

## **The Global Canadian Academia Beyond Methodological Nationalism: Exploring Burris' Relational Hypothesis of Networks of PhD Exchange**

*Francois Lachapelle*

In 2012, my research partner Patrick Burnett and I co-founded the Relational Academia [RA] project, a self-funded research endeavor documenting the trajectory of PhD students who “made it” as tenured faculty in Canadian universities. Together, we built the largest dataset to date detailing the attributes (e.g. education, gender, publication record, mobility, etc.) of 4,727 PhDs employed in five social sciences disciplines at Canada’s 15 top research-intensive universities (U15) between 1978 and 2015. In this paper, the author is interested in theorizing the position of non-core scientific nations such as Canada—and its PhD granting schools—in the global fields of science by looking at scholars’ mobility patterns cross-nationally. When discussing the position of Canada’s science in the larger global scientific realm, sociologists of science and post-colonial scholars tend to lump countries like Canada as a core international institution along with the U.S. (Siler & McLaughlin 2008; Qi 2014) while non-western countries predominantly occupy the periphery. Going beyond methodological nationalism, this paper recognizes the radical disparity and stratification distinguishing the fields of Canadian research-intensive schools along lines of prestige, available resources, enrolment, mission. For instance, while Canadian higher education used to be characterized by the relative uniformity of its schools in terms of quality or reputation (institutional flatness-Davies and Zarifa 2006), recent research describes the Canadian field as increasingly marked by inequalities, closure, and differential global strategies (Guppy et al. 2013). The author argues that unearthing durable PhD networks between specific schools is a privilege site to explore the Canadian field’s (1) emergent stratification and (2) its schools’ global positioning. This project lay a theoretical framework which incorporates empirical elements from both cosmopolitan and post-colonial theories of science as it includes two salient characteristics of late 20th/early 21st century university based-scientific fields: (1) globalization process dominated by a handful of Anglo-American schools and (2) reactionary localization process in dominated national scientific fields. Thus, to better articulate these forces, our model goes beyond core/periphery scholarship (Schott 1993) that lump together all Northern nations in the core and Southern nations in the periphery. First, to the existent binary model—core/periphery, it is argued that two additional positions can be occupied by PhD-granting schools: the semi-core and the semi-periphery. Second, each of the quadratic positions—core, semi-core, semi-periphery, and periphery—are further divided into two modalities: glocal and local. Theoretically speaking, the ‘glocal’ position articulate the dominant position occupied by schools such as Toronto, Harvard, and LSE as these schools participates in the production and reproduction of the global scientific field’s Anglo-American dominance in two relational ways-global and local; global way as they successfully place their PhDs in a very large number of schools outside their national boundaries and local way as they tend to dominate their respective national PhDs placement market. The local position, on the other hand, is occupied by schools that solely participates in the production and reproduction of national scientific field’s local dominance. In total, the theoretical model advances eight different positions that can be occupied by PhD-granting schools and accounts for the relational nature of scientific fields. One of the main underlying arguments is that a relational understanding of scientific fields based on such a sophisticated core-periphery model can help uncover durable patterns of asymmetrical globalized knowledge flows.