

Joerges, Bernward; Shinn, Terry

**Working Paper**

## Research technology: Instrumentation between science, state and industry

WZB Discussion Paper, No. FS II 00-503

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

WZB Berlin Social Science Center

*Suggested Citation:* Joerges, Bernward; Shinn, Terry (2000) : Research technology: Instrumentation between science, state and industry, WZB Discussion Paper, No. FS II 00-503, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB), Berlin

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/49627>

**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.*

Schriftenreihe der Forschungsgruppe "Metropolenforschung"  
des Forschungsschwerpunkts Technik - Arbeit - Umwelt  
am Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung

FS II 00-503

**Research-Technology**  
Instrumentation Between Science, State  
and Industry

Bernward Joerges<sup>1</sup>

Terry Shinn<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Berlin Germany

<sup>2</sup>GEMAS/CNRS, Paris, France

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH (WZB)

Reichpietschufer 50, D-10785 Berlin

Tel. (030)-25 491-0 Fax (030)-25 491-254 od. -684



# **RESEARCH-TECHNOLOGY**

## **Instrumentation Between Science, State and Industry**

### **Abstract**

This paper explores a little studied arena that exists *between* science and technology, an arena in which a singular and important variety of open-ended, multipurpose instrumentation is developed by practitioners (neither scientist nor engineer, call them research-technologists) for use in academia, industry, state metrology and technical services, and considerably beyond. The generic instrumentation designed in this almost subterraneously institutionalized/professionalized, interstitial arena fuels both science and engineering work. This involves intermittent crossings of the boundaries that demarcate and protect the conventional cognitive and artefact cultures familiar to many historians and sociologists. Research-technologists thereby comprise a distinctive (but never distinct) transverse science and technology culture that generates a species of pragmatic universality, which in turn provides multiple and diversified audiences with a common repertory of vocabularies, notational systems, images and perhaps even paradigms. Research-technology practitioners deliver a lingua-franca that contributes to cognitive, material and social cohesion. Research-technology is about the complementarity between boundary-crossing and the stability/maintenance of boundaries.

## **"RESEARCH-TECHNOLOGY"**

### **Instrumentierung zwischen Wissenschaft, Staat und Industrie**

### **Zusammenfassung**

Der Aufsatz diskutiert eine Forschungsarena *zwischen* Wissenschaft und Technik, die kaum untersucht ist: eine Arena, in der eine eigenartige und wichtige Form anwendungs-offener und einer Vielfalt von Zwecken dienlicher Instrumentierung entwickelt wird, und zwar von Praktikern, die sich weder als Wissenschaftler noch als Ingenieure bezeichnen lassen. Ihre Instrumente, die auf dem basieren, was wir hier "research-technology" nennen, finden den Weg in zahllose akademische, industrielle, staatliche Anwendungsfelder. Die Bedeutung von "research-technology" wird darin gesehen, dass ihr grenzüberschreitender Einfluss auf anderweitig wenig verbundene wissenschaftliche und ausserwissenschaftliche Disziplinen und Einrichtungen eine Form pragmatischer Universalität erzeugt. Diese Form von Instrumentierung trägt mit anderen Worten bei zur kognitiven und materiell-technischen Integration von sich fortlaufend differenzierenden intellektuellen, professionellen und institutionellen Strukturen.



## CONTENTS

<b>A Fresh Look at Instrumentation</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Research-Technology</b>	<b>2</b>
Science and Society	3
Science and Engineering	4
Theory and Experiment	5
<b>A specific kind of instrumentation</b>	<b>6</b>
Interstitial Communities	6
Generic Devices	7
Metrology	8
Dis-Embedding, Re-Embedding	9
Case Histories	10
<b>Research-Technology in Historical Perspective</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>The Place of Research-technology in Social Studies of Science and Technology</b>	<b>11</b>
Discipline-Related Science and Technology Studies	11
Transitory Science and Technology Studies	12
Transverse Science and Technology Studies	13
<b>Generic Instrumentation, Divisions of Labor and Differentiation</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Generic Instrumentation, Re-embedding and Cohesion</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>17</b>



## A Fresh Look at Instrumentation

In the 1930s, 40s, and 50s, the American Jesse Beams (1898–1977) developed the modern ultracentrifuge (Elzen 1986; Gordy 1983). The device and the man do not fit neatly into any standard institutional, professional, or intellectual mold. Long-time chairman of the University of Virginia physics department, Beams also sponsored two firms, acted as a key consultant to four additional companies, participated in the Manhattan Project, worked for the military during the 1940s and 50s, and contributed to numerous NSF science programs. Beams was not the classical academic, engineer, entrepreneur, nor technical consultant. Although often located at or near the University of Virginia, his principal connection to that academic institution was the huge and well-equipped workshops that he developed there during decades of arduous endeavor (Brown 1967).

Beams' ultracentrifuge had a parallel life. The ultracentrifuge was a by-product of his 1924 doctoral dissertation which focused on rapidly rotating mechanical systems. Assigned by his thesis director to investigate the time interval of quantum absorption events, Beams developed a high-speed rotating technique for the accurate measurement of very short intervals of time. This device, and not the study of physical phenomena, was the centerpiece of his successful dissertation. An interest in multipurpose, multi-audience technical apparatus rather than a focus on the stuff of the physical world emerged as Beams' guiding logic. Yet this focus did not make Beams an engineer or technologist in the usual sense of the term.

His initial devices employed air-driven turbines. However, their performance was limited by mechanical factors as well as by air friction. He first augmented speed by introducing a flexible drive-shaft which allowed for adjustments in the center of gravity, thereby multiplying rotating capacity. He next placed the rotating vessel inside a vacuum, thereby eliminating air friction. But nonetheless shaft mechanics continued to restrict performance. To solve this, Beams employed magnets to spin his vessel. The vessel was suspended inside a vacuum, thanks to a magnet-based servomechanism. This constituted his consummate ultracentrifuge which rotated at previously unheard-of rates.

The ultracentrifuge became an important element in bio-medical research on bacteria and viruses, and soon figured centrally in medical diagnosis and treatment. Beams engineered devices for radioactive isotope separation in the late 1930s which were effectively tested in the Manhattan Project and became commercially viable in the 1950s and 1960s. The Beams ultracentrifuge served in early ram jet propulsion research, and it was also used to do physics and engineering research on the strength of thin films. A Beams device rotating at over three million revolutions per second was used by physicists to measure light pressure. A somewhat different instrument enabled enhanced precision in the measurement of the gravitational constant.

As an author Beams published abundantly, sometimes in disciplinary periodicals, but much more of his written output appeared in instrumentation journals, such as the *American Review of Scientific Instruments*. A high proportion of his writings took the form of unpublished technical reports and he co-sponsored half a dozen patents. Beams' written productions were equally divided between the public and private spheres: between articles and patents on the one hand (public), and confidential reports and consultancy on the other (private). Concurrent with these publications, he continued to build far-reaching artefacts.



Beams and his devices crossed innumerable boundaries. Beams circulated in and out of institutions and shifted from employer to employer. He belonged to many organizations, movements, and interests. He was neither a-institutional nor anti-institutional, but rather multi-institutional. He had no single home; his home lay everywhere. He explored and exploited the laws of nature as embedded in instruments and, like Beams himself, his ultracentrifuges also crossed a multitude of boundaries. They were open-ended, general-purpose devices which came to perform a host of functions and found their way into a variety of non-academic publications and applications.

A special vocabulary and way of seeing events developed in conjunction with the Beams device. Light pressure and gravitation, isotope separation and thin films, microbes and viruses came to be spoken about in terms of rotational speeds and centrifugal pressures. "Rotation," and with it "specific density," emerged as a lingua franca for a disparate spread of fields and functions, extending from academia and research to industrial production and medical services. The rotational vocabulary and imagery of Beams' instrument percolated outward. Beams' approach and his artefacts thereby helped coalesce dispersed technical, professional, and institutional worlds.

### **Research-Technology**

The Beams ultracentrifuge is just one instance of what we label "research-technology." The term research-technology first arose in the early 1930s in an exchange of letters between the Dutch Nobel Laureate Pieter Zeeman (1865-1943) and the French physicist Aimé Cotton (1869-1951) – director of the laboratory that housed the Bellevue giant electromagnet (Shinn 1993). In the context of that correspondence, "research-technology" referred to multipurpose devices for detection, measurement and control that were conceived and developed by a community connected to both science and industry – yet at the same time also separate from each of these. We appropriate here their conception of research-technology, and extend it to many other phenomena which are less stable and less localized in time and space than the Zeeman/Cotton situation. In the following pages, we use the concept for instances where research activities are orientated primarily toward technologies which facilitate both the production of scientific knowledge and the production of other goods. In particular, we use the term for instances where instruments and methods traverse numerous geographic and institutional boundaries; that is, fields distinctly different and distant from the instruments' and methods' initial focus.

We suggest that instruments such as the ultracentrifuge, and the trajectories of the men who devise such artefacts, diverge in an interesting way from other forms of artefacts and careers in science, metrology and engineering with which students of science and technology are more familiar. The instrument systems developed by research-technologists strike us as especially general, open-ended, and flexible. When tailored effectively, research-technology instruments potentially fit into many niches and serve a host of unrelated applications. Their multi-functional character distinguishes them from many other devices which are designed to address specific, narrowly defined problems in a circumscribed arena in and outside of science. Research-technology activities link universities, industry, public and private research or metrology establishments, instrument-making firms, consulting companies, the military, and metrological agencies. Research-technology practitioners do not follow the career path of the traditional academic or engineering professional. They pursue "hybrid careers," shifting back and forth between dif-

ferent employers. Others, while remaining with a single employer, establish strong, albeit intermittent contacts with a variety of arenas which are not otherwise connected.

In conventional parlance, the analytic language used by sociologists and historians of science and technology often draws a distinction between technology and academic learning. The world of research-technology, we suggest, bridges the two. The bridging occurs with respect to knowledge, skills, artefacts, language and imagery, and their attendant interactions. In a research-technology frame, conventional oppositions such as theoretical and experimental, science or engineering, technology and industry are largely effaced. In this frame, the focus is neither on scientific practices, in the sense of theorizing about experimentally produced phenomena, nor on engineering practices, in the sense of constructing and producing definite end-user goods and services. Instead, the focus is on practices oriented toward the production and theorizing of open devices which potentially serve multiple spheres.

The research-technology perspective raises issues in three problem domains. Firstly, how can the research-technology phenomenon be situated with respect to the ongoing debate about the dynamic relationships of science and society? Secondly, how can it be situated with respect to a gradual scientization and increased occupational fluidity of engineering professions which characterizes the changing relationships between science and engineering? Thirdly, how can it be situated in the contemporary debates in philosophy and social studies of science over the relationships between theory and experiment? In this first section, we will briefly address each of these points before outlining the general analytic coordinates that structure the concept of research-technology.

### *Science and Society*

The theme of “instrumentation between science, state and industry” does not square well with the venerable discourse which opposes “science” and “technology” in social studies of science. In this discourse, “technology” stands for the contrary of “science”; it represents the practical uses of science in society at large and is understood as separate from the somehow autonomous sphere of “science” (Layton 1971a). This vocabulary, widespread as it may be, is not very useful for our purposes, and, for that matter, for any inquiry into the role of instruments. Technology, in the sense of technical instruments and the knowledge systems that go with them, pervades all societal systems. There are technologies of science, of industry, of state, and so forth, and it would be ill-advised to assume that, in the end, they all flow out of “science.” But even if the crude opposition of science and technology has little analytic value, the dual problem remains: how to effectively conceive the dynamic relationship between scientific spheres and other societal spheres, and how to conceive the role that technological matters play in this relationship.

Much of the debate surrounding these issues is framed in terms of “What drives what?” Does science drive technology (that is production technology, the field of utilitarian technology aimed at producing things for use outside science) or does technology drive science? Using “industry” and “state” as shorthand for extra-scientific social spheres, this translates into the question: Do science and its technologies drive those of industry and the state, or is it the other way around?

Schematically speaking, the relationship can take four forms: science drives industry/the state; industry/the state drives science; the relationship is independent; or it is dialectical. In terms of ideal types, these four positions have all had their protagonists. The current fashion seems to be a special version of the dialectical answer where science

and industry/the state are inextricably interrelated (e.g. Latour 1992). In extreme formulations, the science/technology nexus has become a hybrid field of seamless webs where the distinction between them is no longer considered useful. According to this view, there is only technoscience, in which the boundaries between science and industry/the state are discursive artefacts that must be looked at in terms of their strategic utility. Moreover, these boundaries are in constant flux depending on the interests of dominant players.

The research-technology perspective does not accord with seamless analytical frames of this kind. We will argue that research-technology instrumentation is a phenomenon “in the middle” which does not coincide with either science or industrial production. We see it as a field of instrumentation outside both science and industry, yet important for both.

It is possible then to distinguish three spheres of instrumentation and instrument-makers: inside science, as in conventional studies of scientific instrumentation (Heidelberg and Steinle 1998; Heilbron, van Helden, and Hankins 1992; Löwy and Gaudillière 1998); inside industrial production, as in conventional studies of non-scientific technology, such as the assembly line (Noble 1984); and outside science and production, but for both. This third type belongs to research-technology. In other words, we wish to bypass one erstwhile notion whereby instrumentation in science and technology has two distinctly different sources, and another erstwhile notion whereby technology is an applied side of science.

The strong thesis that guides this analysis is that research-technology generates broad fundamental impulses that drive scientific research, industrial production and technology-related state activities along their respective paths. Of course, the research-technology hypothesis does not deny that much instrumentation is conceived, developed and diffused within the strict confines of a narrow industrial (von Hippel 1988) or scientific (Edge and Mulkey 1976) context, nor does it imply that research-technology mechanisms account for all types of transfer from one sphere to another.

### *Science and Engineering*

To better understand the emergence of research-technology, it is useful to see it against broad transformations in engineering practice and institutions. Historically, the knowledge base and professional practices of engineers in many fields have changed appreciably as technology has become ever more scientized. In the past, engineering was often associated with practical craft skills and with the application of technical recipes to concrete problems. Since at least the second World War, the intellectual and professional gap that separated science and engineering has gradually diminished. Emblematic of this rapprochement is the increasing use of the terms “engineering science” in the Anglo-American world, “Ingenieurwissenschaften” in German-speaking countries and “science physique pour l’ingénieur” in France.

The professional identity of engineering groups in civil engineering, mechanics, chemistry, electricity and electronics often entailed a demarcation from mathematized esoteric learning and disciplinary academic science, as well as a demarcation from the university departments that taught and researched such learning. While engineers trained in university schools of engineering, in many important respects they nevertheless stood outside of academia. Engineers’ principal intellectual and professional identity instead lay with their industrial employers. Professional engineers generally centered their careers in non-academic organizations, where they usually remained (Layton 1971b). This traditional profile has changed appreciably, however. Today, engineering knowledge and

practice increasingly bear the mark of high science as, in turn, academic disciplines depend increasingly on scientized engineering (Bucciarelli 1994).

The scientization of engineering is associated with growing cognitive specialization. New fields of academic learning have emerged, and many of them are directly relevant to engineering. Mastery of these fields by engineers often entails a grasp of advanced mathematics, as well as a firm grounding in academic science. Concurrently, many technical systems have become ever more complicated and large-scale, thereby requiring additional learning and skills. Beyond this, the scientization of engineering has involved significant professional changes. Engineers had long been envious of the luster of science and the high social status of scientists. The emerging links between engineering and academia have provided engineering professions with an opportunity to share the elevated status of academic learning. Also, scientized engineering involves enhanced career fluidity. Engendered by fast-moving technical frontiers, many practitioners move from project to project.

The last few years have seen the rise of two analytic schemata that focus on a convergence between scientists and engineers. In *The New Production of Knowledge*, Gibbons and his colleagues have suggested that the development of new knowledge-intensive economic spheres is accelerating the de-differentiation between scientists and engineers, and is producing a new category of cognitive and technical personnel whose point of reference is the solution of socially relevant problems (Gibbons et al. 1994). The Triple Helix perspective similarly hypothesizes a radical convergence between scientists and engineers – a convergence which putatively yields a historically new intellectual and technical breed expressed as a synthesis of the two professional groups (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1998, 2000, 109–23). This synthesis does not, however, take the form of a de-differentiation but instead a neo-differentiation (Shinn 1999). At first glance, research-technology might appear to belong to the New Production of Knowledge or Triple Helix schemata. However, it has to be established whether the kind of fluidity we associate with research-technology is of the same sort described in these two perspectives, particularly as regards the intellectual and social work connected with instrumentation.

### ***Theory and Experiment***

With few exceptions, students of science have long considered that experimentation was paramount in scientific research. Experimentation was seen as guiding theory, or even as governing it. This stance is reflected in many of the classical studies on Newton, Galileo, and Huygens, and it underpinned the work of philosophers in the logical positivist tradition (Suppe 1974; Westfall 1980). Pierre Duhem was among the first to question the dominance of experimental orthodoxy, and Kuhn successfully extended Duhem's thesis (Duhem 1915; Kuhn 1962). The relationship between theory and experimentation continues to be reassessed, and today many scholars believe that theory often guides, and even dictates experiments and their outcome (Bachelard 1951; Pickering 1984; Pinch 1986; Quine 1972, 1986).

Nevertheless, a handful of historians and sociologists question whether the relationship between theory and experimentation is as direct and unmediated as it is often made out to be. Peter Galison, for example, has argued that the old debate about the interplay of experiment and theory, and the attendant ideological debates about the epistemological correctness of idealist and empiricist positions, needs to be revised by introducing a third dimension; namely, instruments and the theories attached to them (Galison 1997). Galison

does not suggest that instrumentation provides a panacea for establishing the validity of a knowledge claim; he instead indicates that instruments constitute a third reference against which statements can be tested, and are a semi-autonomous input into both experimentation and theory. Nevertheless, his approach also focuses predominately on the role of instrumentation inside science proper. It is a debate about science and technology in the procrustean framework of technology in and of science. Beyond Galison's influential contribution, one can observe a general renewal of interest in the technical, cognitive-epistemological and socio-cultural aspects of metrological devices throughout the field. How does the research-technology perspective fit into this debate?

In positing that research-technology is a specific kind of instrumentation, one which is explicitly characterized as poly-disciplinary and potentially extra-scientific in its purposes and effects, we confront the theory/experimentation problem from a different angle. It may safely be said that mainstream philosophical and sociological schools in the study of science have generally paid scant attention to boundary-crossing practices and representations of the sort common to research-technology where instrumentation transcends experimentation and the theory/experimentation matrix. This line of inquiry extends recent claims that independently of measuring and representing effects, experimental systems also perform controlling and productive functions for purposes beyond scientific knowledge and theory validation (Hagner and Rheinberger 1998: 355–73; Heidelberger 1998: 71–92).

### **A Specific Kind of Instrumentation**

Against the backdrop of ongoing debates around science/society relationships and theory/experimentation relationships, and changes in engineering practice and institutions, we can now turn our attention to the emergence and workings of research-technology. Referring back to the example of Jesse Beams and the ultracentrifuge which opened this paper, three major features of research-technology come to the fore. The first characteristic is its trans-community positioning, or as we say, its “interstitiality.” *Research-technologists wear many hats*. Secondly, their devices exhibit a peculiar openness or “generic” quality. Research-technology devices branch outward to many spaces. Thirdly, research-technologies involve the development of standardized languages or “metrologies.” Research-technologists create a lingua franca for theoretical and extra-theoretical uses.

The case histories mentioned below explore social interstitiality, generic instrumentality and metrological codification in a variety of trans-disciplinary, trans-science and extra-science settings. What accounts for this configuration and how do research-technologies acquire their distinct feature of travel between otherwise unconnected fields? How is it possible that local instrument achievements become global in the sense of a re-embedding in many other places, both inside and outside science?

#### ***Interstitial Communities***

In what sense can one talk about research-technology communities? Jesse Beams, and to a greater or lesser degree the research-technologists studied in the case histories mentioned below, exhibit peculiarly “subterranean” modes of multi-lateral professional and institutional association which do not accord well with standard sociological notions of communities as ensembles of stable, institutionalized interactions. These research-technologists admittedly work within universities, industry, state or independent establishments,

yet at the same time they maintain some distance from their organizations. In many instances, they pursue “hybrid careers,” shifting back and forth between different employers or, while remaining with a single employer, lend their services to changing outside interests. We will also show that many research-technologists develop a personality make-up suited to sustain many-sided professional relationships and “multi-lingual” cognitive worlds.

Some sociologists will say that research-technology’s social configurations should not, for these reasons, be called “communities,” but rather non-communities, since research-technologists are not concentrated within one type of scientific, industrial or state organization which provides them with stable, recognized positions reserved for experts in generic precision instrumentation. Indeed, research-technologists’ community identity cannot be mapped in terms of an organizational or professional referent. The referents of “academic scientist” or “industrial engineer” are not relevant to research-technology. Neither can the identity of research-technologists be based on the production of a definite category of fact (in science) or artefact (in production). Instead, we suggest that the shared project which conveys a semblance of community in the familiar sense of the term is their elaboration of diffuse, purposefully unfinished devices (not-yet facts and not-yet artefacts) to be distributed across the broadest possible landscape.

In cases where research-technology involves a shared project for groups of practitioners working within the same field of instrumentation, the term community, in the classical sociological sense, will be acceptable to most analysts. In other cases though, “shared project” merely means that research-technologists recognize each other’s pursuits when they happen to meet. The term research-technology community refers here to something akin to the way tribesmen know they belong to the same tribe. In order to avoid confusion with other tribes, various insider/outsider affiliations are invoked. Rather than by tracing stable membership and hierarchical/promotional career structures, research-technologists can more easily be identified through specialized academic or trade journals and by their participation in national or international instrument fairs and expositions. Historically, instrument fairs have played a major role in the constitution of the research-technology movement (Shinn 2000b, c).

In connection with interstitiality we need to understand how research-technologists avoid standard forms of professionalization. What are the sources of their open and flexible group identities? Their interest as a class of experts seems to lie in expanding the sphere of unaffiliated, open-to-all, dispersed generation of devices that promise solutions to problems where precision detection and measurement, precision control of certain phenomena and even the controlled production of certain effects are crucial for success (see for example Roqué 2000). How do research-technologists manage to articulate and defend group interests in the absence of membership organizations with established boundaries? Separate as research-technology groups are from both conventional science and industrial engineering, yet parasitic on both, how do these quasi-communities assure community reproduction and growth? How do they sustain their autonomy in environments which have customarily rewarded monopolistic organizational linkages? (See Nevers et al. 2000, also Johnston 2000.)

### *Generic Devices*

We refer to the particular kind of technical artefacts research-technologists deal with as “generic devices.” Research-technology communities first arose in the nineteenth century

with precision mechanics and optics (see Jackson 2000) and today specialize in the invention, construction and diffusion of precision instrumentation for use both inside and outside academia. They develop packages or whole systems of generic detection, measurement, and control devices that focus on particular parameters which are potentially of interest to scientists, laboratory technicians, test personnel, production engineers, and planners (see Gaudillière 2000, Johnston 2000, Rheinberger 2000). Sometimes, as in the case of early lasers and masers, or in the case of laboratories producing new semi-conducting materials, research-technologists and their generic devices produce novel physical effects in order to explore their measurability and controllability.

In many instances, these devices are not designed to respond to any specific academic or industrial demand. Research-technologists may sometimes generate promising packets of instrumentation for yet undefined ends. They may offer technological answers to questions that have hardly been raised. Research-technologists' instruments are then generic in the sense that they are base-line apparatus which can subsequently be transformed by engineers into products tailored to specific economic ends or adapted by experimenters to further cognitive ends in academic research. Flexibility is part of the product. One could say that "interpretive flexibility" constitutes in itself a goal and an achievement. This is a precondition for research-technology's extended market that stretches from academia to industry and the state.

Roqué and Rheinberger (2000) show that research-technologists are typically involved in prototyping, in the sense that they avoid early closure of design processes that keeps devices generic. In connection with genericity we need to understand how research-technologists manage to maintain an instrument chain in which "core devices" are developed, that then spawn cascades of secondary apparatus, which are in turn used to solve a range of problems. How do generic devices make their way into both research and production?

### ***Metrology***

Metrologies can be seen as systems of notation, modeling and representation, including their epistemic justifications. Metrology is integral to the development of generic devices and the maintenance of interstitiality. Either the nomenclatures, units of measurement and standards of existing metrologies are refashioned in creating generic instrumentation, or else new ones are formulated. The lingua franca of metrology constitutes the vehicle that allows generic apparatus access to many audiences and arenas. At the same time, it preserves research-technologists from becoming caught up in the particular discourses of these audiences and arenas.

On one level, research-technologists may generate novel ways of representing, visually or otherwise, events and empirical phenomena. On a broader level, they may impose a novel view of the world by dint of establishing and legitimating new functional relations between recognized categories of elements that were previously perceived in a different light. In some cases, research-technologists' metrological work is instrumental in coalescing and crystallizing notations, analytic units and formulae into a corpus of rules or procedures which deserve to be called a methodology, and that eventually make their way into textbooks as state-of-the-art procedures. How is this achieved?

Ultimately, the issue of metrology includes questions concerning the particular epistemological stances, and even world views, associated with research-technology work. Do research-technologists sometimes even stylize and theorize their own practice and proce-

dures in a manner that deserves to be called the advancing of a world view or episteme? (An example is the sweeping and comprehensive views of cyberneticists who see nature as a grandiose engineering feat, see Heims 1991).

### ***Dis-Embedding, Re-Embedding***

One way of drawing together considerations of the institutional, instrument and metrological aspects of research-technology processes is to look at them in terms of an iteration of dis-embedding and re-embedding episodes in the far-flung trajectories of a particular device or prototype. Recent approaches in the philosophy and sociology of science and technology have consistently pointed to the situatedness, localness and embeddedness of all knowledge production. Arguments about instruments are at the core of these positions, whether they are framed in terms of tacit knowledge, craft, the bodies of experimenters, or science vernaculars (including Pidgin and Creole). At the same time, claims about universal standards of rationality in experimentation and engineering tend to be presented as mere representations or legitimations of scientific and technological practice.

In contrast, research-technology, as a distinctive mode of producing instrumentation for de-situated and trans-local uses both inside and outside science, appears as a distinct achievement of dis-embedding which lies outside the purview of such approaches. In this perspective, dis-embedding does not occur by default, as in diffusion theories, but is instead tied to specific skills and forms of representation. While admittedly all knowledge production, including instrument knowledge, is local, and all knowledge consumption is local too, the central question remains: how can knowledge be consumed far from its place of production, and how does it travel (Czarniawska and Joerges, 1996)?

We suggest that generic instruments comprise a sort of dictionary that enables the translation of local practices and knowledge into diverging and multiple sites, and constitutes the transverse action of research-technology. Can something akin to universality arise through the sharing of common skills and representational systems located in something like a template, or “hub matrix?” Could one say that research-technologists design dis-embedded generic devices so that they can be readily re-embedded? Local re-embedding by engineers or scientists occurs within the limitations contained in the template of the generic instrument and also within the limitations of the local cultural and material context. Re-embeddings can thus differ considerably from one another, yet a certain fidelity to the hub template persists. To what extent does the use of a specific template by practitioners in different locales allow them to communicate effectively through the development of converging skills, terminologies and imagery? It may be this feature that makes research-technology the potent, universalizing motor that we take it to be.

### ***Case Histories***

A series of Research-Technology case histories are assembled in Joerges and Shinn (forthcoming 2000). The phenomena they cover may be seen as new in the sense that they have become more varied and broadly visible since World War II, yet it would be inappropriate to see research-technology as something radically new. Also, while research-technology may eventually increase in size and scope, this does not indicate that it is a new form of science. Instead, we consider research-technology as a new perspective, an alternative way of looking at instrumentation for social studies of science and technology. Since it is very much a phenomenon “in-between” and often relatively invisible to outside



observers, it is not surprising that it has gone largely unnoticed by students of science and technology.

The episodes examined in Joerges and Shinn span more than a century, beginning in the early 1800s and ending in the 1980s. Early beginnings are traced in Myles Jackson's analysis of German optics and the Role of Joseph von Fraunhofer as well as in Shinn's history of the German *Zeitschrift für Instrumentenkunde* 1860 -1900. Other case stories emphasize the key analytic parameters set out above. To differing degrees and in different ways, they explore how many interests, institutions, disciplines, and professions are traversed by generic instrumentation and its dis-embedders and re-embedders.

Thus *interstitiality* provides the focus of Xavier Roqué's portrait of Marie Curie-the-research-technologist and Terry Shinn's analysis of U.S. research-technology communities between about 1900 and 1955. Similarly, Patricia Nerver's et. al. look at interstitial research communities emerging between German plant science and plant breeding since its beginnings up to the 1990s . These authors show that, while historians and sociologists generally concentrate on the genesis of stable relations and stabilizing structures, the very essence of research-technology is its fluidity and its operation between established institutions and interests.

Other authors explore instrument *genericity* and examine the trajectories of generic instrumentation systems and their specific applications. Sean Johnston traces Fourier spectroscopy instrumentation from the 1950s to the 1970s. The same period is covered by Hans-Jörg Rheinberger's analysis of liquid scintillation counters. Jean-Paul Gaudillière looks at American Biomedical Research from the 1930s to the 1960s, in particular instrumentation via standardized mice.

Metrological issues, in particular the roles played by generic instrumentation and interstitial communities in the work of standardization, provides the focus of Ann Johnson's case study of break testing and antilock beak systems. Alexandre Mallard reports from the metrological arenas of atmospheric chemistry and urban pollution monitoring instrumentation.

The studies collected in Joerges and Shinn explore then the circumstances under which research-technology fields have emerged and evolved in light of changing demands inside and outside of science. Contributors deal with the places, times, and technological fields where research-technology occurs. They present the institutions, journals, meetings, forms of association, and the multi-professional and multi-personal identities that sustain research-technologies.

## **Research-Technology in Historical Perspective**

Arguing that the significance of research-technologies lies in their trans-community positioning or “interstitiality,” in the openness or “genericity” of their devices, and in the provision of standardized languages or “metrologies”, does not answer two underlying questions: Where and how does research-technology fit in social studies of science and technology? And how does the research-technology perspective contribute to a broader understanding of societal dynamics? In this second section we will address these issues in turn.

## **The Place of Research-technology in Social Studies of Science and Technology**

Research-technology is a long-standing configuration of intellectual and artefact production that has until recently largely gone undiscerned. Research-technology is not another configuration in a possibly novel mode of producing scientific knowledge and devices (see, for instance, Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff 1998 [with an Introduction on 197–201]; Gibbons et al. 1994). The existence and operation of research-technology have been masked by a certain insensitivity, in science and technology studies, to the subtleties of boarder-crossings inside science and between science and other social systems. Indeed, some latter-day students of science and technology have responded to increased boarder-crossings by positing a far-reaching erosion of familiar social forms in science. A better understanding of the process may be acquired by looking at boarder-crossing in terms of the divisions of labor and forms of differentiation in the production of science and technology (Shinn 2000a).

Post-seventeenth century science and technology can be depicted as taking three different institutional forms: discipline-related science and technology culture, transitory science and technology culture, and transverse science and technology culture. The study of discipline-related science and technology culture has emphasized institutional and professional elements in the growth of scientific knowledge and distinguished between science and engineering. Analyses of transitory science and technology culture maintain the idea of a demarcation between academia and engineering, but at the same time show how practitioners intermittently pass back and forth between the two arenas. A study of transverse science and technology culture is congruent with the research-technology perspective. Here, the idea of the institutional boundedness of science and engineering is preserved, but the focus is on situations where back and forth movement is unceasing. It is conceived as a distinct social form in itself, basic both to the maintenance and separateness of disciplinary science and engineering.

### ***Discipline-Related Science and Technology Studies***

The history and sociology of science and technology has largely been written in the framework of discipline-related science and technology culture. Innumerable monographs explore the birth, maturity and occasionally the terminal phase of disciplines like astronomy, chemistry, ecology, engineering specialties, phrenology, geology, physics, or micro-and molecular biology (for example, Abir-Am 1993; Gingras 1991; Heilbron and Seidel 1989; Kevles 1978; Lemaine et al. 1976; Mullins 1972; Nye 1993; Rheinberger 1997). The sheer volume of such scholarship is so abundant and omnipresent that inattentive observers of science might erroneously conclude that the history of modern science is principally the history of discipline-related science. In fact, all three science cultures have operated and co-existed for at least two centuries (see, for instance, Pestre 1997). There are sound reasons for the historiographic emphasis on discipline-related science and technology culture. Disciplines are structured around easily identifiable and stable institutions; and disciplines, like most other institutions, produce and leave behind a voluminous paper trail which renders disciplinary analysis more manageable than other forms of analysis. Science disciplines are rooted in the institutions of laboratories, university departments, journals, national and international professional bodies, conferences and congresses, procedures for certifying competence, systems for awarding prizes, formal net-

works and unofficial connections. Markers like these facilitate the detection and analysis of definite career patterns and categories of scientific production. Moreover, the perceived centrality of institutions in discipline-related science studies has its parallels in the structural analysis of society at large. Connections and congruities between science and society are easily established.

It is in this frame that certain terminologies and notions from non-science realms, such as political and organizational life, have been carried over to probe the world of science. Thus, Richard Whitley's studies of the social and intellectual organization of a large number of scientific disciplines have borrowed crucial vocabularies and insights from the organizational structures of non-science institutions and extended them to the landscape of science's discipline-related culture (Whitley 1984). In a similar vein, general historians have often written the history of science as shaped by world historical tides. An example is Eric Hobsbawm's chapter on "Science" where he elucidates scientific development as the struggle between democratic nations and fascist/communist regimes for supremacy on the world stage (Hobsbawm 1995). Even the classical work of Thomas Kuhn on scientific revolutions may be interpreted as a case in point.

### *Transitory Science and Technology Studies*

Despite their successes, studies of discipline-related cultures have proven deaf to other equally important cultures in science. And yet, an immense amount of science occurs outside the disciplinary matrix. Many careers and much cognition or construction take place in a transitory science and technology culture which is not systematically congruent with orthodox disciplines.

This form of science is not free from the effects of institutional differentiation, but they are dealt with in complex ways which are sometimes overlooked or misunderstood. Intellectual, technical and professional opportunities sometimes arise near the periphery of orthodox fields. In such instances effective research or career-making requires practitioners to step temporarily across the boundaries of their home disciplines, as they seek techniques, data, concepts and colleague cooperation in neighboring specialties. Most of the time, the quest for additional cognitive, material or human resources involves two, or at the most three, disciplines. Practitioner movement consists of a to-and-fro oscillatory pattern. The trajectory remains circumscribed with respect to time and to scale of movement. It is important to note that in transitory science and technology culture practitioners' principal center of identity and action is still disciplinary, even though individuals do traverse fields.

Transitory science and technology cultures subsume two different yet related trajectories. The life and work of Lord Kelvin is emblematic of one pattern. Norton Wise and Crosbie Smith have documented how Kelvin changed from physics to engineering and from engineering back to physics (Wise and Smith 1989; see also the examples of transitory science culture described by Mulkay 1974). As perspectives opened, the man shifted territory. Nevertheless, Kelvin's itinerary remained circumscribed. Moreover, both from the standpoint of the historian and the professional scientist, Kelvin's fundamental allegiance and identity remained discipline-bound, entwined with the orthodox discipline of classical physics.

Alternatively, transitory science and technology culture can lead to the derivation of a new sub-discipline, as in the cases of physical chemistry, biochemistry, biophysics, astrophysics, and geophysics. The list of such creations is long and deeply rooted in the

practices of science and technology. In these cases, the oscillatory trajectories of practitioners mentioned above terminate in the establishment of a novel field – a conjunction of two or several established fields. New sub-disciplines are the product of transitory science and technology cultures. In order to understand these cultures and their intellectual/technical achievements, historians and sociologists must concentrate on interfacing and motion.

Yet, to repeat, in these cultures movement and interfacing still tend to be strictly defined and regulated by disciplinary referents. Institutional demarcations and divisions of labor remain paramount, although they are played out in a specific manner. Focus is on career mobility and knowledge fluidity; but both function in a confining and restricted set of institutional coordinates.

### *Transverse Science and Technology Studies*

While in a few respects transitory science and technology cultures resemble transverse cultures, the latter nevertheless represent a distinct mode of production. In transverse science and technology cultures the degrees of freedom and scope of action of practitioners are far greater than in transitory science and technology cultures. For the purpose of our analysis, we will consider research-technology as an exemplar of this last mode of knowledge/artefact production. As documented in Jackson (2000) and Shinn (2000b), for instance, research-technology reaches back at least one and a half centuries. It then rapidly emerged in Britain, France and the United States. In each of these sites, and during each historical period, it operated alongside the discipline-related and transitory science and technology cultures. The three cultures may in fact be regarded as interdependent and reciprocally enriching one another.

If, as we suggested, transverse science and technology culture, in the guise of research-technology, has been around for a long time, and has often proven important to the growth of scientific knowledge and technology, why then has it been so conspicuously absent from the historiographic palette? Why have historians and sociologists often overlooked its very existence? Part of the answer to this question derives from the fact that participants in transverse science and technology culture are “moving targets.”

Research-technology practitioners’ association with employers, disciplines and professions is fleeting. The paper trail needed to document their trajectories is thin and fragmentary, making sociological and historical investigation problematic. The difficulty of sound research is exacerbated by the existence of multiple and diverse vehicles for practitioner productions, from conventional scientific publications to patents, confidential reports, exhibits, commercial products, metrological regulations and many others. For scholars whose investigations are rooted in the detection and analysis of stable institutions and sharp divisions of intellectual and material labor, the dealings of transverse culture prove difficult to survey. Similarly, scholars who represent science and technology as seamless technoscience and who ignore gradations of differentiation and divisions of labor, are oblivious to the subtleties and indeed regular structures of research-technology.

Transverse science and technology cultures are characterized by several elements. Practitioners principally draw their identity from projects rather than the disciplines or organizations that they frequent. Yet the perpetuation of well grounded institutions, in the form of academic and technical professions and employers, remains foundational to these cultures. Such defined settings provide necessary inputs for fresh projects in the form of

ideas, information and apparatus. They also consume and validate the cognitive/technical products of the participants of transverse cultures. An arena of action in which practitioners are relatively free to shift about constitutes the social and material space wherein novelties may be generated outside the constraints of short-term demands. Two advantages are gained by generalizing research-technology into a separate science and technology culture. First, research-technology's place in the history of science and technology is clarified, as is its historiographical status. Secondly, certain lacunae and contradictions in the operations and representations of discipline-based and transitory science and the relations between them are explained and resolved.

### **Generic Instrumentation, Divisions of Labor and Differentiation**

Attempting to summarize and, to a certain extent, to generalize the lessons to be drawn from the case histories in this volume, it seems to us that the process of an ongoing division of labor and differentiation in research-technology takes place in two interacting spaces: on the one hand in a space of design and dis-embedding of generic instruments by research-technologists, and, on the other hand, in a space of re-embedding of generic equipment, again by research-technologists or practitioners outside research-technology. The first type of practices is located deep inside the interstitial arenas while the second type is performed near their peripheries. Depending on the space research-technologists are operating in at a given time, they shift their stance with respect to differentiation and divisions of labor.

The part of research-technology work which directly involves production of templates strongly relies on divisions of labor. At this point, practitioners require distance and indeed protection from end-user demands and pressures in or outside science. This is necessary for the development of fundamental instrument theory and the design of generic equipment. As long as research-technologists focus on core devices, they remain committed to differentiation and divisions of labor.

However, when they deal with practitioners from industry, the state or disciplinary science, a de-emphasis of divisions of labor and differentiation is required to allow them to enter and re-enter these worlds. Such dealings characteristically occur at two moments in research-technology: when practitioners seek project ideas, concepts, and information from potential local users; and when they engage in demonstrating how generic devices could be tailored to particular local uses. Here, transverse mobility depends on temporarily suspending a commitment to divisions of labor constitutive of the targeted professions and organizations.

The bi-directional boundary crossing by research-technologists in turn induces a partial and temporary relinquishing of customary attachments to differentiation and divisions of labor in the arenas they frequent. As practitioners from industry, metrology, academia, or the military engage in the acquisition and tailoring of generic instrumentation, they too tend to lower the barriers. Once acquisition is completed, members of these professional communities again ground their practices in accustomed divisions of labor.

In sum: gradations of reliance on established divisions of labor are played out in the interstitial arenas where the multi-faceted work of research-technology is performed. Practitioners choose either to maintain their "in-between" positions, which provide the necessary space for generic practices, or to move in and out of neighboring science and industrial cultures. They can move between organizations, research projects, or even

paradigms when required; they can also structure practice around a generic instrument-based imperative, appealing to principles of divisions of labor and professional differentiation in order to protect their own project. We see this less as a contradiction or paradox than as a case of flexible institutionalization in a field that requires the wearing of many hats. It is research-technologists' response to the complex set of intellectual, material and social relations that emerged as science, technology and the social order at large have expanded in scale and become progressively differentiated.

### **Generic Instrumentation, Re-embedding and Cohesion**

We can now advance a stronger thesis, namely, that one impact of generic instrumentation is increased social and intellectual cohesion, which runs counter to the on-going differentiation and fragmentation of science and society. To the extent that research-technology engenders a form of practice-based universality, it acts as an antidote to the effects of centrifugal forces. How is this possible?

To make a generic instrument effective in end-user audiences' own devices, its adoption entails the incorporation of its protocols. Protocols of generic devices are in turn linked to metrologies. Metrologies contribute to both the constitution of protocols and the circulation of devices. Together with protocols, instrument adopters import implicit working concepts, beliefs about why a generic instrument is effective and ideas about what it can and cannot do; and they import explicit vocabularies, images and notational systems.

Successive re-embeddings in different local material contexts and by different groups yield practitioner assurance that the principles of a template apparatus are solid, and that belief in it is well justified. Belief rooted in local experience and testing gradually gains in objectivity. Practices are independently repeated and are multiplied in numerous environments. This is not the objectivity born of pure reason or the *experimentum crucis*. Objectivization is instead built up through collective practice which is structured around effect-producing materials and procedures. Here, objectivization is practical and cumulative.

As a given generic instrument is tailored differently by various audiences to satisfy their demands, it gives rise to specific niche protocols and vocabularies. If this occurs in many places, ensembles of terminologies and procedures based on the most general principles of the generic device emerge in turn, beyond the local vocabularies. Transverse repertoires of protocols, held in common by all users, whatever their local application requirements may be, accumulate. It is important to note that the transverse, quasi-universalizing quality of this process is not only a matter of rhetoric and professional power, but is also very much one of material demonstration and concrete practice in multiple arenas.

The universality born of dis-embedding and endless re-embeddings is a universality of varied experience in countless niches, a universality grounded in informed and legitimate practice. *It is practice-based universality*. The weight of trans-personal conviction, experience and proof stemming from practice-based universality adds to the power of conventional disciplinary tests and procedures habitually employed to buttress sweeping generalizations. It is interesting then to consider the research products of transverse science and technology cultures in terms of materials for "pan-validation." In order for the research outcomes of the transverse science and technology cultures to be seen internally

as worthy of being sustained, they must resonate with numerous and diversified outside arenas, whether inside or outside of science.

In sum, cross boundary encounters are grounded in the transverse stock of cognitive and material resources coming out of research-technology programs. Communication between institutionally and cognitively differentiated groups of end-users develops. Seen in terms of its consequences, the dis-embedding/re-embedding cycle of research-technology operates as a cohesive force which counter-balances the dispersive propensities of cognitive and professional specialization – a trait characteristic of contemporary science as well as of much modern social and institutional life. Practitioners from disparate disciplinary horizons and from different walks of life can use the shared vocabularies, techniques, imageries, and notional systems of generic instrumentation to cross their respective boundaries. While dis-embedding/re-embedding is not synonymous with full cognitive and professional integration, research-technology nevertheless figures centrally in the cohesion which ultimately sustains much of science as well as many aspects of social existence. In a more speculative vein, we suggest that the vocabularies and images engendered through research-technology actually help contemporary culture achieve a measure of continuity and stability by furnishing a repertory of shared terminology and common experience to which socio-professional groups from different nations and different cultures can refer, and through which they can address one another.

## References

- Abir-Am, Pnina (1993). From multidisciplinary collaborations to transnational objectivity: International space as constitutive of molecular biology, 1930-1970, in E. Crawford, T. Shinn, and S. Sörlin (eds.), *Denationalizing science, sociology of the sciences yearbook 1992* (pp. 153–86). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bachelard, Gaston (1951). *L'activité rationaliste de la physique contemporaine*. Paris: PUF.
- Brown, Frederick L. (1967). *A brief history of the Physics Department of the University of Virginia, 1922-1961*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Bucciarelli, Larry (1994). *Designing engineers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bud, Robert and Cozzens, Susan E. (eds.) (1992). *Invisible connections: Instruments, institutions and science*. Bellingham: SPIE Optical Engineering Press.
- Czarniawska, Barbara and Joerges, Bernward (1996). Travels of ideas, in B. Czarniawska and G. Sevón (eds.), *Translating organizational change* (pp. 13-48). Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Duhem, Pierre (1915). *La théorie physique, son objet, sa structure* (1st ed.). Paris: J. Vrin.
- Edge, David O. and Mulkey, Michael (1976). *Astronomy transformed: The emergence of radio astronomy in Britain*. New York: Wiley.
- Elzen, Boelie (1986). Two ultracentrifuges: A comparative study of the social construction of artefacts. *Social Studies of Science* 16(4), 621–62.
- Etzkowitz, Henry and Leydesdorff, Loet (2000). The triple helix of university-industry-government relations, mode-2, and national systems of innovation. *Research Policy* 29(2), 109–23.
- Etzkowitz, Henry and Leydesdorff, Loet (eds.) (1998). A triple helix of university-industry-government relations. *Industry & Higher Education* 12(4): 197–258 (with an Introduction on 197-201).
- Galison, Peter (1997). *Image and logic: Material culture of microphysics*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.



- Gaudilliere, Jean-Paul (forthcoming 2000). Organisms into Instruments: Making Mice in America, 1930-1960, in B. Joerges and T. Shinn (eds.), *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*. Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 175-97.
- Gibbons, Michael, Limoges, Camille, Nowotny, Helga, Schwartzman, Simon, Scott, Peter and Trow, Martin (1994). *The new production of knowledge. The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage
- Gingras, Yves (1991). *Physics and the rise of scientific research in Canada* (transl. by Peter Keating). Montréal: Kingston.
- Gordy, W. (1983). *Jesse Wakefield Beams. Biographical Memoirs*, Vol. 54 (pp. 3–49). National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America.
- Hagner, Michael and Rheinberger, Hans-Jörg (1998). Experimental systems, objects of investigation, and spaces of representation, in M. Heidelberger and F. Steinle (eds.), *Experimental Essays – Versuche zum Experiment* (pp. 355–73). Baden-Baden: Nomos
- Hans-Joerg Rheinberger (forthcoming 2000). Putting Isotopes to Work Liquid Scintillation Counters, 1950-1970, in B. Joerges and T. Shinn (eds.), *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*. Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 143-74.
- Heidelberger, Michael (1998). Die Erweiterung der Wirklichkeit, in M. Heidelberger and F. Steinle (eds.), *Experimental essays – Versuche zum Experiment* (pp. 71-92). Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Heidelberger, Michael and Steinle, Friedrich (eds.) (1998). *Experimental essays – Versuche zum Experiment*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Heilbron, John and Seidel, Robert W. (1989). *Lawrence and his laboratory. A history of the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Heilbron, John, van Helden, A., and Hankins, T.L. (eds.) (1992). Instruments (special issue). *Osiris* 6.
- Heims, Steve J. (1991). *The cybernetics group*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hippel, Eric von (1988). *The sources of innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric (1995). *The age of extremes: The short 20<sup>th</sup> century, 1914-1991*. London: Abacus Edition, Little, Brown and Co.

- Jackson, Myles W. (forthcoming 2000). From Theodolite to Spectral Apparatus: Joseph von Fraunhofer and the Invention of an Optical Research Technology, in B. Joerges and T. Shinn (eds.), *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*, Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 17-28.
- Joerges, Bernward, and Shinn, Terry (eds.) (forthcoming in 2000). *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*. Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Johnson, Ann (forthcoming 2000). From Dynamometers to Simulations: The Transformation of Brake Testing Technology into Antilock Braking Systems, in B. Joerges and T. Shinn (eds.), *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*. Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 199-218.
- Johnston, Sean F. (forthcoming 2000). In Search of Space: Fourier-Spectroscopy, 1950-1970, in B. Joerges and T. Shinn (eds.), *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*. Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 121-142.
- Kevles, Daniel (1978). *The physicists*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, Bruno (1992). *Aramis ou l'amour des techniques*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Layton, Edwin T. (1971a). Mirror-image twins: The communities of science and technology in 19th century America. *Technology and Culture* 12, 562-80.
- Layton, Edwin T. (1971b). *The revolt of the engineers: Social responsibility and the American engineering profession*. Cleveland, OH: Press of Case Western Reserve University.
- Lemaine, Gérard, MacLeod, Roy, Mulkay, Michael, and Weingart, Peter (eds.) (1976). *Perspectives on the emergence of scientific disciplines*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Leydesdorff, Loet and Etzkowitz, Henry (eds.) (1998). *A triple helix of university-industry-government relations: The future location of research?* New York: Science Policy Institute.
- Löwy, Ilana and Gaudillière, Jean-Paul (1998). *The invisible industrialist: manufactures and the construction of scientific knowledge*. London: Macmillan.

- Mallard, Alexandre (forthcoming 2000). From the Laboratory to the Market: The Metrological Arenas of Research-Technology in B. Joerges and T. Shinn (eds.), *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*. Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 219-38.
- Mulkay, Michael (1974). Conceptual displacement and migration in science: A prefatory paper. *Science Studies* 4(3): 205-34.
- Mullins, Nicholas (1972). The development of a scientific specialty: The Phage Group and the origins of molecular biology. *Minerva* 10(1): 51-82.
- Nevers, Patricia, Hasse, Raimund, Hohlfeld, Rainer and Zimmerli, Walther (forthcoming 2000). The Role of Research Technology in Mediating Between Plant Science and Plant Breeding, in B. Joerges and T. Shinn (eds.), *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*. Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 97-119.
- Noble, David (1984). *Forces of Production: a Social History of Industrial Automation*. New York: Knopf.
- Nye, Marie Joe (1993). *From chemical philosophy to theoretical chemistry: Dynamics of matter and dynamics of disciplines, 1800-1950*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Pestre, Dominique (1997). La production des savoirs entre académies et marché. *Revue d'Économie Industrielle* 79: 163-74.
- Pickering, Anthony (1984). *Constructing quarks: A sociological history of particle physics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pinch, Trevor J. (1986). *Confronting nature: The sociology of solar-neutrino detection*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: D. Reidel Publishers.
- Quine, Willard V.O. (1969). *Ontological Relativity and other Essays*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Quine, Willard V.O. (1972). *Methods of logic*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Quine, Willard V.O. (1986). *Philosophy of logic*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rheinberger, Hans-Jörg (1997). *Toward a history of epistemic things: Synthesizing proteins in the test tube*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Roqué, Xavier (forthcoming 2000). Displacing Radioactivity, in B. Joerges and T. Shinn (eds.), *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*. Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 51-68.
- Shinn, Terry (1993). The Bellevue grand electroaimant, 1900-1940: Birth of a research-technology community. *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences* 24, 157–87.
- Shinn, Terry (1999). Change or mutation? Reflections on the foundations of contemporary science. *Social Science Information* 38(1, March), 149–76.
- Shinn, Terry (2000a). Formes de division du travail scientifique et convergence intellectuelle. La recherche technico-instrumentale. *Revue Française de Sociologie* 41(3): 447–73.
- Shinn, Terry (forthcoming 2000b). The Research-Technology Matrix in Germany, 1870-1914, in B. Joerges and T. Shinn (eds.), *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*. Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 29-53.
- Shinn, Terry (forthcoming 2000c). Strange Cooperations in the US, 1900–1955, in B. Joerges and T. Shinn (eds.), *Instrumentation Between Science State and Industry*. Yearbook for the Sociology of the Sciences, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 69-98.
- Suppe, Frederick (1974). *The structure of scientific theories*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Westfall, Richard S. (1980). *Never at rest: A biography of Isaac Newton*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitley, Richard (1984). *The intellectual and social organization of the sciences*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wise, Norton and Smith, Crosbie (1989). *Energy and empire. A biographical study of Lord Kelvin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press



**Veröffentlichungsreihe**  
**der Arbeitsgruppe "Metropolenforschung"**  
des Forschungsschwerpunkts Technik - Arbeit - Umwelt  
am Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung

**2000**

**FS II 00-501**

Katharina Peters

*When Reform Comes into Play: Budgeting as Negotiations between Administrations.* 21 Seiten

**FS II 00-502**

Matthias Horwitz

*Rechtswissenschaftliche Expertise für den Tiergartentunnel.* Zur Institutionalisierung eines Grenzobjekts. 47 Seiten

**FS II 00-503**

Bernward Joerges und Terry Shinn

*Research-Technology.* Instrumentation Between Science, State and Industry. 21 Seiten

**FS II 00-504**

Bernward Joerges

*Technik – das Andere der Gesellschaft?* 20 Jahre Techniksoziologie. 18 Seiten

**1999**

**FS II 99-501**

Ralf Thies und Dietmar Jazbinsek

*Embleme der Moderne.* Berlin und Chicago in Stadttexen der Jahrhundertwende. 26 Seiten

Auslaufend. Veröffentlicht unter dem Titel „Berlin – das europäische Chicago. Über ein Leitmotiv der Amerikanisierungsdebatte zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts“, in: Clemens Zimmermann und Jürgen Reulecke (Hg.), *Die Stadt als Moloch? Das Land als Kraftquell? Wahrnehmungen und Wirkungen der Großstädte um 1900.* Basel, Boston, Berlin: Birkhäuser 1999, S. 53-94

**FS II 99-502**

Katharina Peters

*Der Plumpsack geht um: Berliner Budgetkreisläufe.* 40 Seiten

Auslaufend. Veröffentlicht unter dem Titel „Die Doppelkonstruktion budgetärer Wirklichkeit. Repräsentationen und Praktiken der Finanzverwaltung“, in: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, Jg. 29, Heft 2, April 2000, S. 121-137.

**FS II 99-503**

Dorothea Kress

*Großstadt und Geschlechterordnung*. Geschichten aus dem Kino. 18 Seiten

**FS II 99-504**

Matthias Horwitz

*Max Webers Institutionalisierungskonzept*. Über den Zusammenhang von Ideen und Interessen am Beispiel Stadt. 36 Seiten

**FS II 99-505**

Katharina Peters

*Wenn Reform ins Spiel kommt*. Über das inneradministrative Verhandeln von Berliner Globalsummen. 29 Seiten

**1998**

**FS II 98-501**

Dietmar Jazbinsek und Ralf Thies

*Berlin/Chicago 1914*. Die Berliner Großstadt-Dokumente und ihre Rezeption durch die Gründergeneration der Chicago School of Sociology. 56 Seiten

**FS II 98-502**

Jörg Potthast

*"Sollen wir mal ein Hochhaus bauen?"* Das Architekturbüro als Labor der Stadt. 90 Seiten

**FS II 98-503**

Bernward Joerges

*The High Variability Discourse in the History and Sociology of Large Technical Systems*. 31 Seiten

Auslaufend. Erschienen in: Olivier Coutard (Ed.), *The Governance of Large Technical Systems*, London and New York: Routledge 1999, 258-290

**1997**

**FS II 97-501**

Katharina Peters

*Die gerech(ne)te Stadt*. Streitgespräch in Berlin - ein Essay. 34 Seiten

**FS II 97-502**

Bernward Joerges

*Die Brücken des Robert Moses oder: Do Politics Have Artifacts?* Zur Konstruktion von Stadtraum und Stadtgesellschaft in technik- und planungssoziologischen Diskursen. 29 Seiten

Auslaufend. Erschienen in: *Leviathan* 27, 1, 1999, S. 43-63 (Teil 1) und in: Gert Schmidt (Hg.), *Automobil und Automobilismus. Technik und Gesellschaft Jahrbuch 10*, Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus 1999, S. 197-218 (Teil 2); English version: "Do Politics Have Artefacts?" und „Scams Cannot Be Busted“, in: *Social Studies of Sciences*, Vol. 29, Nr. 3 (June 1999), S. 411-431 und S. 450-457

**FS II 97-503**

Matthias Horwitz

*High-Tech Beton für den Potsdamer Platz. Zur Institutionalisierung eines Wissensobjektes.* 48 Seiten

**1996**

**FS II 96-501**

Dietmar Jazbinsek und Ralf Thies

*Großstadt-Dokumente. Metropolenforschung im Berlin der Jahrhundertwende.* 89 Seiten

**FS II 96-502**

Katharina Peters

*Pausenhalle der Transformation. Skizze eines ostdeutschen Amtes in Nachwendzeiten.* 23 Seiten

Auslaufend. Veröffentlicht unter dem Titel „Warten auf Godot. Eine Skizze ostdeutscher Bürokratie im Transformationsprozeß“, in: Stefan Hirschauer und Klaus Amman (Hg.), *Die Befremdung der eigenen Kultur*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1997, S. 198-217.

**FS II 96-503**

Matthias Horwitz, Bernward Joerges und Jörg Potthast (Hg.)

*Stadt und Film. Versuche zu einer 'Visuellen Soziologie'.* Mit Beiträgen von B. Joerges, D. Kress, A. Krämer, D. Naegler und J. Potthast. 113 Seiten

**1995**

**FS II 95-501**

Barbara Czarniawska and Bernward Joerges

*Travels of Ideas. Organizational Change as Translation.* 37 Seiten

Auslaufend. Veröffentlicht in: Barbara Czarniawska & Guje Sevón (eds.), *Translating Organizational Change*, Berlin etc.: De Gruyter 1996, S. 13-48.

**FS II 95-502**

Richard Rottenburg

*When Organizations Travel. On Intercultural Translation.* 43 Seiten

Auslaufend. Veröffentlicht in: Barbara Czarniawska & Guje Sevón (eds.), *Translating Organizational Change*, Berlin etc.: De Gruyter 1996, S. 191-240.



**Absender • Return Address:**

Bei Ihren Bestellungen von WZB-Papers schicken Sie bitte unbedingt einen an Sie adressierten **Aufkleber** mit, sowie **je Paper** eine **Briefmarke im Wert von DM 1,00** oder einen **"Coupon Réponse International"** (für Besteller aus dem Ausland).

Please send a **self-addressed label** and **postage stamps in the amount of 1 DM** or a **"Coupon-Réponse International"** (if you are ordering from outside Germany) for **each** WZB-Paper requested.

**Bestellschein**

**Order Form**

An das  
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin  
für Sozialforschung  
**PRESSE- UND INFORMATIONSREFERAT**  
Reichpietschufer 50  
D-10785 Berlin

*Hiermit bestelle ich folgende(s)  
Discussion Paper(s):*

*Please send me the following  
Discussion Paper(s):*

--	--