a scholar is identified who is willing to lend scientific support to a specific position in a conflict. Thereby the distinction between values and facts is, so to speak, overcome.

This conceptualization raises a number of problems of which three are of particular interest to us. First, all the models implicitly take for granted that the scholar is not only able to produce something but also produces a good or service relevant to practice. Or, put differently, the scholar has the theoretically grounded empirical evidence at his/her disposal to resolve a particular problem a practitioner is confronted with. In that sense supply is taken for granted. Second, all the scientific products are value based. And third, the exchange relationship is a one-way-street, only the demand side is of interest.

With respect to production/production ability, the assumption that the social sciences have empirical evidence at their disposal with respect to any problem is heroic. One could even go further and challenge the assumption of the predictive capability of political science at the present stage of development of the discipline. That is, supply is considered to be unproblematic, which is definitely not the case. With respect to the second problem Habermas is right but only in terms of clashing perspectives. Barry Hughes (1991) has shown that perspective, a broader notion of paradigm, embodies more than just theories and facts. Clashes of perspectives in international relations result from the specific delimitation of the domain of study. If we go down to a lower level of abstraction, it is simply wrong to assume that, say, a specific hypothesis is either true or false depending on the values of the scholar. In other words, values are more or less relevant depending on the level of generality of the argument.

Finally, the exchange relationship is postulated to be a one-way-street. As already mentioned, supply is considered to be unproblematic. We strongly challenge this basic assumption on several grounds. For one, the scientific perspectives which include values and prescriptions, have to match those shared by the practitioners. This may or may not be the case. Even if it is the case (Realpolitik may be such a perspective widely shared by scholars and practitioners alike), the theory derived from this general perspective and on which the scholar relies to satisfy the demand of his customer, may neither be understood nor accepted by the practitioner. Another possibility is that the supply of the best empirically grounded evidence and prescriptions derived from successful explanations/predictions may be useless to the consumer or practitioner. Diplomats involved in conflict regulation to avoid military conflict would not know what to do with scientific products which cast the issue in terms of the international system level. All these arguments point to the fact that both sides, demand and supply are problematic and need to be taken into account.

Whereas Habermas believes the pragmatic model to be the most adequate for conceptualizing the exchange relationship, Renn (1985:119-122) points to four problems of a different nature. One consequence is that the increasing use of science leads to truth pluralism thereby undermining the very notion of scientific truth itself. Second, all the models reveal that social or political conflicts cannot be resolved
cognitively. Third, even the use of scientific research does not contribute to adequate problem solving. Finally, the scholars lose their reputation of being able to deliver scientifically based insights because they can necessarily be identified with interests groups. Thus, once scholars enter in an exchange relationship with practice they thereby undermine the very autonomy of the world of science.

Renn therefore suggests three alternative models: the purist model, the advocacy model, and the social integrative model. The first is the consequent caricature of the inevitability of partiality due to the value basis of knowledge. The purist model views science as a production sector differentiated according to the values of the producers and the products which are designed along these values. Knowing this production sector, the practitioner in need of scientific support picks the producer of his liking who will then deliver what he wants.

The advocacy model is also a caricature of the opposite extreme. In this case the scholar or producer is the knowledgeable one and becomes the defender of a specific consumer organization in the name of science. This might be labeled the "Ralph Nader exchange model". On top of this, the producer is not only the lawyer of his customer but also his marketing manager.

In the social integrative model the scholar is assigned two core functions: the one consists of compiling all the relevant instrumental knowledge available (Renn, 1985:125); at the same time he must contribute to formal procedures for initiating consensus building, that are accepted by all conflict parties as strategies for reaching a compromise (Renn, 185:125, emphasis added). Ironically, Renn thereby explicitly demands that the scholar functions as a catalyst. The ultimate goal is to achieve a mode of conflict regulation accepted as fair and legitimate by the participants. On top of being producer, lawyer and marketing manager for his client, the scholar is also assigned the role of the impartial mediator. How these roles could ever be reconciled is totally unclear.

Again, Renn’s conceptualizations reveal the same general shortcomings which characterize the models proposed by Habermas. The supply side is implicitly treated as a given. The scholar can always supply his customer with the product he needs. His models reveal a very narrow conception of product design. The product is limited to the legitimization of a special policy or goal in the name of science in the advocacy or purist models. In the case of the social integrative model, the final product legitimates not only a specific policy but also needs the producer at the same time as a conflict mediator. Product and producer are set on an equal footing. What would be certain in this case is the greater demand for scholars, depending on the legitimation/mediation activity in a given society.

Again, these models fundamentally portray a one-way-street in the exchange between science and practice. The criticism raised in general terms against the Habermas conceptualization applies as well with respect to Renn. This author, however, goes even further than Habermas in that he needs not only products but also producers to satisfy demand. We have discussed these two alternative conceptualizations to show that the discussion is problematic as long as we stay at a
very high level of abstraction with respect to the problem of exchange and also that no satisfactory conceptualization can be found unless we take account of both sides of the exchange relationship.

3 Scholars= producers, practitioners= customers?

The supply-demand or market analogy from economics has already been touched on. At this stage we will clarify the similarities and differences of the exchange relationship between scholars and practitioners in politics as opposed to the producer and consumer exchange relationship in economics. The economic exchange relationship consists of producers, on the one hand, who compete with similar or different goods and services for the consumers. The market is the place where the exchange relationship is established even though the producers rarely enter into direct contact with their consumers. The exchange takes place in terms of money vs. goods/services. If the producer can satisfy the demand he will stay in business, if not he or she will be driven out of the market.\(^7\) The scarcity of supply is regulated by prices.

This stylized relationship may not be a very accurate description of what is actually going on in the economy. For analytical purposes, however, it suffices. Coming to the science-practice exchange relationship we find major differences on the supply as well as on the demand sides. In economics producers may differ fundamentally in their specific choices for combining the production factors information, technology, capital and labor. In principle all the producers have the same access to the relevant scientific and technological information. Whether they can actually afford it is a different matter. Finally, producers must have a relatively good notion as to the needs of their potential consumers. Either these needs exist or they succeed in convincing the consumers that their specific good or service satisfies a specific need they had not been aware of before.

The consumer, in turn, assuming he behaves rationally, must set priorities for the goods and services he or she wants. Based on these priorities the consumers not only decide about the order in which specific needs are satisfied but also about the success, if not survival, of the producers. This presupposes as well that he or she has a fairly good knowledge of what the various alternative products or services are. Even if his decisions to purchase specific goods or services are not rationally grounded, the result is still the same.

What about the scholar-producer? This exchange relationship differs on at least six different counts.

First, even if we take the role of the scholar as a producer for granted, the members of the scientific community are his primary consumers. The practitioner as a consumer is only of secondary importance if important at all. In other words, this production sector is to some extent self-contained.
Second, taking for granted that the consumer-practitioner is also a relevant target, there are serious problems with respect to the production factors and their combination. In economics, the various technological alternatives for producing, say, washing machines, are known. Either technology is available which works, without being understood, or a specific technology has been derived from science, which then also helps to explain why a specific technology works. Technology is usually derived from the physical sciences. This is possible because a specific scientific domain has reached its final stage.

This idea relies on the evolution of the scientific mode of production identified by Van den Daele/Weingart (1976:253) which proceeds along five stages: experimental empiricism, the conceptualization strategy, the big theoretical explanation attempts, normal science, and the finalization stages. As von Beyme (1986:12) has argued "it is difficult to press political science into any of these stages." Or, in other words, the technology available is experience (experimental empiricism in practice) which may or may not work. The social sciences are not in the finalization stage which would allow them to derive the relevant technology (applied science) for resolving a specific political problem. One could go further and argue that scholars do not even agree on the proper production factors, including epistemology, theory, hypotheses and data.

Third, the product or service the consumer-practitioner needs, as Bruder (1981) among others has argued, is problem and issue area specific information. These problems are usually multidisciplinary in nature, whereas a particular producer-scholar will only be able to provide disciplinary information. In other words, there is an apriori incompatibility assumption between the potential good or service a producer can deliver and the good or service a consumer actually needs. The consumer may at best buy production components from various producers but he will have to put these pieces together by himself.

Fourth, even if all the consumers-practitioners would ignore what the scholars-producers manufacture this would not affect in a fundamental way the production capabilities of the former. Not the consumer decides about the fate of the producer and his survival on the market, but some senior producers who have the power to decide about the success or failure of their juniors. Once well established survival in this market is guaranteed.

Fifth, whereas the exchange relationship in economics is impersonal, the exchange relationship between scholars and practitioners is highly personal. As the scientific products are usually not displayed on shelves, either the consumer goes to the specific production site or the producer goes, so to speak, to the home of the consumer.

Sixth and final, whereas stores will usually have most of the, say, washing machines available for inspection a consumer wants to buy, the scientific product a consumer needs would not be ready for inspection even if the consumer and the producer met. What they would do is probably discuss product specifications. The
producer must be able to convince the consumer that he will finally deliver a custom
designed product the latter needs. The consumer must trust the producer that he will
finally get the product he or she needs.

As a consequence the market analogy is useful in pointing out the differences
that characterize the exchange relationship between scholars and practitioners. We
cannot leave it there but have to go one step further by asking the question what kind
of custom designed good or service is it that scholars can deliver to satisfy practi­
tioners’ demands (cf. Dietzel, 1978; Friedrich, 1970; Greiffenhagen/Prätorius,
1979)? Von Beyme (1984:8) has suggested a very simple but intuitively appealing
typology of the services which are constitutive elements of the exchange relationship
between the worlds of science and practice. He distinguishes between four goods or
services he characterizes as functions: problem identification and early warning
function, interest- and conflict arbitration function, evaluation function and, legit­
imation and justification function.

The second and fourth functions clearly cover the two dimensions Renn and
Habermas have in mind, namely interest and conflict arbitration and legitimation
and justification. The first refers to the use of scientific knowledge to resolve conflicts
of interests with respect to a specific policy issue area. The second means relying
on scholarly reputation to legitimize a chosen course of action as scientifically
grounded. These two functions are predicated on the assumption that scientific
reputation is a valuable asset in the political decision-making and legitimation
process. This obviously emphasizes the packaging of political decisions where the
designer is the most important factor, but not the product.

Quite different are the other two functions. Problem identification and early
warning relate to the construction of reality where a "government wants to find out
something which it does not know yet" (von Beyme, 1984:8). Evaluation, in contrast,
uses scholarly skills to evaluate a specific policy or a whole program the adminis­
tration itself is unable to overlook and evaluate due to the lack of adequate resources.
These two identify specific skills the scholar has and which a potential consumer
may be interested in. Von Beyme takes the position, with which we fully agree, that
there is theoretical and empirical systematic knowledge which in its own right may
be useful for the practitioners.

Based on this discussion, we are now in a position to draw some general con­
clusions which prepare the ground for the empirical analysis. Social science in
general, international relations in particular, can certainly contribute to legitimizing
political decisions or policies. But, as we argued as well by relying on von Beyme,
political scientists have certainly specific skills the practitioner does not have. They
can deliver services with respect to problem identification and early warning as well
as evaluation. And these services delivered need not necessarily be a priori partisan
oriented.
Contrary to the economic exchange relationship the interaction between producer and consumer is a personal relationship. This is the basis for defining consensus with respect to the design of the product the consumer needs and the producer has to manufacture. In general, the products are custom designed, therefore unique. The exchange relationship is therefore a priori a two-way-street. But even if designed as a two-way-street, the model cannot assume apriori full information on the part of the consumer about the production sector called science. Therefore the diffusion of knowledge about producers and their skills is a precondition for exchange relations to be established. This enhances competition among producers which is desirable.

Until now we have simply assumed that the relationship is a relevant one. This is true from a general perspective. But is it also reality? For an answer we will give first a summary of the empirical research about the problems and prospects of the exchange relationship between scholars and practitioners in Germany. In a second step we will discuss the findings of our survey among the members of the Working Group on Security Policy.

4 The German production site: empirical insights

Within our framework political science in general, international relations in particular would be the equivalent to the production sector. This presupposes that there is an equivalent to what is called "Wirtschaftsstandort Deutschland", the production site Germany. This implies that such a production sector exists which has the capability of satisfying the demand of potential clients. Furthermore, we wish to know what is produced in particular, what the mode of production is and whether an exchange relationship exists.

The production sector political science, as Newton and Vallès (1992:228) have argued, will only flourish in the context of affluence and democracy. Germany is both affluent and democratic, which explains why political science in general (von Beyme, 1991), international relations in particular (Rittberger/Hummel, 1990), began to develop only with the reconstruction of a democratic Germany after World War II. It has always been understood as a democracy science. Even though political science is primarily a transnational, if not a universal, enterprise, on a global scale this production sector is not homogeneous (Newton/Vallès,1991:238; cf. also McKay, 1991:446). Transnational variations are found in terms of the conditions and factors of production specific to the national context.

We will not raise the issue of international competitiveness but rather limit ourselves to the specific German market. The specific scholarly tradition determines the actual use and combination of the production factors available. The same holds with respect to consumer behavior. We suspect that in the area of foreign policy the science-practice relationship resembles a closed market. Therefore the exchange relationship is primarily established between national consumers and producers.
Political science, with international relations as a constitutive component, has been a growth sector in Germany. Yet it took considerable time before its expansion and, as a consequence, institutionalization (v. Beyme, 1986, 1991; Czempiel, 1986; Meyers, 1990; Rittberger/Hummel, 1990; Schössler, 1990) took place. The international relations' production sector was, and still is, unique in that first of all it encompasses both international relations in general, but also includes area and developmental studies. Second, research capacities such as the Bundesinstitut für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studien in Cologne (cf. also Leggewie, 1987) were first established outside the universities as a reaction to the Cold War (Rittberger/Hummel, 1990:32).

Only in the early sixties did the field become institutionalized within the universities. The goal or reserving one-third of the full professorships in the political science departments for international relations, however, was never reached. In the late sixties and early seventies one could almost speak of a growth industry. For one, because of the expansion of the universities at large, for another, because of the establishment of peace research which has always considered itself as a part of international relations in general.

Additional evidence for the growth of the discipline is the number of courses on international relations which increased from 123 to 1446 between 1950 and 1979/80 (Rittberger/Hummel, 1990:). Interesting though is the trend away from general courses on international relations, decreasing during that time period from about one-third to about one-fifth, whereas the courses on developing countries, part of IR, increased from 12 to 27 percent in the same time period (Rittberger/Hummel, 1990:). Another indication is that in 1964 the sub-discipline became institutionalized within the German Political Science Association as the "Sektion Internationale Beziehungen". In the seventies the section no longer existed. Only in 1985 was a new effort made to reestablish it with some success. Today the section has about 200 members.

The end of the Cold War certainly has had and will continue to have an impact on the discipline that is hard to evaluate. One consequence is already visible. Each of the newly founded or reconstructed universities in the former GDR is endowed with one chair in international relations, thus contributing to a new expansion of this sector. In addition there are the special skills in area studies which existed for a long time in the GDR (cf Berg et al., 1992; Koop/Wartmann, 1993).

What is actually produced and how is it produced? These two issues are especially relevant because they predetermine what can or could be delivered. With respect to the first question the findings presented are from a mail survey conducted in the mid-eighties by Professor Böhret (1995). Of a total of 571 questionnaires mailed to senior and junior scholars working in the (West) German universities, a total of 266 questionnaires were returned, 254 of which were suited for the analysis (Böhret, 1985:220-222). Not included were all the scholars working outside the universities. Böhret concludes that the sample is representative.
The scholars were asked about their research activities, which were then combined into a categorical system identifying the major areas of inquiry. In international relations five specific sub-areas were identified. These will be mentioned below. Among other things, he asked the respondents to list past research-topics, the themes they were presently working on, and prospective future research areas. We have summarized these responses by collapsing the total number of answers into two categories: international relations and all others, listed in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1: Senior Scholars Research: IR vs. Political Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>past research</th>
<th>present research</th>
<th>future research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>12,20 (46)</td>
<td>15,65 (49)</td>
<td>13,71 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>87,80 (331)</td>
<td>84,35 (264)</td>
<td>86,29 (214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: computed from Böhret, 1985, Table 7 A
(for explanations see the text)

Table 2: Junior Scholars Research: IR vs. Political Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>past research</th>
<th>present research</th>
<th>future research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>29,89 (26)</td>
<td>27,71 (23)</td>
<td>27,42 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>70,11 (61)</td>
<td>72,29 (60)</td>
<td>72,58 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: computed from Böhret, 1985, Table 8 A
(for explanations see the text)

These two tables are interesting on two counts. First of all, we see that international relations at large is a research field which, at the senior level represents only a small proportion of the political science field in Germany. In addition we see that there is some variation in terms of emphasis in past, present, and future interests, but these variations, as indicated by the respondents, are not terribly large. In other words, there is some continuity with respect to the production sphere. This seems to
be the case at the junior research level as well. What is striking, however, is that a much greater proportion of the junior scholars are working in the international relations area.

If we break down the total number of themes referring to international relations into its subcategories listed in Table 3, we still find that junior researchers have a greater interest in international relations in general than their senior counterparts, 27.5 vs. 20.3 percent. In contrast, the senior scholars are obviously more involved in foreign policy studies, German or other, than the junior scholars, whereby the activity of the former is considerably higher in relative terms than that of the latter. Peace research and European political issues, in contrast, seem to be equally valued by both.

Table 3: Specialization in International Relations: Senior and Junior Scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Senior Scholars</th>
<th>Junior Scholars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International relations</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>27.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organizations</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Politics</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Foreign Policy</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy of others</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Research</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nominations</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: computed from Böhret, 1985, Table 4

Next to the expansion of this sector we find that continuity exists with respect to the research interests at large on the one hand, but a distinct pattern of research interests between junior and senior scholars exists on the other. More specific issues are to some extent favoured by senior researchers, more general topics by the junior scholars. It would certainly be wrong to postulate that the situation has not changed. Clearly, the end of the Cold War has had a significant impact within the IR-community at large, and the German IR-community in particular. How this has changed is hard to say as no systematic evidence is available. Still, it may be safe to conclude that there is a solid international relations production base in Germany.

Let us turn now to the production specifics. German academic culture in general, political science in particular, has distinct characteristics. One of them, as von Beyme (1986:15) believes, is what he calls "Theorielastigkeit", that is, a stronger emphasis on epistemological and theoretical issues rather than on a pragmatic approach to empirical research. This may have been true in the sixties and seventies, but it does not seem to be the case any longer as the interest areas of the IR-scholars as de-
scribed above indicate. Czempiel (1986) deplores the state of the discipline by arguing that it is theoretically underdeveloped, characterized by a conspicuous absence of the use of systematic methods, the prevalence of case studies and a strong affinity to practice. The mode of production, then, according to Czempiel, is not one of the theoretical "high tech" variety, but a pragmatic and simple one. This implies, in principle, a more consumer friendly oriented mode of production.

That a "high tech" approach has been abandoned, following Meyers (1990), is due to the fact that at the theoretical level the fight for one unified basic theoretical approach has been given up. The fundamental debate has been replaced by a more substantive oriented discourse leading to diversification in the mode of production. Rittberger/Hummel (1990) add to this argument by stating that after having caught up with the mainstream theoretical debate originating in the United States the question today is whether German scholars will be able to actively participate in it in the future. This refers to the attempt to overcome the long existing fragmentation of the discipline with respect to its epistemological foundation.

Based upon this assessment several inferences seem to be justified. First, the mode of production has become more pragmatic, more diversified, and therefore, in principle, more consumer oriented. Second, part of this pragmatism is due to the fact that research is to a considerable extent taking place outside the universities. Obviously diversification may also imply fragmentation. One first question is to what extent there is a consensus relating to the epistemological orientation. If there is, productive diversification is likely to exist. If not, to speak of fragmentation would be more adequate.

In their content analysis of published articles in German journals between 1954 and 1984, Falter/Göhler (1986:138) find that in International Relations 65 percent (n=45) of all the articles published can be attributed to the empirical-analytical approach as opposed to 16 percent belonging to the dialectical-critical variety. This suggests that the basic epistemological division is vanishing with an increasingly strong bias in favour of the empirical-analytical approach. According to the overall findings Falter/Göhler report that only in four out of 17 research areas does the dialectical-critical approach with its holistic world view dominate. Thus, the hypothesis seems to be plausible that diversification prevails.

The more specific research is and the greater the abstention of scholars from theory building the greater the potential applicability or usefulness of this type of research for practice. This proposition is the positive formulation of the critique formulated by Czempiel and reported above. Nevertheless, a negative impact could be that in the longer run the boundaries between the practitioner and the producer will become more and more diffuse and hard to draw. At the same time the boundaries between the various specialists within the discipline could become more marked. As a net result the academic world may adjust more and more to the world of practice. Whether this is actually likely, is open to speculation.
Does the turn toward a more pragmatic mode of production also mean a greater demand for scientific products? In other words, has such an exchange relationship between scholars and practitioners been established and institutionalized? There is very little systematic empirical evidence with respect to the evolution of the interaction between international relations scholars and practitioners. One piece of evidence is reported by Honolka’s (1986) survey among German political scientists. According to this survey some scholars in the profession have the reputation of having an active exchange relationship with practitioners. Of those considered to be influential in that respect, the third ranking scholar and only international relations specialist listed in Honolka’s (1986:51) table is Karl Kaiser. This is not a surprise because of Kaiser’s high visibility as director of the research institute of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik and an advisor to the former chancellor, Helmut Schmidt.

The study by Christine Landfried (1986) gives us some additional information. In her survey among political scientists, members of the two German professional political science associations, she asked the scholars whether they had been involved in exchange with practice. From this survey she reports a total of 172 such exchanges (Landfried, 1986: 106). In 27 percent of all these cases international relation issues were at stake. If one includes the development area (n=16), the percentage goes up to 37 percent. In other words, relative to the size of the discipline there seems to be a demand for scholarly advice from international relations specialists. The consumers are primarily the political parties, parliamentary institutions with the federal parliament dominating, the central government, the state governments and even the communes. Unfortunately the information provided by Landfried does not identify specific producer-consumer dyads. Yet what this shows is that there is considerable exchange taking place.

What is it that the consumers want? Coming back to the original four functions or production skills which may constitute the exchange relationship, the relative importance of each of them can be inferred from the answers Landfried reports. These are listed in table 4.

As we can see from this table, the overwhelming function requested and performed relates to problem identification (36 percent) and evaluation (34 percent). In other words, two-thirds of the services relate indeed to the professional skills of the academics. In contrast, legitimation and conflict regulation, still comprising one-third of the total exchange activities reported, are in the minority. One problem this survey raises but does not answer is whether this evaluation on the part of the scholars is accurate. The results are plausible if von Beyme (1984) is correct when speaking about the willingness of German academics to get involved with practitioners. According to him, the general tendency seems to be that German professors are quite willing to get government funding for their projects. The intention is less to get actively involved in politics or policy-making but rather to secure the financing of their projects they would undertake in any event.
Table 4: Function of scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Specific answers by respondents</th>
<th>Frequency(*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Identification</td>
<td>• problem identification</td>
<td>122 (36.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>• specific design of measures etc.</td>
<td>98 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• control function within institution</td>
<td>18 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Regulation</td>
<td>• buying time</td>
<td>14 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• counterweight to interest groups</td>
<td>31 (9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimation</td>
<td>• support for decisions already made</td>
<td>32 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>• no specific idea on part of customer</td>
<td>21 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents= 156 political scientists  
Source: Landfried, 1986:110

This leads to the follow-up question as to the structure of the exchange relationship. We suspect that the institutional context in which the exchange takes place will restrain or enhance the functions of the scholar-producer. Landfried gives a general overview of the literature which, unfortunately, is not IR-specific. Nevertheless her analysis reveals a number of insights relevant to our discussion.

In the German political system, well-established structures of exchange relationships exist. Most prominent are the scientific advisory boards of the specific ministries. In 1984, 528 such bodies existed at the federal level (Landfried, 1986:107). Next are working contacts with specific research institutes. Other than that there are commissions and hearings in which scholars actively participate. The real problem, according to Mayntz (1984:8) is that all these bodies consist of scholars and interest group representatives. Political scientists, following the survey of the literature by Landfried, are in the minority. Even if they are specialists in a specific area they may not even be called upon, with lawyers and interests group representatives dominating.

The official channels for the exchange between scholars and practitioners, then, seem to be problematic. Their location at a lower level of the hierarchy and the mixture of scholars and interest group representatives do not necessarily contribute to the transfer of knowledge. The importance of informal channels of interaction cannot be assessed even though we would assume that they are important. Two aspects relating to the consumer side may be important in this respect: to what degree do civil servants consider scientific knowledge as relevant to their work, and to what extent do they actually make use of it?

The systematic study by Bruder (1981) sheds some light on this question. A precondition is the recognition of the production sector as reliable. If the results reported by Bruder are of any value then the picture is indeed grim.
Table 5: The Reputation of the Scientific Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>relatively reliable</th>
<th>relatively unreliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bruder, 1981:63

As this table shows, modern social sciences are confronted with a credibility problem. Of the 105 civil servants interviewed only one out of five believes that sociology, psychology or political science (which ranks absolutely lowest) are particularly trustworthy in terms of what they produce. This correlates almost perfectly with the belief regarding the unreliability of the various disciplines. We will not venture further into this issue yet the message seems to be clear: unless political science establishes a high reputation as a discipline the likelihood of exchange relations to be established are relatively low. One part of the explanation may certainly be that the overwhelming number of civil servants interviewed are lawyers (42). Social scientists make up only about 20 percent of the total sample. In addition, political scientists are only a minority. The German foreign service does recruit political scientists, but their proportion is extremely low. The Foreign Service recruits predominantly lawyers and economists. In other words, the potential consumers are not too knowledgeable about the potential producer: 77 percent of the respondents said that they know too little about the social sciences. In addition there is widespread skepticism about this production sector (76 percent). The reputation of the social sciences in general does not mean that the practitioners consider them no use. On the contrary, among others, they are considered worthwhile for the analysis of present and future social processes and developments, but 59 percent of the respondents state that the results are not quantified enough and very often formulated inaccessible jargon.

One case of successful cooperation between science and practice in the area of foreign policy may be useful to look at: namely the successful expertise of the Peisert Commission on (German) Foreign Cultural Policy. As Peisert himself (1977) argues, the commission was successful for a number of specific reasons. He lists a total of 47 variables which were critical in his case. The precondition for the exchange to be successful requires the explicit desire on the part of the consumer=practitioner
to resolve a given problem, which must be relevant and acute. The problem definition (i.e., product design) needs to be very precise taking into account the possibilities and limits of the social sciences. At the same time both the initiator on the consumer side and the responsible person on the production side have to have a good reputation and high visibility. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the topic may not be ideologically loaded and no particular conflicts may prevail among those affected by the final product. Taking these statements from the total list of 12 conditions Peisert mentions, it seems clear that even if the preconditions are given, the exchange in terms of producing something valuable may not materialize but have undesirable side effects if the topic has ideological implications and is likely to increase intra-organizational conflict on the consumer side.

Summarizing this overview of a number of empirical findings, we found that first of all the lack of knowledge about a specific production sphere may be a major problem accounting for the absence of an exchange relationship between science and practice. But even if that knowledge is there the reputation may be the next potential barrier. Third, even if this barrier is overcome, then the product may not have the desired qualities referred to above. The structure of the exchange relationship itself may further or prevent the development of a good product, depending on where it is located in the ministerial hierarchy and what the specific context is. Finally, even a very good custom designed product may be not worth a dime if it enhances ideological divisions and conflict within the domain of the potential consumer.

This overview reveals that exchange seems to be quite considerable. At the same time we can not satisfactorily assess to what extent this is also true in the international relations domain. One reason is that a considerable amount of the overall production potential is very likely located outside the universities as Czempiel correctly states, whereas our data only covers the universities.

We will try to reduce this fundamental gap of knowledge by focusing on the conditions and necessities furthering the exchange in the domain of international relations. Our starting point is not so much centered around the success of exchange relationships (evaluation of the products delivered) but rather has to do with the preconditions, knowledge and reputation, that may further it. We will address this specific topic in the next section which summarizes the findings from the case study on the Security Policy Working Group.

5 The Security Policy Working Group

Whereas the major ideological confrontation within the field had subsided by the late seventies with institutionalization being fairly advanced, the early eighties saw a new political confrontation, this time directed against the German Peace Research Association, which had played a major role in funding security related studies. Parallel to the dissolution of this organization a bitter political fight raged between opponents and proponents of the Pershing 2 missile deployment in Western Europe in which scholars took positions publicly on both sides.
One wonders how it was possible that the Security Policy Working Group (Arbeitsgruppe Sicherheitspolitik) was established at all. Not only did it include representatives from both camps on the academic side, among others Dieter Lutz and Jürgen Mechtersheimer, who argued against deployment, and K.-Peter Stratmann in favour; it also included members from both the foreign and defense ministries.

The exact reconstruction of this group's establishment is impossible. In any event the secretary general of the German Society for Peace and Conflict Research (DGFK), Karlheinz Koppe, took the initiative of bringing scholars and practitioners together. He personally convinced the defense minister, Georg Leber, that members of his ministry should discuss the disagreement on the military balance data with scholars from the peace research community. Also supportive of this idea was the responsible desk officer, Jürgen Citron, from the foreign office. With the support of Koppe he had arranged a first discussion with Dieter Lutz on this topic.

Unexpectedly, both ministries as well as scholars agreed to evaluate jointly the various data sources on nuclear weapons. With a unified data base, accepted by all, the members from both worlds would be in a position to concentrate on the substantive divergences rather than on fighting about differences in counting weapon systems. This was not an easy task because in contrast to the academic specialists the practitioners had access to classified information. The result was a large book: Kernwaffen im Ost-West-Vergleich (Forndran/Krell, 1984) published in 1984. Of the 12 articles included, three were written by members of the defense ministry. As a result of this successful cooperation the group decided to continue its work with the analogous compilation and analysis of the data on the Conventional East-West Military Balance (Forndran/Schmidt, 1986). Of the total of eleven articles included (discounting the appendix including the various data on conventional weapon systems) only four were written by academics, the remainder by members of the defense ministry.

Despite the conservative "Wende" brought about by Helmut Kohl, Chancellor since 1982, the working group members decided in 1986 to continue meeting. They thereby expressed the willingness to continue the cooperative and fruitful exchange that had evolved in the past five years. Koppe, now head of the Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung Bonn (AFB), formally an "outpost" of the Hessische Stiftung für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung in Frankfurt, volunteered to provide the group with funding and infrastructure.

At the same time it was clear that unless the group could give itself a new specific task it would dissolve. No meeting took place in 1988, but when the members met again in 1989 agreement was reached to focus on issues of European Security. The initial terms of reference became obsolete with the dramatic changes in the Soviet Empire. Therefore the original project was redefined. In the spring of 1993 the final product, the book on European Security after the end of the Warsaw Pact (Forndran/Pohlmann, 1993), was published. This time only one of the 13 papers was written by an officer, the German head of the Eurocorps in Straßburg.
At present the group is searching for a new subject of inquiry. Professor Forndran from Braunschweig, now Dean of the new department of the Social Sciences at the University of Magdeburg in the new German state, Sachsen-Anhalt, and chairman of the group from the beginning agreed to continue to act in this function. In the fall of 1993 the final decision will be made on the new topic of investigation.

Let us turn to the description of the membership composition of the working group between 1981 and 1993. The continuously updated mailing list of the SPWG, made available by the AFB, was used as the primary source of information. As a result we get the composition of the group at its foundation and in 1993 as listed in table 5.

Table 5: Membership 1981, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>total members</th>
<th>as of 1981</th>
<th>as of 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Office</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Ministry</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) total number of members between 1981 and 1993

According to table 5 the group initially had 16 members, half of them scholars. In 1993 the group had increased to 22, two-thirds of which were scholars. As the total number of members who at one point or another had participated in the work of the group indicates, there has been considerable fluctuation over time. A more specific description of the group’s composition over time is listed in table 6.

Table 6: Membership Fluctuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>average membership length</th>
<th>new*)</th>
<th>exit</th>
<th>ratio new/exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Office</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Ministry</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) does not include original members
As table 6 reveals, average membership duration was 4.47 years, continuity being highest for scholars, lowest for foreign service officers as one would expect. Foreign service officers get new assignments every four to five years. In these 13 years 19 new scholars joined the group, 13 left it, 6 new foreign service officers joined and 7 left, whereas the number of new members equals the number of exits from the defense ministry: 16. The average number of new people joining is 13.7; the number of exits is lower by almost 2, i.e. 12.

A simple indicator of fluctuation, which at the same time indicates growth, can be derived by dividing the number of new members by the number of exits. As we can see there was minor growth, the overall index value being 1.11. Looking at the index for the scholars the value is 1.46 which indicates a substantial increase over time. Defense ministry participation was relatively stable in that the exits equalled the number of new people joining. The high figure is explained by the heavy involvement of the military group during the 1983-1985 discussions for the second publication of the group. As far as the foreign office is concerned, its participation has decreased in that more people left than joined the group between 1981 and 1993.

Fig. 1: Participation, 1981-1993
Thus far, 45 meetings took place, the overwhelming proportion between 1981 and 1985. In figure 1 we have listed the proportion of scholars who were members of the group and the proportion of scholars who participated in the meetings. As the graph shows the proportion of scholars/members decreased in the first two years before reaching the original proportion of 50 percent again in 1986. Since 1989 the proportion of scholars/members has grown considerably. Thus, we can observe a process of "academization", more than 70 percent of the group in its present composition are academics.

Looking at the actual participation rate we see a much more uneven pattern in that the average proportion of scholars fluctuated between a low of 40 percent and a high of 80 percent. After the absolute minimum at the 7th meeting in 1984 with about 25 percent there seems to have been an uneven but nevertheless clear upward trend. Since 1989 the average proportion of scholars participating in the meetings was at least 60 percent with a maximum of 90 percent in 1992, the first session that year.

This graph shows that during the time of the first two publications which had been of direct importance to both worlds, the number of meetings was frequent and the participation of the practitioners was much higher on the average than later on. In addition we find that the group has slowly changed in composition in that there has been a move towards a greater dominance of scholars.

Following this brief description of group composition, continuity and fluctuation in composition let us now turn to the survey results. We obtained them from a mail questionnaire: a total of 74 were sent out in March 1993. 37 have been sent back of which 30 could be used for the final analysis. The first issue we will address is whether group participation has contributed to a better mutual understanding, greater regard for the different roles and abilities and, finally, reputation, all of which are preconditions for institutionalized exchange relations.

The role of scientific research for practice was one of the central questions formulated according to the four functions described by von Beyme. The respondents were asked to indicate whether any of them where relevant in the first place, and second, to rank them in order of importance. We have collapsed the answers by adding the first and second most important functions on the one hand, and those ranked as "less important" or "of little importance" on the other.

Table 7 lists the total of responses to each question in brackets, the grand total for the two questions combined is listed in bold figures. The results are not what we had expected in the first place. As one can see the scholars consider the informative function of science to which questions a) and b) refer, as equally important as the more political functions referred to in questions c) and d) with eleven answers each. Equally striking is that the evaluation of the role of scholarship by the practitioners only slightly differs from the scholars' evaluation. They consider the functions as defined by questions a) and b) slightly more relevant than the political functions (15 for a) and b) versus 12 for c) and d).
Table 7: Functions of Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>Practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Science possesses information not easily available to practice</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Science contributes to the evaluation of complex issues in the political decision-making process</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Science contributes to conflict resolution in the political decision-making process</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Science contributes to the legitimation of political decisions</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sum</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lesser relevance attributed to the functions of research by the scholars is striking in two aspects. First a great number in both groups consider the first two functions (questions a) and b) less relevant, 6 and 10 respectively. By way of comparison, the more political functions (questions c) and d) rank slightly higher in terms of lesser importance attributed to them by both groups. What this picture reveals is that scholars and practitioners alike are aware of the importance of both the informative as well as the political functions of scholarship.

What role is attributed to the working group by its members? The questionnaire included seven questions which will give us a first answer. In these questions the respondents were asked to rank the answers in terms of approval, disapproval, an open category "other" (that could be specified) and "no answer". The latter has not been listed because there were only two cases with "don't know". The focus of the questions is indicated in the left column of table 8, the specific question wording is listed in the appendix.  

The importance of the working group as a discussion forum is overwhelmingly acknowledged by both groups. Only one scholar denied this as a result of a presentation he gave at one point in the group, whereas five others chose the "other" category. Going through the questionnaires, the best explanation we found for this relatively high figure is only one comment expressing the opinion that the group is not terribly relevant. All practitioners, in contrast, acknowledge the importance of the group as a discussion forum.

The access to information otherwise difficult to obtain is also overwhelmingly appreciated by the former and present members of the group. When it comes to the network aspect in terms of the group having opened up new channels we find again an overwhelming consensus between both groups. Yet there are two scholars and three practitioners who do not share this opinion. The five "other" responses were not clarified with a comment.
Table 8: Functions of the Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Question</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Forum</td>
<td>scholars: 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practitioners: 17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Access</td>
<td>scholars: 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practitioners: 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Aspect</td>
<td>scholars: 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practitioners: 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>scholars: 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practitioners: 13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Overview about Research</td>
<td>scholars: 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practitioners: 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Overview about Practice</td>
<td>scholars: 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practitioners: 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trust as an important dimension in the exchange process is obviously important in that participation has contributed to its improvement. This is not trivial considering the results reported by Bruder above. One scholar denied this. The responses in the "other" came from respondents who had only recently joined the group. Therefore they wanted to refrain from a premature assessment.

In the last two questions we wanted to find out to what extent participation in the group has contributed to a better overview of what is going on in research and practice. Not only the practitioners but also the scholars gained additional insights about ongoing research activities. Two out of thirteen scholars maintain, though, that this was not the case. One scholar mentions in the "other" category that one of the advantages of the working group was that it allowed for interdisciplinary contacts he would otherwise not have made. A practitioner mentions the fact that his primary concern is that academic research is important to the extent that it fits his specific needs.

If the group allowed both communities to gain greater insight into the various research activities within the scholarly community, the same also holds for practice, the last item listed in table 8. The great majority profited from the contacts established in that it gained greater insight into the world of practice. Three scholars deny this. In one case a scholar mentioned that it was part of his regular job to establish contacts with practitioners.

Summing up the results reported in table 8 we find that for the scholars the information dimension was most important and the network dimension ranked second. Equally relevant are the discussion forum, trust, and overview about practice. For the practitioners, the discussion forum opportunity is the most relevant one, closely followed by the information access. Interestingly trust is ranked third in
importance by the practitioners. Scholars seem to be more instrumental in their assessment of the group than the practitioners with their emphasis on intellectual exchange (discussion forum).

To what extent has membership in the working group had an impact upon the frequency of contacts between practitioners and scholars? We asked the respondents to answer two questions to indicate whether they had "very often", "often", "occasionally", "rarely" or "never" had contacts with practitioners respectively scholars, before joining the group and afterwards. We collapsed the five categories into two, a high category combining the "very often" and "often" categories, and a low category including "rarely" or "never". The results are listed in table 9.

Table 9: Contacts before and after joining the group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practitioners with Scholars</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before joining</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after joining</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholars with practitioners</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before joining</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after joining</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the practitioners first, we find that there is an almost equal number of those who had little or no exchange at all with scholars and those who had such contacts, 18 and 16 cases. If we look at the difference participation made in the group, we find that in four cases membership had a positive impact by reducing the low contact frequency and in two cases raising the high frequency category. The distribution is in the right direction but it the effect is not terribly strong.

If we look at the distribution obtained for the scholars the column totals differ significantly from those of the practitioners. Only two out of a total of 26 scholars had little or no exchange at all with practice before joining the group. Whereas the distribution points again in the right direction, only in two out of 26 cases has there been a positive effect. Thus, contact with practice is by and large independent of group membership in the case of the scholars.

6 Discussion and conclusions

Nobody would expect the exchange between scholars and practitioners to occur automatically. We postulated that at least two conditions must be satisfied in order
for the exchange to take place. First, a well institutionalized production sector, i.e. scholarship, must exist. Second, scholars and practitioners must be informed about each others needs. In order for the exchange to actually occur, both sides must be willing to engage in an exchange, which presupposes mutual trust.

In our analysis we presented empirical evidence related to each of these topics. Only preliminary conclusions can be drawn at this stage. With respect to the institutionalization dimension, international relations in Germany has been successful in creating opportunities for scholarship in this specific area for the first time after World War II. At the universities the field of international relations including area and developmental studies is represented in every department of political science.

Outside the universities a variety of research institutes with a considerable research potential has been established. In contrast to the universities these institutes are relatively close to the policy-making community. Superficially, an asset of the scholarly community is its propensity for policy oriented studies. The draw-back however is a lack of theoretical development and "great debates", a shortcoming which may be remedied in the future.

Are practitioners informed as to what scholars are doing? From the evidence presented, there a certain discrepancy became visible. According to Bruder one barrier exists in that a great number of civil servants in the administration, lawyers and economists by training, do not seem to have a solid and first-hand knowledge about political science in general. Even though the discipline has low esteem, social sciences are nevertheless considered relevant. In addition, the evidence presented by Landfried shows that the frequency of exchange, including international relations, is considerable. The results from our survey support this conclusion. In addition, both scholars and practitioners who had been members of the working group had frequent contacts with the other group before joining.

What is impossible to assess from the information presented is the substance of the exchange. We do not know either how frequent contacts occur outside the formal channels of exchange, which are institutionalized at various levels of the hierarchy in the government. We know that a variety of such informal contacts exist between scholars and practitioners. This seems to be the case for roughly half of the practitioners and almost all the scholars who had been members of the working group.

Because of the relatively personal character of the relationship between practitioners and scholars trust seems to facilitate the exchange. Contrary to our expectations, however, the survey among former and present members of the security policy working group shows that trust was not considered the most salient issue. In contrast, the findings suggest that most of the members have already had prior contacts with the "other" world before joining the group.
For what reasons is exchange taking place? According to a general survey scholars predominantly contribute to problem definition and solution on the one hand, program evaluation on the other. Only a small group seems to be willing in the name of scholarship to participate in activities which are political in the narrower sense, such as policy legitimation and conflict regulation. These findings by Landfried contrast with those from our survey: both scholars and practitioners consider both types of activities as more or less equally relevant. A resolution of this apparent contradiction could only be found if one were able to identify the reason for the actual exchange, to evaluate the specific substantive issue, and to assess the outcome of the exchange.

What the exploratory study on the Security Policy Working Group has shown is that such a body can strengthen the already existing exchange relationships. Our working hypothesis is that for the scholars such a group is primarily evaluated in instrumental terms: it provides them with additional information and contacts. For the practitioners, in turn, the intellectual exchange (discussion forum) in conjunction with securing (additional) information seem to be central.

This leads us to conclude that the working group was probably not terribly relevant in terms of establishing exchange relationships. It was certainly highly innovative with respect to the substance of the exchange, i.e. by putting together in a joint effort a mutually agreed upon data base on nuclear and conventional weapon systems. Nevertheless we believe that such a group has not only profited from a favorable environment which allowed it to be established in the first place, but that it may also have a positive spill-over effect on both worlds.

This study has little to say about what scholars contribute to practice. Given the short-term and micro-level orientation of the practitioners on the one hand, the longer term and macro-level orientation of the scholars on the other, naive optimism that scholarship is of direct relevance per se to the world of practice is at best premature, at worst displaced. Regular intellectual exchange, in contrast, is needed more than ever. The end of the Cold War demonstrated to both communities how limited their world views had been. This intellectual exchange should therefore at least include those issues we do not know much about, from the theoretical as well as practical point of view.
Notes

1) We gratefully acknowledge the generous support from Karlheinz Koppe, director of the Arbeitsstelle für Friedensforschung in Bonn, for this project.

2) The following discussion is the outcome of our review of the literature in Germany. Inevitably this led us to review the policy science and reform discussion in Germany, which was prominent in the seventies and the mid-eighties.

3) The present postmodernism discussion by Rick Ashley in the United States bears great similarity to this historical debate. The core has been the proper definition of science, the role of values, and the feasibility of non-partisan science (cf. Ashley/Walker, 1990).

4) A good example is Gaddis (1992/93), who takes issue with international relations and the apparent failure to predict the end of the Cold War.

5) The German word is Sachadäquanz. The argument seems to imply some ideology of truth, a notion long abandoned in the philosophy of science.

6) One wonders what would happen if the major firms canceled their contracts with the major commercial firms and did everything by themselves.

7) We will not push the analogy too far. We therefore have to present apologies to our economic colleagues by being extremely selective in the choice of the elements used to characterize the producer-consumer exchange relationship.

8) I use the term "cultural" in a very broad sense, including training, professional socialization, and organizational culture etc.

9) There are certainly exceptions. Henry Kissinger as an academic consultant, for example, may have access to foreign policy professionals other than in the United States. But this is generally not true.

10) According to a 1960 recommendation of the Lepsius Commission, established by the German Research Foundation, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

11) Scholars usually identify themselves with one of three exclusive alternative metatheoretical positions: the normative philosophical, the empirical behavioral or positivistic, and the dialectic, if not Marxist, epistemology (Schössler, 1990:38). This theological confrontation no longer prevails.

12) Scholars like Rittberger or Helga Haftendorn, to mention but two, have played a prominent role in that respect. Others, such as Weede or Rattinger, are well recognized members of the scientific community not only in Germany but also in the USA.

13) In the area of fascism (50 percent), underdevelopment (67 percent), social psychology (70 percent), and labour/social issues (78 percent).

14) This includes international politics (n=16), German foreign policy (n=14), Security policy (n=9), foreign policy of other states (n=8).

15) The questionnaire is available on request from the senior author.
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Appendix: Question Wording (cf. table 8)

Discussion Forum: the working group is a relevant discussion forum

Information Access: the working group leads to usable information/insights etc.

Network Aspect: the working group helps me to establish additional contacts with practitioners/scholars

Trust: the personal contacts among the members of the working group has contributed to better relations between practitioners and scholars.

Better Overview about Research: the working group contributes to a better overview of the research field

Better Overview about Practice: the working group contributes to a better overview about the work of practitioners.