



Latour and Woolgar's Laboratory Life and Knorr-Cetina's Epistemic Cultures, ~~Latour and Woolgar~~ have a similar goal ~~in their books~~, which is ~~their concentration onto clarify~~ the construction of scientific knowledge and the culture of scientists. Latour and Woolgar ~~draw their attention on~~ address the processes by which ~~that~~ scientists make sense of their scientific activities, and Knorr-Cetina ~~names~~ refers to the similar processes as epistemic culture, which ~~is about~~ involves a machinery of knowing within ~~prevalent among~~ scientists (Knorr-Cetina 1999: 2).

The two works concern ~~y are both concerned with the~~ issues of reality. However, Latour and Woolgar ~~talk about~~ emphasize the gaps between ~~among~~ what observers see, what observers can make sense of, and what scientists claim ~~— an emphasis that is not more than front and center in~~ Knorr-Cetina's research ~~does~~. The former researchers argue ~~y emphasize~~ that ~~what some outside~~ observers, when looking in from the outside, can see ~~is a~~ disordered arrays of data on which ~~observations with which~~ scientists ~~to impose~~ produce order (Latour and Woolgar 1986: 36). Thus, when accustomed to a scientific way of thinking, if observers have a tendency to ~~who~~ directly adopt the self-reported data of scientists and thus, ~~they~~ might lose ~~the chance opportunities~~ to understand the composition of scientific activities (Latour and Woolgar 1986: 28-29). Similarly, Knorr-Cetina expresses agreement with this argument ~~is on their side~~. However, the way her approach to she talks about ~~discussing~~ this issue ~~is different~~ differs from Latour and Woolgar's: ~~The~~ the model in which ~~that~~ she adopts to understand ~~the~~ scientists is more organized (or ordered). She ~~calls~~ refers to scientists as ~~the~~ producers, and ~~she~~ uses defined terms such as 'epistemic subjects' to describe the scientists' activities. ~~It seems she has a model for the reality~~. It is likely that she came to the field with an openly articulated model, of reality or an assumed but unarticulated one, yet

she wrote with a hidden model. Nevertheless, her attempt goal is to unfold various versions of realities that reflect the physical level and the symbolic level of scientific activities (Knorr-Cetina 1999: 244) ~~(Knorr-Cetina 1999: 244), which is about the physical level of scientific activities and the symbolic level of them.~~ In this regard, ~~She~~ mentions that her description in her book is not comprehensive but kaleidoscopic.

Latour and Woolgar express skepticism about ~~are skeptical to~~ the existence of a reality of ~~the~~ phenomena. The researchers, according to their own comments, ~~y~~ mentioned that they ~~are~~ were not trying to “obtain ~~a~~ greater access to a body of previously unrevealed truth” (Latour and Woolgar 1986: 31).² Rather, the validity ~~which that~~ they were pursuing rests on both the extraction of some suitable themes from countless interpretations and the application of these themes ~~is finding out some suitable themes to their observations from countless interpretations~~ (Latour and Woolgar 1986: 37). Knorr-Cetina ~~also~~ takes the same position ~~that she in~~ arguing that there is “coexistence of levels of orders between which accents of reality can shift” (Knorr-Cetina 1999: 250).³ These researchers’ ~~is~~ interpretation of reality relates to reflects their attitude to ward generalization. ~~I felt~~ Knorr-Cetina’s attitude to ward generalization, however, might suffer from ~~be~~ more contradictions ~~or~~ than Latour and Woolgar’s. ~~In regard~~ When discussing to her answer to the questions about Weber’s “pure type”; she seems to be ~~not~~ uninterested in using to use her case (←What do you mean by ‘case?’) ~~to serve~~ as the standard type applicable to ~~of~~ other scientific communities (Knorr-Cetina 1999: 244). I think the reason for (←For what? Do you mean “the reason for her apparent lack of interest might be...?”) might be linked to her argument ~~that she argues~~ that realities are coexistent in a community. However, her intention effort to answer her own inquiries questions about “knowledge societies” perhaps transforms ~~makes~~ her case (←What do you mean by ‘case?’), itself, turn to be one of the into an elements of ~~the~~ knowledge societies. Then, the two cases (←Clarify what you mean by ‘cases’) in her book might inevitably pave the way to help explain the constitution of knowledge societies. For me, this academic effort comes across as it looks exactly as an attempt at generalization.

Knorr-Cetina's framework of "knowledge societies" might ~~have had~~ ~~make~~ some influence on her writing, which ~~is~~ ~~different~~ from Latour and Woolgar's ~~in the way of delineating regarding the delineation of~~ questions. Her effort to understand the disunity of science ~~is~~ ~~falls~~ under the umbrella of inquiries ~~of into~~ knowledge societies, ~~and her-~~ ~~central argument is that~~ ~~Aa~~ closer look at ~~the~~ scientific practices could ~~result in outcomes that~~ echo ~~the-related~~ discontinuities. ~~On the contrary~~ ~~In contrast~~, Latour and Woolgar ~~have as their starting point from~~ their dissatisfaction with the distinction ~~between of~~ the social and the technical in science, and they ~~still~~ focus on the construction of ~~the~~ facts in ~~laboratory~~ ~~laboratories rather than~~ ~~in~~ ~~instead of the~~ societies.¹

~~Latour and Woolgar's and Knorr-Cetina's respective prioritizations~~ ~~Their insistence~~ of anthropological approaches are similar ~~to each other~~, as ~~well as are~~ ~~their~~ ~~the~~ researchers' ~~respective~~ critiques ~~targeting to some certain~~ problems derived from sociological accounts. To blur the distinction ~~of between~~ the social and the technical, Latour and Woolgar ~~have to stick on~~ ~~advocate an~~ anthropological approach to ~~illuminate~~ ~~illuminating~~ the dangers ~~that beset of~~ the ~~attempted~~ categorization of ~~the~~ social ~~aspects~~ ~~phenomena~~. ~~For~~ Knorr-Cetina ~~strives~~ to emphasize the interweaving of ~~the~~ symbolic meanings ~~with instruments and practices by~~ ~~advocating anthropological approaches that would transform~~ (~~← Transform what? Maybe "transform the invisible"?)~~ into (~~← into what? Maybe "into the visible"?)~~ ~~the~~ existence of instrument, the practices, she would be able to make invisible visible by anthropological approaches. ~~Moreover~~, ~~the~~ authors of ~~the~~ two books ~~all~~ try to criticize the drawbacks of certain sociological approaches. For example, functionalists ~~sometimes~~ emphasizes ~~the~~ social norms but ~~ignoring the~~ symbolic dimensions.² ~~Basing on their ethnography in laboratories~~ ~~In short~~, the ~~cited authors draw on their lab-based ethnographic work to identify and explore~~ ~~y all mention~~ the limitations ~~of~~ historical perspectives ~~in their research~~.

¹ Knorr-Cetina ~~rejects~~ ~~doesn't agree to~~ the distinction, ~~though~~ (Knorr-Cetina 1999: 247).

² However, I ~~felt~~ ~~feel~~ that Knorr-Cetina is more sociological than Latour and Woolgar, in terms of ~~the~~ writing strategies and styles.