

The Epistemic Advantage of the Periphery A Self-Socioanalysis of Academic *Habitus* in the European Scientific Field

Sandro Serpa*

Interdisciplinary Centre of Social Sciences – CICS.UAc/CICS.NOVA.UAc, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, University of the Azores, 9500-321 Ponta Delgada, Portugal

*: All correspondence should be sent to: Dr. Sandro Serpa

Author's Contact: Dr. Sandro Serpa, Ph.D., E-mail: sandro.nf.serpa@uac.pt

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15354/si.25.or0502>

Funding: This work was supported by FCT, I.P., the Portuguese national funding agency for science, research, and technology, under the project UID/4647/2023 –Centre of Social Sciences of Universidade Nova de Lisboa.

COI: The author declares no competing interest.

AI Declaration: The author affirms that artificial intelligence (*Gemini*, August 2025) did contribute to the process of preparing the work.

This article re-examines the prevailing notion that a peripheral position within a scientific field is inherently disadvantageous. It argues, instead, that such a position can be strategically converted into a distinct epistemic advantage. The analysis deconstructs peripherality into geographic, institutional, and epistemic dimensions. It proposes that their convergence can nurture a heightened sociological self-awareness. Drawing on a Bourdieusian theoretical framework, the author employs participant objectivation to reflect upon his own academic trajectory as a sociologist based in the ultra-peripheral archipelago of The Azores. The analysis reveals that a peripheral location can nurture a distinctive academic *habitus* focused on the practical challenges of scientific production. This conversion, however, is a contingent achievement. It is fulfilled in opposition to more likely outcomes of discouragement, assimilation, or invisibility, rather than being a deterministic result. Consequently, the article reframes scientific objectivity not as a function of neutrality, but as the product of a rigorous objectification of one's own position within the field. The central argument is that by subjecting their own social determinants to sociological scrutiny, researchers can illuminate the power dynamics that structure scientific practice. From this perspective, the periphery can serve as a privileged site for sociological inquiry.

Keywords: Participant Objectivation; Peripheral Academic *Habitus*; Reflexivity; Self-Socioanalysis; Scientific Field; Sociological Perspective

Science Insights, October 31, 2025; Vol. 47, No. 4, pp.1997-2004.

© 2025 Insights Publisher. All rights reserved.



Creative Commons Non Commercial CC BY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed by the Insights Publisher.

The Paradox of Objectivity in a Socially Constructed Science

THE SOCIOLOGY of science, and sociology more broadly, confronts a foundational paradox that challenges its scientific legitimacy: if all knowledge is a social product, inevitably shaped by the context of its creation within a field of struggles, interests, and power relations (Bourdieu, 1988; Gibbons et al., 1994; Serpa & Ferreira, 2020a), on what grounds can sociology claim objectivity? This article addresses this question not by denying social influence, but by subjecting it to rigorous analysis. It argues that the structural disadvantages of the academic periphery can be strategically converted into a distinct epistemic advantage through the nurturing of a peripheral academic *habitus* – a set of dispositions defined by heightened sociological reflexivity.

This argument is built on the central hypothesis that objectivity is reinforced when the social position of the knowledge producer becomes itself an object of scientific scrutiny, a practice that Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) termed *epistemic reflexivity*. The standard critique of sociology posits that a researcher's social position – determined by factors such as class, gender, or geographic location – inevitably biases their work, thereby undermining claims to objectivity. This article accepts the premise that social position is a critical variable, but inverts the conclusion. Rather than a liability to be minimized or ignored, the researcher's position is an unavoidable factor that must be controlled for. The method for achieving this control is to make that very position the object of sociological analysis. This epistemological reframing redefines scientific objectivity not as a static state of feigned neutrality but as a dynamic process of controlled subjectivity. The most objective sociologist, from this perspective, is not the one who claims to have no position, but the one who has most rigorously analyzed their own position and its effects on their scientific practice.

This problem is not merely abstract; it is embedded in the material and symbolic structures of global science. The contemporary academic landscape is characterized by a global division of labor in the social sciences, which concentrates theoretical production in metropolitan centers while relegating peripheral locations to the roles of data provision or theory consumption (Alatas, 2003). This structure creates dynamics of academic dependency, wherein research agendas, methods, and standards of excellence are determined by or borrowed from the center (Alatas, 2003; Marginson & Xu, 2023). For many academics situated outside these hegemonic centers, this marginalization poses a significant challenge to the establishment of a stable professional identity (James & Lokhtina, 2018). This article posits that, rather than being an insurmountable obstacle, this peripheral condition can be transformed into a research tool and a source of epistemic advantage.

To test this hypothesis, the author applies the principle of epistemic reflexivity to his own career as a sociologist at the University of the Azores, an institution located in a European ultra-peripheral region (Serpa, 2021a). This position is treated not as an anomaly but as a manifestation of the aforementioned global structure. The analysis reveals that the conversion of peripherality into an advantage is a contingent, not a deterministic, outcome; such a position can more easily lead to discouragement

or assimilation. The development of an academic *habitus* – the system of dispositions individuals internalize to navigate the field – is a process of socialization. By examining the author's scientific journey as an empirical case, this study demonstrates how peripheral socialization can foster a unique set of dispositions. This self-analysis is itself a strategic move within the examined field, demonstrating how peripheral experience can be transformed into theoretical capital. By examining the social determinants of the sociologist, this study argues that a methodology born from the periphery can address the discipline's central problem of legitimacy (Serpa & Ferreira, 2020a). The periphery thus becomes not merely a vantage point, but a crucible for methodological innovation that strengthens sociology's scientific capital.

To this end, the text first establishes its methodological framework, positioning self-socioanalysis as a rigorous application of Bourdieu's principle of participant objectivation. It then outlines Bourdieu's theoretical framework and develops the concept of a peripheral academic *habitus*. Subsequently, it puts forth evidence of the epistemic advantage derived from this *habitus*, weighing it against the inherent risks and counter-trajectories. Finally, it concludes by analyzing these practices as a form of critical reflection on the established scientific order.

Self-Socioanalysis as a Tool of Participant Objectivation

Contemporary sociology faces a persistent challenge to its scientific legitimacy, a risk that could lead to its deinstitutionalization if it loses its specific scientific capital (Serpa & Ferreira, 2020a). This article positions itself within this debate by arguing that the practice of self-socioanalysis, far from being a concession to a non-scientific agenda, represents a methodologically rigorous response to strengthen the scientific capital of the discipline. The primary methodological framework for this study is *participant objectivation*, a concept developed by Pierre Bourdieu (2003) to denote “[...] the objectivation of the subject of objectivation” (p. 282). This method involves applying the tools of sociology to oneself, transforming one's personal and professional journey into an object of scientific analysis. Its objective is to objectify one's own subjectivity – to understand how one's social origins and trajectory, embodied in the *habitus*, shape one's research practices and intellectual perspective.

Contrary to critiques that frame such approaches as narcissistic, participant objectivation is a methodological necessity for achieving greater objectivity in the social sciences. As Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) argue, objectivity is enhanced when the social position of the knowledge producer is critically examined in a reflexive manner. It is a methodical confrontation with the social conditions that make the act of objectivation itself possible (Bourdieu, 2003). This study can also be understood as a form of analytic autoethnography (Anderson, 2006). Unlike more evocative forms that prioritize personal narrative, the analytic approach requires the researcher to be a full member of the social world under study and use personal experience to illuminate and develop theoretical understandings of broader social phenomena. In this case, the author's self-socioanalysis serves not as an end in itself, but as a systematic method for generating data on the functioning of the academic field from a peripheral

position. It aligns with Anderson's (2006) criteria by positioning the researcher as a visible participant committed to an analytic agenda that transcends self-absorption to engage with sociological theory (Atkinson, 2006).

The operationalization of this analysis was conducted through an exhaustive survey of the author's scientific production over more than two decades. This corpus of work was subsequently analyzed not only for its thematic content but also as a set of strategic maneuvers (Bourdieu, 1989) within the scientific field, understood as an arena of competition for legitimacy (Bourdieu, 1988). Each publication was subjected to an analysis of its genesis, identifying the structural frictions that prompted it, such as difficulties in obtaining research funding or challenges within the peer-review process (Ferreira & Serpa, 2018a; Sá et al., 2020). This process transforms an academic trajectory and its biographical events into a set of sociological data.

This approach reveals a self-referential loop that embodies Bourdieusian *praxis*: the research output is not merely data for the analysis but the performance of the very strategy being analyzed. The structural frictions that the author experienced – such as opaque peer review or the financial barriers of Open Access – were not simply endured; they were converted into the subject matter of his research. The act of researching and publishing on these topics is the concrete mechanism by which disadvantage is converted into scientific capital. This article, the self-socioanalysis itself, represents the ultimate strategic move: it objectifies the entire process, turning the strategy itself into a new form of symbolic capital. This performative dimension of the methodology serves as a powerful proof of concept for the article's thesis; it does not merely describe the conversion of disadvantage into epistemic capital but enacts it.

The author acknowledges the inherent methodological risks, such as the potential for post-hoc rationalization. To mitigate them, the analysis is firmly anchored in the chronology and content of the scientific production, treating publications as an empirical record of strategic responses (Bourdieu, 1988) to obstacles imposed by the field structure. The focus thus shifts from subjective intention to the objectified trajectory, validating the conversion of structural disadvantages – or private troubles – into public issues, an exercise that reflects the core of the sociological imagination (Mills, 2000; Ferreira & Serpa, 2018b; Serpa & Ferreira, 2020b).

The Logic of the Academic Field and the Dimensions of Peripherality

To understand the argument that the periphery can offer an epistemic advantage, it is necessary to map the terrain where this advantage arises. This requires, first, an understanding of the academic world as a social field in the Bourdieusian sense and, second, a nuanced deconstruction of peripherality as a multidimensional position within that field.

Bourdieu's Field Theory and the Struggle for Capital

Pierre Bourdieu's field theory describes the academic world not as a serene realm of intellectual dialogue but as a competitive social arena with its own rules and a constant struggle for power and recognition (Bourdieu, 1988). The scientific field is a locus

of a constant struggle where agents compete for scientific authority, which is the power to define what is valid knowledge and impose that definition on others (Bourdieu, 1988). The structure of this field is defined by the power dynamics between its participants, with each participant's position determined by the volume and type of capital they possess. In this context, the author's position at the University of the Azores is structurally peripheral, which implies, from the outset, less institutional capital, making the struggle for recognition more challenging.

Competition in the field is a symbolic struggle to impose a particular worldview. The pervasive culture of *publish or perish*, for example, reflects this struggle for visibility and legitimacy, with rules often defined by dominant centers that disproportionately affect those in weaker positions (Rawat & Meena, 2014; Sá et al., 2020). An individual's position is determined by their forms of capital, which Bourdieu (1988) identifies as (i) scientific capital (prestige granted by peers), a resource the author examined in his studies on peer review; (ii) social capital (the network of contacts and connections); and (iii) symbolic capital (perceived legitimacy and recognition). However, Bourdieu's (1989) theory is not deterministic; it allows for strategy and agency on the part of social actors. Therefore, this analysis is not limited to observing a peripheral position but seeks to understand the logic behind the strategies for navigating the field from that position.

Deconstructing Peripherality: Geographic, Institutional, and Epistemic Dimensions

The concept of peripherality is best understood not as a monolithic condition but as a multidimensional position within the global scientific field. To grasp how peripherality shapes an academic *habitus*, these dimensions – although often overlapping in practice – require analytical distinction. Geographic peripherality pertains to an actor's physical remoteness from dominant academic centers. Historically, spatial proximity has been crucial for substantive collaboration and the transmission of tacit knowledge. For a scholar based in the Azores, a mid-Atlantic archipelago, this distance erects tangible barriers to conference participation, informal network building, and access to the knowledge spillovers that characterize academic hubs. This form of marginality, defined by infrastructural and logistical challenges, can engender a sense of professional isolation. Institutional peripherality relates to an individual's affiliation with non-elite, under-resourced, or non-research-intensive organizations. Such institutions typically lack the symbolic capital, robust funding, and advanced research infrastructure of their central counterparts. This deficit creates a structural disadvantage in the competition for grants and recognition that is distinct from mere geographic location. The University of the Azores, as a smaller university outside major European academic networks, exemplifies an institutional position that imposes its own set of constraints. Epistemic peripherality denotes a position of marginality relative to the dominant theoretical paradigms, research agendas, and intellectual canons overwhelmingly produced in the Global North (Alatas, 2003). This dimension refers to the intellectual dependency that arises when theories and concepts developed in one context are treated as universal, while locally generated knowledge is devalued or

Table 1. A Typology of Central versus Peripheral Academic <i>Habitus</i> .		
Relationship with rules	Unconscious mastery of the rules of the game; implicit norms accepted without question.	Conscious decoding of rules, which become explicit objects of analysis and strategy.
Main strategy	Conservation of capital and defense of orthodoxy shaped by established norms.	Adaptation to orthodoxy through learning established norms or, alternatively, conversion of capital through heterodoxy, subversion, and creation of new niches.
Perception of the field	The field is perceived as a natural and purely meritocratic system.	The field is perceived as a political space defined by power relations.
Type of reflexivity	Limited to criticism within existing paradigms.	Structural and essential, whereby the objectification of the researcher becomes a navigational tool.
Source of capital	Derived from institutional prestige and conformity with dominant norms.	Generated through reflective analysis, alternative networks, and the conversion of disadvantage into epistemic advantage.
Dominant forms of capital	Relies on institutionally recognized Scientific, Social, and Symbolic Capital.	Cultivates and deploys unrecognized forms of Navigational and Resistance Capital.
Source: Table prepared by Gemini under the author's instructions.		

ignored.

Crucially, these three dimensions are not merely additive; they interact in a dialectical and mutually reinforcing relationship. This dialectic is central to the article’s argument. Geographic and institutional marginality create the material conditions that can precipitate a critical consciousness of epistemic marginality. An academic based in a central, well-resourced institution is more likely to experience the *rules of the game* – the dominant theories, the accepted methodologies, the standards of evaluation – as natural, objective, and invisible. This unquestioned acceptance of the field’s logic is what Bourdieu and Wacquant call *doxa* (1992). For the peripheral academic, however, these same rules are experienced as constant, visible frictions. The lack of access to networks, the struggle for funding, the sense that one’s research is deemed irrelevant by central paradigms – these are not abstract concepts but lived realities. This constant collision with the field’s power-laden structures makes them visible as arbitrary constructs rather than natural laws. Peripherality, in this sense, functions as a sociological amplifier, making visible the invisible power structures of the field. Therefore, the material disadvantages can become the catalyst for an epistemic awakening. This dialectical relationship is the engine that produces the peripheral academic *habitus*.

Establishment of a Peripheral Academic *Habitus*

The link between the objective structures of the field and the practices of individuals is the *habitus*: a system of enduring, transposable dispositions, a matrix of perceptions and actions shaped by individual and collective history that functions as a practical sense (Bourdieu, 1989; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). An academic’s choices are influenced by their background, and they must actively nurture their capital and *habitus* in order to succeed. This concept is fundamental to introducing the idea of a peripheral academic *habitus*. If *habitus* is the product of a history within a field, an individual on the periphery will have a different history – and thus a different *habitus* – from someone at the center.

For the academic at the center, the rules of the game are a natural and unquestionable environment, a *doxa*. For the author

on the periphery (Cussel, Raigal Aran & Barranco, 2024; Luczaj, 2020), these same rules – by central institutions (institutional), communicated through journals and conferences that are often physically distant (geographic), and which enforce a particular set of acceptable research topics and theories (epistemic) – emerge as visible obstacles that must be consciously deciphered and strategically navigated. This situation creates a state of sociological alertness that prevents passive acceptance of the field’s logic. The need to understand the reasons behind a rejected article or the challenge of building a reputation transforms academic practice into a continuous investigation of the rules of the game.

This state of alertness is intensified by the experience of symbolic violence – the subtle ways in which power relations are imposed, often with the complicity of the dominated (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Peer review, for example, can function as an instrument of symbolic violence when the criteria applied are more cultural than purely scientific. One response to this violence is sociological reflexivity, which becomes a tool for deploying what can be termed resistance capital. This process requires careful attention to ethical dilemmas (Ferreira & Serpa, 2018c) and an analysis of the conceptual backstage itself (Serpa & Ferreira, 2018a). For the academic at the center, reflexivity may be a theoretical option; for the author, it became a practical necessity for survival and advancement.

This process of objectification transforms private problems into public questions about the structure of the global scientific field (Ferreira & Serpa, 2018b), a concept central to the *sociological imagination* (Mills, 2000; Serpa & Ferreira, 2020b). It allows the analysis of institutional barriers, such as those in Open Access (Sá & Serpa, 2020) or peer review transparency (Ferreira & Serpa, 2018a), to transcend personal grievances and become a sociological critique of the power structures governing science.

In this article, the author proposes that this reflexive and strategic disposition gives rise to two previously untheorized forms of capital. The first, navigational capital, is the conscious skill of decoding and maneuvering through a field’s implicit rules, or the “skills of maneuvering through social institutions” (Yosso, 2005, p. 80). The second, resistance capital, is the ca-

capacity to convert a structural critique of those rules into scientific legitimacy and symbolic capital, drawing on “knowledges and skills fostered through oppositional behavior that challenges inequality” (Yosso, 2005, p. 80).

This act of naming and defining these specific forms of capital represents a theoretical extension of Bourdieu’s framework, offering new analytical tools for studying agency within stratified fields.

The conceptual distinction between central and peripheral academic *habitus* can be summarized as ideal types, as depicted in **Table 1**. This typology serves as a powerful heuristic device, moving the concept from a narrative description to a robust analytical tool.

In short, while academics with a central *habitus* tend to preserve institutionally-sanctioned capital and advocate orthodoxy, the author’s peripheral position forced him to consciously cultivate and deploy navigational and resistance capital. This approach requires acute and subtle reflexivity, in which the objectification of one’s own position becomes an essential tool for both survival and scientific innovation.

Converting Structural Disadvantage into Epistemic Capital

The central thesis of this article is that a peripheral position, by fostering radical reflexivity, can be actively transformed into an epistemic advantage. This advantage is not access to a superior or more authentic truth, but a sociologically privileged vantage point for uncovering the political workings of the scientific field. Those in positions of authority tend to accept the structure of the field as given (*doxa*), while those who constantly face its limitations are forced to map its architecture in order to survive. The author’s scientific output serves as empirical validation of this thesis, demonstrating a systematic conversion of structural obstacles into objects of study. The logic of this research trajectory is not random but structurally determined; it is a map of the field’s power structures, drawn from the perspective of someone who has directly collided with them.

From Private Troubles to Public Issues: An Objectified Trajectory

The author’s research program provides a map of the field’s barriers, drawn by someone who has collided with them. This process can be illustrated through a clear causal sequence: a structural obstacle prompts a reflexive analysis, which in turn leads to a strategic action (publication), thereby converting disadvantage into scientific capital.

One such instance began with the recurring initial rejection of manuscripts, a common experience for peripheral scholars. Instead of internalizing this as an individual deficiency, the author reflexively analyzed this barrier as a sociological problem – a manifestation of symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) embedded in the mechanisms of power in peer review. This reflexive turn led directly to a strategic action: a series of investigations into the review process itself. This resulted in publications advocating for greater transparency and exploring *preprints* as a strategy for disseminating knowledge outside hegemonic channels (Ferreira & Serpa, 2018d). In this way, a structural obstacle was systematically converted into an

object of study and a source of scientific capital.

This pattern of inquiry is consistently observed throughout the author’s academic trajectory. Driven by an imperative to elucidate mechanisms of exclusion, the author’s research encompassed investigations into disparities in Open Access funding (Sá & Serpa, 2020) and the pervasive pressures within academic publishing (Sá et al., 2020; Serpa et al., 2021). Furthermore, the strategic imperative to foster visibility from a peripheral standpoint motivated inquiries into online reputation as a form of symbolic capital (Ferreira & Serpa, 2018e) and critical examinations of the evolving landscape of scientific publishing (Serpa et al., 2021, 2024).

To comprehensively understand the institutional milieu of his academic embedding, the author leveraged theoretical frameworks from Organizational Sociology, applying concepts such as bureaucracy (Serpa & Ferreira, 2019), organizational culture (Serpa, 2016), and leadership (Serpa, 2015) directly to the university context. This critical perspective was further substantiated by his contributions to the Sociology of Education, which specifically addressed mechanisms of academic achievement, including transversal skills (Sá & Serpa, 2018) and pedagogical approaches to sociology (Ferreira & Serpa, 2017; Serpa & Ferreira, 2020b). Finally, his research on the Digital Society provides a contextualization for his personal academic trajectory, positioning technology as both an instrument for mitigating peripherality and a primary subject of inquiry, exemplified by his work on Society 5.0 (Ferreira & Serpa, 2018f; Serpa, 2021b) and Artificial Intelligence (Serpa et al., 2024, 2025). The author’s *curriculum vitae*, when objectified in this manner, becomes the primary evidence for his theory, revealing a research agenda shaped not merely by intellectual interest but by the practical necessity of navigating a stratified field.

Counter-Trajectories: The Risks of Discouragement, Assimilation, and Invisibility

The conversion of peripheral disadvantage into epistemic advantage is a contingent, achieved standpoint, not an automatic process. To claim that peripherality inherently fosters reflexivity is to risk a normative fallacy, as this ignores the significant evidence of counter-trajectories that reinforce, rather than challenge, existing power structures. This section adds a crucial layer of nuance, explicitly guarding against a romanticization of marginality by analyzing the far more common negative outcomes of a peripheral position.

First, discouragement and alienation are common responses to the relentless institutional barriers and resource scarcity in peripheral contexts. Rather than converting these obstacles into sociological insights, many scholars internalize them as personal failures, which leads to burnout and high attrition rates (Mazzetti et al., 2019).

Second, assimilation represents a survival strategy in which peripheral scholars abandon critical or unique perspectives to mimic the hegemonic practices of the center. By adopting mainstream topics and adhering to dominant methodologies, they seek acceptance by erasing their own distinctiveness. This act of intellectual colonization overcomes peripherality at the cost of reinforcing the very structures that create it (Alatas, 2003).

Third, invisibility occurs when peripheral scholars are epistemically silenced. Despite being legitimate peripheral participants, their work is systematically ignored, uncited, and overshadowed by the high-volume output of central institutions. This is not a personal failure but a structural effect of a field where prestige and attention are highly concentrated (Marginson & Xu, 2023).

These counter-trajectories refine our understanding of the standpoint theory. A simplistic interpretation suggests that marginalization automatically confers superior knowledge. However, a more robust view, following Sandra Harding (2004), frames the standpoint as an achievement forged through political and intellectual struggle. The position on the periphery only offers the potential for a unique epistemic advantage point. The actualization of this potential depends on the mobilization of what has been termed here a capital of resistance – a combination of theoretical tools (like those of Bourdieu), critical consciousness, and access to supportive alternative networks. Without this capital, the struggle against marginality is likely to result in one of the negative counter-trajectories. Thus, the advantage is not an intrinsic attribute of a position but the hard-won outcome of a high-stakes strategic engagement with the field. The trajectory of critical reflexivity outlined here does not represent a destination (Ferreira & Serpa, 2021) but a possibility that must be actively constructed against formidable structural pressures.

Conclusion

The Potential Critical Vocation of the Peripheral Sociologist

This article sought to establish a theoretical basis for the argument that reflexivity from the periphery can be an epistemic advantage. Using Pierre Bourdieu's tools, the author has demonstrated that the self-socioanalysis presented here is a systematic application of his scientific project of participant objectivation (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). The analysis revealed that scientific objectivity is not achieved through a fictional neutrality, but through the continuous practice of objectifying one's own position – a position understood as a complex intersection of geographic, institutional, and epistemic peripherality.

The epistemic advantage of the periphery is not an automatic result, but an intellectual achievement forged in the struggle against symbolic violence and won against the significant risks of discouragement, assimilation, and invisibility. Being on the periphery can force a conscious decoding of the rules of the game, fostering acute scientific reflexivity. By transforming his private troubles as a peripheral academic into public questions

about the dynamics of global science, the author's career embodies the sociological vocation advocated by C. Wright Mills (2000). His academic work, by dissecting the mechanisms of publication, evaluation, and recognition, serves both as an analysis of the field and a contribution to it.

In short, the self-socioanalytic trajectory provides a model of how objectivity in the social sciences is reinforced not by claiming a neutral perspective, but by continuously objectifying the position from which knowledge is created (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). It is through this reflective work that the periphery, far from being a place of epistemic silencing, can become a privileged advantage point for understanding the struggles that define contemporary science. The article's ultimate implication is that the work of de-centering science and challenging academic dependency is not merely a political goal separate from scientific practice; it is a methodological imperative for producing better, more objective science. This powerfully unites the article's epistemological, theoretical, and political dimensions, suggesting that the critical vocation of the peripheral sociologist is to use their unique standpoint to expose the hidden power structures governing knowledge production, thereby contributing to a more democratic and globally inclusive scientific field.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study has several acknowledged limitations. The primary limitation is the nature of self-socioanalysis as a single-case study, which restricts its generalizability in a statistical sense. The goal, however, is not to make broad empirical claims but to achieve theoretical transferability – inviting readers to make connections between the elements of this study and their own contexts, and using this specific case to generate a theoretical model of the peripheral academic *habitus* that can be explored elsewhere. The subjective nature of the method, including the risk of ideological generalization, and the challenge of maintaining analytical distance, are also methodological constraints.

These limitations suggest several avenues for future research. A central question concerns the transferability of the peripheral academic *habitus* model to other global contexts. It is likely that the substantive content of this *habitus* is shaped by the particular colonial histories and material conditions of different peripheries, with the potential for significant disciplinary variations. Comparative studies could investigate how different forms of resistance capital are mobilized across various settings, thereby contributing to a more globally nuanced understanding of the relationship between social position and scientific knowledge. ■

Received: August 18, 2025 | Revised: September 19, 2025 | Accepted: September 26, 2025

References

- Alatas, S. F. (2003). Academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences. *Current Sociology*, 51(6), 599–613. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921030516003>
- Anderson, L. (2006). Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 373–395. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241605280449>
- Atkinson, P. (2006). Rescuing autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 400–404. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241606286980>
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). O poder simbólico [The Symbolic power]. Difel.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003). Participant objectivation. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 9(2), 281–294. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.00150>
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cussel, M., Raigal Aran, J., & Barranco, O. (2024). Academics in the semi-periphery: Translation and linguistic strategies on the rocky road to publishing in English. *Social Science Information*, 62(4), 440–464. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/05390184231221460>
- Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2017). Challenges in the teaching of sociology in higher education: Contributions to a discussion. *Societies*, 7(4), 30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc7040030>
- Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2018a). Publicising the identified peer-reviewer: Legitimacy and quality of the scientific publication. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Educational Studies*, 13(1), 11–17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-011x/cgp/v13i01/11-17>
- Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2018b). Sociological problem and social problem: Contributions to a discussion. *Sociology and Anthropology*, 6(11), 840–844. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13189/sa.2018.061104>
- Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2018c). Informed consent in social sciences research: Ethical challenges. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 6(5), 13–23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v6i5.3106>
- Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2018d). The importance of preprint in scientific publication: Perspectives and challenges. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 4(12), 642–647. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32861/jssr.412.642.647>
- Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2018e). Online visibility, social networks and glamorous scientific publications. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 6(10), 58–66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v6i10.3652>
- Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2018f). Society 5.0 and social development: Contributions to a discussion. *Management and Organizational Studies*, 5(4), 26–31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5430/mos.v5n4p26>
- Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2021). Future anticipation in sociology. *Science Insights*, 39(1), 333–341. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15354/si.21.re229>
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. Sage.
- Harding, S. G. (2004). *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*. Routledge.
- James, N., & Lokhtina, I. (2018). Feeling on the periphery? The challenge of supporting academic development and identity through communities of practice. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 50(1), 39–56. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2018.1520561>
- Luczaj, K. (2020). Conceptualising the academic periphery: The case of Eastern European academic systems. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 18(5), 511–527. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2020.1789450>
- Marginson, S., & Xu, X. (2023). Hegemony and inequality in global science: Problems of the center-periphery model. *Comparative Education Review*, 67(1), 31–52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1086/722760>
- Mazzetti, A. C., Rubin-Oliveira, M., Pezarico, G., & Wielewicz, H. D. G. (2019). Relação centro x periferia: A universidade em debate [Center-periphery relationship: The university under debate]. *Educação em Revista*, 35, e193459. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-4698193459>
- Mills, C. W. (2000). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford University Press.
- Rawat, S., & Meena, S. (2014). Publish or perish: Where are we heading? *Journal of Research in Medical Sciences*, 19(2), 87–89.
- Sá, M. J., Ferreira, C. M., Santos, A. I., & Serpa, S. (2020). Publishing at any cost? The need for the improvement of the quality of scholarly publications. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(3), 214–221. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n3p214>
- Sá, M. J., & Serpa, S. (2018). Transversal competences: Their importance and learning processes by higher education students. *Education Sciences*, 8(3), 126. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8030126>
- Sá, M. J., & Serpa, S. (2020). Some issues on the funding of the scientific publication in open access. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(4), 77–85. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2020-0063>
- Serpa, S. (2015). Autonomy in leadership: A case study of the founder's role in establishing an organization. *Asian Social Science*, 11(13), 212–220. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n13p212>
- Serpa, S. (2016). An overview of the concept of organizational culture. *International Business Management*,

10(1), 51–61.

Serpa, S. (2021a). Sociology and education in an academic career. *Science Insights*, 37(2), 277–280. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.15354/si.21.fl005>

Serpa, S. (2021b). Digital society and digital sociology: One thing leads to the other. *Science Insights*, 38(3), 314–316. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.15354/si.21.ps016>

Serpa, S., & Ferreira, C. M. (2018a). Goffman's backstage revisited: Conceptual relevance in contemporary social interactions. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 6(10), 74–80. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v6i10.3659>

Serpa, S., & Ferreira, C. M. (2019). The concept of bureaucracy by Max Weber. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 7(2), 12–18.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v7i2.3979>

Serpa, S., & Ferreira, C. M. (2020a). Sociology: Tension between science and militant activism? *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 10(6), 1–8. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2020-0105>

Serpa, S., & Ferreira, C. M. (2020b). Heuristic potentials of the sociological imagination. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 10(4), 11–16. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2020-0060>

Serpa, S., Ferreira, C. M., Santos, A. I. S., Cheng, X., Cheung, A. C. K., Zhou, L., Sá, M. J., Pellegrini, M., & Wang, F. (2021). Future of scholarly publishing: A perspective. *Science Insights*, 39(3), 353–360. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.15354/si.21.re239>

Serpa, S., Micic, L., Štilić, A., & Mastilo, Z. (2025). Sociology of Artificial Intelligence for social sustainability in the Digital Age. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 14(1), 22–33. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2025-0003>

Serpa, S., Wang, F., Zhou, L., & Keleş, Ö. (2024). Artificial Intelligence as author of scientific publications. *Science Insights*, 44(1), 1215–1219. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.15354/si.24.re866>

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69–91. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006>