UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Colleagues with benefits

How diaspora knowledge networks make difference to post-Soviet scientists' migration, research and career

Antoshchuk, I.

Publication date
2023

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Antoshchuk, I. (2023). *Colleagues with benefits: How diaspora knowledge networks make difference to post-Soviet scientists' migration, research and career*. [Thesis, externally prepared, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:18 Nov 2026

CHAPTER 5

Gendering Diaspora Knowledge Networks: Why Diasporic Solidarity Fails to Promote Gender Equality

Abstract

Despite growing interest in the role of gender issues in transnational migration, systematic analysis of gender relations as a central, structuring force in this process is still rare. This is particularly true for research on migration networks. We know ethnic networks of low-skilled migrants are significantly gendered, but not how gender works in the migration networks of the highly skilled. Existing studies either do not problematize this question or provide inconsistent evidence. My chapter seeks to address this gap, exploring diaspora knowledge networks (DKNs) of Russian-speaking computer scientists (RCS) who migrated to the UK from post-Soviet countries in the 1990s–2000s. The chapter draws on an intersectional perspective in migration studies, exploring the interplay of gender inequalities, diasporic belonging, and professional hierarchies. Empirically, the study is based on thematic analysis of fifty-three semi-structured interviews. I found DKNs to be significantly gendered such that men play the primary roles and relations in the network, which grants influence and benefits to men, while disadvantaging women. The mobilization of masculinities and male bonding in academic contexts, supported by multiple cultural mechanisms, including specific use of the Russian language and the reproduction of post-Soviet academic and professional culture, explain this situation. Emerging diasporic commonalities turn out to be a predominantly masculine cultural project that sustains men's advantages in DKNs.

Introduction

"They are the best, the elite among young people, and I see they are the same as me," said a Russian-speaking professor, explaining his preference for working with PhD students from the post-Soviet region. "In my time, when I was entering [the university], we had a group of young guys. We read the journal *Quantum*[103] and

103 Leading Soviet scientists, including Pyotr Kapitsa. Andrey Kolmogorov and Isaak Kikoin, established this famous physics and mathematics journal for schoolchildren in 1970. It became well-known for educating youth and stirring a deep interest in science and technology among them. For more information please see: Aksenteva M.S. "The journal 'Quantum' is only 30 years old after all!" Phys. Usp., No. 43 (2000): 1261–1262 (2000), https://www.ufn.ru/ru/articles/2000/12/f/; "For the 50th anniversary of 'Quantum' ", Quantum, No.1 (2020): 2–3 https://www.mathnet.ru/links/90b76d919dd7000e1c28355763009608/kvant1054.pdf.

loved physics and math. These guys are the same, I just see it." Later he added: "When I take PhD students, I understand young Russian guys better, as we have something in common." Underlining the sense of commonality, the professor repeatedly used the word "guys" («ребята»), a term often applied to boys or young males.[104] It struck me how gender-specific the term is, suggesting that the diaspora networks Russian-speaking scientists build abroad may be tied not only to common origin and language. I began to wonder what kinds of gender dynamics are involved in and underlies diasporic collaborations among RCS.

In the past few decades, there has been a growing interest in the gender dimension of transnational migration and academic mobility. But scholarly discussions often limit themselves to female experiences of academic mobility (González Ramos and Bosch, 2013; Sang, Al-Dajani, and Özbilgin, 2013; Johansson and Sliwa 2014), while rarely analyzing gender as "a set of social relations that organize immigration patterns" (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994, 3). In particular, we know little about the role of gender relations in migration networks. Studies of low-skilled migrants demonstrate that gender profoundly affects ethnic networks, shaping their size, composition, and density, engaging women and men in different roles and positions, leading to an unequal distribution of network benefits, undermining or facilitating integration into the host country (Hagan 1998; Curran and Saguy 2001; Zhou and Logan 1989; Gilbertson 1995). But do these findings apply to migration networks of highly skilled professionals?

Studies of DKN, transnational associations of highly skilled migrants from the same home country (Meyer and Wattiaux 2006; Meyer 2007; Kuznetsov 2006), reveal little about the matter. Probably, because when women's organisations are specifically marked as such, "general organizations are rarely designated as men's networks" (Holton 2008, 101, cited in De Tona and Lenti, 2011, 245). The only article paying attention to gender shows that women constitute a tiny fraction (4.9%) of the overseas Chinese intellectual diaspora and are less inclined than men to maintain contacts with compatriots in their home country (Xiang 2006, 50-51). Research on ethnic as-

104 According to Ozhegov S.I. and Ushakov D.N. "ребята" [rebiata] has three main meanings: "kids" (children), "guys" (youth or young males) and "buddies" (one's own people, friends at work, or fellow students). In the pre-revolutionary Russian army, officers addressed their soldiers as "ребята.".
Ozhegov's explanatory dictionary, "Rebiata", n.d., http://slovarozhegova.ru/word.php?wordid=26782
Ushakov's explanatory dictionary, "Rebiata", n.d., https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/ushakov/1007078

sociations of highly skilled migrants provides fragmentary, contradictory evidence. Saxenian's (1999, 2002) studies of Chinese, Indian, and Taiwanese professional organizations in Silicon Valley ignore gender as a category, but feature men as "founding fathers" and ordinary members of associations. Men predominate in Chinese associations in the region (Wong 2006) and in Indian ethnic networks in IT body-shopping business (Xiang 2006). However, Asian professionals in Silicon Valley adhere to and benefit from ethnic strategies irrespective of gender (Shih 2006), though differences in access to networks exist. Ethnicity-centered accounts seem insufficient to explain networks of highly skilled migrants. The evidence on the role of gender is inconclusive. My chapter seeks to address this gap by undertaking a comprehensive qualitative analysis of gender disparities in DKNs of RCS. Viewing gender inequalities as both a constitutive force and an outcome of diasporic interactions, I am concerned with two questions: What kind of work does gender perform in DKNs? What kind of gender dynamics are involved in the formation and maintenance of the networks?

Theoretically, the study employs an intersectional perspective from migration research that underlines the "interconnectedness of different identities and hierarchical structures" (Anthias 2012, 102). Intersectional analysis is especially useful for studying male-dominated industries (Raghuram 2008) such as computer science, in which transnational movement and interactions across the home country and destination country contexts can challenge existing inequalities and induce gender reconfigurations. I trace intersections and conflations of gender, as well as diasporic and professional structures, focusing on how RCS mobilize and articulate gender relations in diasporic and professional interactions. First, I consider gender relations as a crucial force that shapes migration processes (Xiang 2005) and is deeply "implicated in the very formation and structure" of migration networks (Friedman-Kasaba 1996, 39). Second, I examine nationhood and ethnicity as inherently gendered collective, cultural, and ideological projects (Yuval-Davis 1998). Third, I introduce profession as a dimension, which contributes to understanding the interplay between professional and national and ethnic belongings (Saxenian 1999, Meyer 2007), as well as between gender and STEM identities (Jorgenson 2002, Faulkner 2009, Ensmenger 2015). Methodologically, like the earlier parts of my dissertation, the study uses thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews that capture intersections of gender, diasporic, and professional structures in migrant scientists' narratives and experiences.

The Specific Context of Post-Soviet Intellectual Migration and Gender Inequality

RCS represent a particularly interesting case for migrant network analysis because of the specificity of intellectual migration from the former USSR, particular the gender history of post-Soviet space and Soviet technological disciplines.

First, since the 1990s, Russia and other post-Soviet countries have experienced a significant brain drain, constituted largely of outflows of STEM and other professionals (Korobkov 2012). Due to high demand abroad and traditionally strong mathematical training, IT specialists and computer scientists were numerous among highly skilled migrants from the former USSR (Biagioli, Lepinay 2019), with the UK being one of their primary destinations (Lepinay et al. 2014; Zemnukhova 2017; Yurevich and Aushkap 2018). As non-EU scholars and third country nationals, they faced formal migration barriers to entering the UK. As scientists, socialized in the Soviet higher education system, which was "quite different from the European notion of a university and remote from the international academic community" (Kuraev 2015, 181), RCS encountered difficulties establishing and advancing themselves in British academia. The latter also proved to be highly competitive, especially for migrant scholars who were recruited en masse for short-term research positions to fulfill the need for "replacement labor" (Khattab and Fenton 2015, 528). Under these conditions, as demonstrated in previous chapters, mobilizing connections to other Russian-speaking scholars proved an effective means to reduce the costs and risks of migration and to facilitate integration and career progression in British universities (Antoschyuk 2019). RCS formed DKNs, which functioned as migrant support and scientific collaboration networks (Antoschyuk 2018).

But what role does gender play in constituting and shaping these networks? An interplay of home country and destination country features makes this question particularly intriguing. In the Soviet Union, women had full political rights and entered the labor market earlier in history than in many other countries. Mass numbers of Soviet and post-Soviet women acquired higher education in science and engineering, achieved high representation in STEM,[105] and confidently excelled themselves

105 Depending on the period and industry, the share of women ranged from 30% to 60%, which is

in technological professions.[106] Beginning in the 1970s, women constituted 47–53% of scientific and research personnel in the USSR and over 50% in post-Soviet Russia (Pushkareva 2010). However, "gender hierarchies persist in spite of high involvement of women" (Karmaeva 2013, 74; Gewinner 2016). But how does the tradition of high female representation in science and technology impact diasporic interactions in host counties? Does it give Russian-speaking women scientists in the UK an advantage, building their confidence, helping them achieve academic success and result in their equal participation in DKNs? At the same time, masculine culture characterizes Soviet and post-Soviet technology (Abramov 2016), including programming profession, which has a "distinctly masculine image," despite women's substantial presence in the profession (Tatarchenko 2017, 727).[107] Moreover, women are underrepresented in academic migration from the region, especially in STEM disciplines (Malakhov 2019).[108] How do the profession's masculine character and the prevalence of men in migration flows influence DKNs? Do these factors cause DKNs to be male-dominated? Has masculine professional culture found a new life abroad or dissipated under the pressure of solidarity with co-migrants reinforced by British restrictive immigration policies? I address these questions below, thus contributing to research on: gender disparities among highly skilled migrants, gendered aspects of migrant networking and integration strategies, gender inequality in academia, scientific collaboration and male-dominated disciplines, and gender history of STEM in post-Soviet states.

much higher than in many Western states (see, for instance, Barabanova et al. 2013; Mansurov and Yurchenko 2016). In contemporary Russia and other post-Soviet states, the percentage of women working in science and technology is still rather high (UNESCO Institute of Statistics).
UNESCO Institute of Statistics, "Science,technology and innovation: Women in Science", n.d., http://data.uis.unesco.org/index.aspx?queryid=118&export

106 Caroline Bullock, "Why Russia is so good at encouraging women into tech?", BBC, Apr 21, 2017, https://www.bbc.com/news/business-39579321
Shura Collinson, "Celebrating women in science and technology on International Women's Day", Skolkovo, March 8, 2016, http://sk.ru/news/b/articles/archive/2016/03/08/celebrating-women-in-science-and-technology-on-international-women_2700_s-day.aspx

107 This resembles the story of professionalizing programming in the US (Ensmenger 2010): masculinity was used as a resource for raising the status of the occupation. The USSR's peculiarity consists in a specific set of factors, including "the Soviet mathematical and cybernetic tradition, the field's status as an up-and-coming profession, and integration in the international community" (Tatarchenko 2017, 711–712).

108 Bibliometric analysis of World of Science publications for 2008–2017 (Malakhov 2019) reveals that post-Soviet women constitute only 12% of STEM migrant academics, which is much lower than the percentage of women scientific and research personnel in Russia (40%).

Gender in DKNs: Bridging Migration and Scientific Collaboration Studies

To understand the role of gender in DKNs, I briefly review the research on gender inequality in migration and scientific networks and develop a theoretical framework. There is insufficient exploration of the role of gender in migration networks, with the focus of existing research primarily on low-skilled migrants. It is known that a gendered division of labor affects the dynamics of network formation and functioning (Boyd 1989). Specific gender roles characterize this division, and gender ideologies justify it (Lorber 1994, 30). These ideologies constitute a system of norms, beliefs and "attitudes regarding the appropriate roles, rights, and responsibilities of women and men in society" (Kroska 2007, 1867). Thus, a study of Guatemalan nationals in the US (Hagan 1998) shows how gender ideologies determined immigrants' places in the labor market and the configuration of the ethnic network: guided by notions of appropriate occupations, men and women entered different occupational spheres, such as retail and domestic work, which eventually led to the formation of almost-separate male and female ethnic networks. Gender ideologies tend to be inert and can persist despite changes in division of labor and external conditions (McIlwaine 2010). But they are sensitive to changes in the composition and structure of ties (Curran and Saguy 2001, 71–72). Gendered division of labor often leads to unequal distribution of network benefits and, as a result, different migration outcomes. Typically, men's networks are more extensive and diverse, enabling them to accumulate advantages, such as wages and employment, and achieve better integration into the host country than women (Hagan 1998; Zhou and Logan 1989; Gilbertson 1995). Women may seek to overcome these disadvantages by establishing their own networks of co-ethnics, which can include informal mothers' groups (Hongagneu-Sotelo 1994, 189), groups of formal asylum seekers, or ethnic minority organizations (Al-Ali 2003). But what about highly skilled professionals? In DKNs, can we expect a different pattern with a more equal division of labor and distribution of benefits?

Scientific networks are also profoundly gendered. Women generally work with fewer collaborators (Bozeman and Corley 2004) and have less extensive and diverse networks than men. Women also have a lower proportion of international collaborations and higher share of domestic partnerships (Larivière et al. 2013; Abramo et al. 2013). Men and women have more ties to scientists of their own gender (Belle et al.

2014), but men demonstrate greater gender homophily. In STEM disciplines, male-to-male connections are prevalent, while female-to-female ties are scant (Ghiasi et al. 2015). Since women also occupy less central and powerful positions in scientific networks than men (Ibid.), the networks are male-dominated, such that women are not only outnumbered, but structurally disadvantaged and less influential than men.

Gender patterns in scientific collaboration stem from "academic patriarchy" (Vettese 2019) or "cultural sexism," a combination of cultural practices, values, and ideologies that act as a "significant, invisible, normalising barrier to women's progression within the academy" (Savigny 2014, 4). Such ideologies manifest in gender-typing of scientific activities and result in a gendered division of academic labor. Research as a high-status and intellectually intensive labor is deemed "men's work," while teaching and service duties that represent "domestic affairs and caregiving work" in the workplace are designated women's territory (Park 1996, 47, 55; Reay 2004). Another important component of "academic patriarchy" is male solidarity and informal male networks (boys' clubs). We know little however about the mechanisms according to which these emerge. In search of one, I draw on the concepts of "homosocial bonding" (Fisher and Kinsey 2014) and "mobilizing masculinities" (Martin 2001). Homosocial bonding concerns "covert," "emotionally charged" social interactions between men that allow them to achieve intimacy and build close, durable connections (Fisher and Kinsey 2014, 45). Mobilizing masculinities is the assertion of masculinities in the workplace through practices and interactions that establish male domination and hierarchy, produce solidarity, affection, and mutual support, and leave women out (Ibid., 588, 607). This particularly occurs during academic mentoring and supervising practices (Van de Brink and Benschop 2014).

Concerning DKNs, does diasporic affinity and migrant solidarity somewhat mitigate gender inequalities in scientific collaboration? What kind of gender dynamics, including division of labor and gender ideologies, characterise DKNs, and how this dynamics is sustained? To answer these questions, I continue the inquiry I initiated in Chapter 4. Here, I focus on the gender structure in the dynamics of DKN formation and development, analyzing the roles women and men in DKN occupy, the positions they occupy, and the relations in which they are involved. Drawing on work on cultural processes that (re)produce "inequality through the routine and taken-for-granted actions of both dominant and subordinate actors" (Lamont et al. 2014, 573), I identify the cultural mechanisms that support and maintain gender inequality and women's marginalization in DKNs.

Methodology

The analysis is based on 53 semi-structured interviews with Russian-speaking computer scientists,[109] which were conducted in 2013–2018 in person (in offices, homes of RCS or cafes) or online (Skype, Whatsapp). Semi-structured interviews was chosen as an appropriate method because it enables to focus on the specific topics, while allowing to collect rich and in-depth information on various aspects of respondents' everyday life, opinions and beliefs. The central topics of my interview were migration and career trajectory and relations of diasporic collaboration in the context of movement, adjustment and integration in the new place. Interviews lasted from fifty minutes to three hours, were recorded by voice recorder and transcribed verbatim in full or partially. Then thematic analysis was implemented to identify "patterns of meanings" and "make sense of collective or shared meanings and experiences" (Braun and Clarke 2012, 57). In addition, I also used university websites, professional (LinkedIn) and other social networks (VKontakte, Facebook, Odnoklassniki), CVs, acknowledgement sections in publications, published interviews with RCS and even some memoirs as a supplementary source of factual and qualitative information on RCS .

RCS are defined by common origin (Russia and former USSR republics),[110] Russian language (native speaker/higher education in Russian) and scientific activity in computer science in the UK, i.e. doing research and/or teaching and producing publications. Respondents were born from 1946 to 1992 and migrated to the UK in 1983–2015 from Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, or Kyrgyzstan.[111]

109 Respondents: eleven women and forty-two men. I conducted forty-four of the interviews in 2015–2018 during field research in the UK. Nine additional interviews, conducted by Liliia Zemnukhova in 2013 as part of the project "Russian computer scientists at home and abroad", are used with her consent.

110 Countries include Ukraine, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Moldova, but exclude Baltic States as they are part of European Union subject to different migration regulations. Only two Russian-speaking scientists from Latvia and a Russian-speaking scientist from Bulgaria are included in the sample because of their education background (higher education in Soviet Union or in Russia) and ties with other Russian-speaking scientists.

111 Exceptions: respondents from other countries (1- Latvia, 1 - Bulgaria) were included in the analysis as they got higher education in Russia and Ukraine, respectively, and sustained diasporic scientific connections with Russian-speaking scientists.

Findings

The Gendered Structure and Dynamics of Diaspora Knowledge Networks

Analyzing DKNs formation and development, I find that they are significantly gendered in structure and dynamics and gendered in a peculiar way as DKN is built upon several types of relationships rooted in migration and scientific structures intersecting with each other. As migrants, RCS are either pioneers who came to the UK on their own or followers, who are assisted by pioneer migrants in their cross-border movement. As scientists, RCS are senior scholars on permanent positions realizing their own research programme and attracting other staff, or junior researchers on temporary positions who do not have much independence in research and are recruited by senior scholars. DKN mixes migration and professional divisions, generating new roles, relations and hierarchies. The main building block of DKN is the relation of mentorship, which develops out of scientific supervision and is coupled with migrant sponsorship, when a senior Russian-speaking academic supports migration of junior Russian-speaking researchers, hiring them as PhD students or postdoctoral fellows. As a result, the figure of a founding father and disciples appear, a mentor surrounded by, relying on and supporting his proteges. Other relations, playing an important role in DKN, are friendship, which is formed between migrant and non-migrant colleagues of equal status and similar hierarchical position, sharing common professional and cultural background, and spouse relationship, when married partners are migrating and collaborating together. Different kinds of diasporic collaboration are characterized by power inequalities and specific division of labor, when men occupy more influential roles and tend to stick together, while women are kept at subordinate positions and do not enjoy diasporic solidarity to the same extent. In the subsequent sections I describe how men appropriate power and achieve dominating positions in the network, while women encounter different barriers on their way.

The Prevalence and Centrality of Men

Stories of DKNs invariably feature men as pioneer migrants and the key people who initiate and extend networks. "If I hadn't come here, maybe there wouldn't be this Russian diaspora," says Evgeniy (1956[112]), a renowned professor at a research-intensive British university and the founding father of a large DKN. He started bring-

112 Upon first mention, I indicate in parentheses the respondent's year of birth and note his or her position at the moment of the interview or last academic position

ing Russian-speaking colleagues to the UK in the 1990s through Royal Society grants and then actively recruited young post-Soviet graduates in the 2000s. The same applies to Mikhail (1946), who established "one of the largest [Russian-speaking] conglomerates in the English milieu" at his university, initially attracting leading Russian computer scientists and then regularly recruiting young specialists from Russia and other post-Soviet countries. As a rule, senior RCS, already settled in the UK, initially sponsored the migration of established scientists from the post-Soviet region with abilities and status equal to theirs. Having surrounded themselves with reliable companions and "good friends," they would begin searching for PhD students and reach out to former colleagues in their alma maters or post-Soviet universities, asking them to recommend bright students and help arrange online or face-to-face meetings with prospective candidates. European educational programmes, such as TEMPUS[113] and ERASMUS,[114] created institutional arrangements that helped senior RCS make contact with young specialists.

> *"This TEMPUS project played a big role. It started in the '90s and continued into the 2000s. When I went to V. [capital of a post-Soviet republic] in 2000, I found Dmitriy myself, my first PhD student. After Dmitriy, Fedor came as the second [student], and then Syaglov came"*
>
> **Evgeniy**

> *"Everybody thinks it [ERASMUS] is for teaching, but one can take PhD and Master's [students]. They are practically already researchers. So there were five guys from Odessa, then five more guys from Odessa, and three from Kiev"*
>
> **Khariton, 1969, senior lecturer**

113 TEMPUS is a trans-European mobility scheme for university studies, launched by Council of European Communities in 1990 (Cordis EU Research results, Trans-European mobility for university studies (TEMPUS)), n.d., https://cordis.europa.eu/article/id/31-transeuropean-mobility-for-university-studies-tempus). The aim of the programme was "facilitate the restructuring of the higher education sector in Central and Eastern European countries through inter-university cooperation, exchanges between students and teaching staff and industry-university cooperation" (Publications Office of the European Union, "TEMPUS", n.d., http://publications.europa.eu/resource/cellar/a9d0aebd-d66e-40d6-a63c-9476fc30e984.0002.02/DOC_2).

114 ERASMUS (now Erasmus Plus) is a European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students, a programme for individuals and organisations in EU and beyond, which was launched in 1987 by European Commission to promote mobility and exchange for higher education students (Encyclopedia.com, "Erasmus program", n.d., https://www.encyclopedia.com/history/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/erasmus-program).

Men also predominate among follower migrants. Senior male RCS typically sought out and invited to the UK fresh male graduates or young professionals. Provided with funding and assisted in other matters, from documentation to accommodation, the latter experienced the move as easy and stress free: "I was just invited and I didn't have to do anything. I just took the path of the least resistance. Because if a good university is inviting me, why should I be particularly selective and apply to somewhere else? I just came and that was it" (Fedor, 1983, lecturer). After finishing their doctorates, these young males may acquire temporary positions in the same universities, promoted and assisted by senior diasporic colleagues: "It was a private arrangement with Anatoliy, that there is a position, and he gives it to me" (Leonid 1981, senior research associate). Then they become reliable and loyal colleagues to senior RCS, not only collaborating on research and writing articles together, but also participating in further development of the DKN. Thus, Dmitriy and Leonid regularly monitor programming competitions, ask their former fellow students, communicate with potential PhD students, and test candidates' abilities. Senior RCS also make job offers to those who decide to work in industry, trying to keep them in academia: "Vladimir [my supervisor], he tried: You see, you should stay here, though we do not have a good position for you yet. But you take this one. You will give lectures, and in half a year you'll have a normal [position]. You'll be doing research and work with us" (Arseniy 1983, PhD student). Whether they worked in academia or industry, male graduates typically remained in close contact with their former diasporic supervisors, staying aware of each other's situations, exchanging professional news, and even becoming friends: "He is now working in a very good Japanese bank. Awfully rich, and we should go to visit him tomorrow" (Sergey, about his former PhD student Mitya).

Failed Founding Mothers and Mentors

Women have different experiences participating in DKNs, which vary according to their level of power and authority. First, when women try to initiate diaspora networks, a way of trying on the role of founding father, their attempts mostly fail. Daria (1979), having attained a project coordinator position, started recruiting Russian-speaking professionals from her alma mater to her research group and other groups. She relocated at least three families from Russia to England. However, sponsoring the migration of her former compatriots did not become a source of authority. Instead, her male colleague claimed leadership, uniting the Russian-speaking community and enforcing his own rules:

> *"He imposed conditions on me. Either you regularly visit Russian tea parties and stop taking all your business trips and stop pretending you've assimilated. Or we will make it so that nobody will say 'hello' to you. And I got the official silent treatment from the entire Russian community on campus …. And this was all done by one man who hasn't managed to build an international circle of communication. He built a Russian circle, and then this Russian circle attacked me"*
>
> **Daria**

Thus, mobilizing "dominating masculinity" (Martin 2001), a follower migrant effectively overrode his subordinate position and undermined the authority of a senior female colleague, betraying the expectation of loyalty and gratitude.

Women also experience disruptions in supervisor-disciple relationships when their disciples are men. Thus, Galina (1972, reader) secured funding and brought a PhD student from Belarus, but he gave up his studies and let her down as his supervisor: "I gave him money for three years. He came and started to publish …. And then he found an illegal source of income in England and he threw himself 100% into 'black' income." He also reproached Galina, expressed discontent, and was overly familiar, using the informal you (ты) instead of the formal one (Вы). His behavior violated the social norms of expressing respect, gratitude and loyalty towards a sponsor. Again, dominating masculinity served to undermine the established power balance that characterize migrant relations, as well as supervisor-student interactions.

In cases when male follower migrants obey female supervisors, the dynamics of female-to-male relationships still differ from male-to-male ones. When male RCS bring junior RCS to the UK, that is considered a great favor. Therefore, mentor-protege relationships emerge, such that PhD students are expected to return the favor and perform services for their supervisors, such as fulfilling informal requests of the supervisor, conducting unrelated research, or working extra hours. But this does not happen when the supervisors are women. Galina was satisfied with her student Erzhan from Kazakhstan, but he initiated their contact, paid for the PhD program, and left after finishing it. Anastasia supervised Vyacheslav, but as the wife of his non-diasporic supervisor she participated in the process to a "lesser extent" and "as a third person, who is observing the process." Their relationship ended when Vyacheslav started working at a different British university. Tatiana, a senior lecturer, co-supervised Petr, who was invited by a Russian-speaking professor. But their collaboration

ended once he left to work in Switzerland. Relationships between senior female and junior male colleagues can function well, if the women do not sponsor the migrations of male disciples or act as primary supervisors. When the mentor-protege relationship has not fully developed, females do not have the informal authority of mentors and males do not have the obligations of follower migrants.

Men and Women Cannot be Friends?

While women are severely discouraged from becoming mentors and founding mothers, they have more opportunities to join the network as companions or "good friends." Still, friendship relations likewise prove to be gendered, with male partners demonstrating more solidarity with their male colleagues. First, pioneer male RCS may assist their male colleagues, who are established scientists, in obtaining positions in British universities and migrating to the UK. Using his local connections and internal knowledge of the British funding system, Evgeniy helped two Russian-speaking scientists obtain research associate positions in the 1990s, and they became his faithful companions and friends for many years afterwards: "I was the first one here. Osipov came in '93. He wrote an email offering his research skills, to Gordon. Gordon contacted me. And by that time I already knew how to bring him here through a Royal Society grant." Georgiy (1952) was an eminent scholar in Russia. But even so, his Russian-speaking acquaintances supported his relocation to the UK in 2004 for a professorship: "Sasha and Robert Lichak worked here … and they said it would be good to hire me. I said, let's hire me. They told Nick. Nick was delighted, and he went to the rector. They created a position that fit my qualifications (Rus. - под меня), announced a call, and I won it, and started working here."

I did not identify similar cases of supporting the migration of mature female scientists. When women work with senior male RCS as equal partners, they typically work in a different institution or country, having established themselves independently in academia, without assistance from diaspora networks. Take, for example, Kristina (1966). She is a professor and the head of a research group, a principal investigator on large-scale IT projects and a long-term, productive collaborator of Stepan, who is also a professor and the director of a research institute at a different UK university. She has a unique migration story. Being Jewish, her family moved to the UK before the 1990s. She benefited from early incorporation into the British higher education system and confidently progressed to a permanent position, at a time when pioneer RCS only began to enter the UK. Anatoliy, a professor at a leading UK university, has maintained a close, rewarding professional and friendship connection to Nina, who works in Finland,

having independently established herself as a scholar and a research group leader.

Second, in male-female collaborations, female scientists may be discouraged from assuming proactive or leading roles. For instance, Yana was invited to collaborate on an article by a male Russian-speaking colleague only when he realized he needed her help specifically, although they had already been acquainted for a long time: "The reviewers asked [them] to include modelling .... Then I remember, there was a call from my collaborator. He said, well, are you ready to work 100% on this project now?" Angelina (1975, reader) tried to establish a collaboration with a junior male colleague, when she acquired a position of a senior lecturer. But he perceived her as a competitor and was not ready to work as equals:

> *"Once I tried to initiate something with him ... but nothing special came out of it ... When I offered we share authorship ... he told me, no, it's mine, you stay away. That I have worked [on it] already so much, so you stay away. He made it understood. This is men's typical behavior. They haven't yet hatched, but they already think they are bosses."*

Such behavior demonstrates that men try to dominate relationships, guiding and setting the terms for collaboration. On the contrary, Angelina's professional ties to female RCS are characterized by mutual trust, personal support, and the exchange of professional favors. For instance, Angelina remarks that she can fully rely on Daria, her former colleague in a big European project: they have not only formed a "friendly relationship," but agreed to include each other in grant applications. She also developed productive ties with women from Ukraine: Angelina found money to invite them (in Rus - "покатать") to London and conduct research together, while they provided necessary data for the project.

Risks and Benefits of Spousal Ties

A particular type of gender-mixed companionship in DKNs is collaborations between wives and husbands. There are dual career couples, in which spouses move from one country to another and progress from one academic position to another almost simultaneously. The story of Ilana and Artem, graduates of Dnepropetrovsk State University, is exemplary in this respect. Though he was the first to graduate and move to Germany for a Master's degree, they both defended their PhDs in the UK

at the same university. Then, they worked as postdoctoral researchers until both obtained lecturer positions in 2010, again at the same British university. They even advanced to senior lecturer and reader positions at the same time. Throughout these years, they collaborated extensively, sharing research projects and publishing many articles together.

But as a rule, male RCS migrate first, bringing their wives as dependents, and outstrip women in their academic careers. In these cases, women defend their PhDs and start professional advancement later than men, while men acquire advantages in terms of professional experience, positions, connections, and resources. Women's chances for scholarly success largely depend on husbands' willingness to support their professional activities. If the men provide support, a productive companionship develops, and women gradually catch up to men. Thus, the story of Raisa, who followed her husband Timofei, who received a postdoctoral fellowship in the UK in 1994, illustrates the possible benefits to female scientists when they migrate as dependents and collaborate with their husbands. Thanks to her husband's contributions as a colleague, adviser, and mastermind, "whose fundamental ideas lay in the core of the project," Raisa successfully defended her PhD thesis in 2001. Then Timofei, having landed a lecturer position, invited her to participate in his research projects, which allowed her to acquire the necessary experience for subsequent advancement. Though the gap in academic status persists—Timofei is already a professor, while Raisa is a lecturer—Raisa is firmly established in academia, and the couple has developed a close professional companionship. Beginning in 2005, they won four Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council grants, published extensively together, and co-supervised several students. Ulyana (1960, lecturer) followed her husband in migration and assisted in his research and teaching, while also taking care of their three children. But when she lost her university position, her husband, already a professor, did not support her in finding a new position. Nor did he invite her to join his team. Ulyana had to combine working in a factory and in social services to earn a living. Her husband found a new partner and divorced her.

Dependence on a husband's support and prioritization of his career can jeopardize women in the long run, as Ulyana's story demonstrates. She did not obtain a PhD from the Moscow Engineering Physics Institute, her alma mater in Russia, since she decided to provide for her family, enabling her husband Gavriil to stay on a poorly paid PhD program. Then children muddled her scholarly plans: "I was constantly pregnant, and they lost faith in me" (In Rus. - поставить крест). Relocation to an

Asian country in 1993 and the need to care for her children postponed Ulyana's defense until she was in her late 30s. Difficulties on the academic job market made her ready to accept any offer, and, as a result, she held several positions in different countries in Europe and the Middle East. However, once her husband "grew tired" of the long-distance relationship, Ulyana quit her job, giving up the prospect of acquiring a deanship, and joined her husband in the UK in 2010. Unfortunately, after a year, her new position in a commercial university was eliminated. Thus, despite jointly published articles and collaboration over many years, companionship failed, and the female partner, having contributed to her husband's advancement, did not receive substantial benefits from collaboration.

Are Women more Welcome as Disciples and Follower Migrants?

If women are not welcome as network builders and have limited access to DKNs as companions, is it easier for them to join DKNs as the disciples of male RCS? Somewhat, but access turns out to be more varied and more problematic than for male RCS. First, women's qualifications and abilities are evaluated more strictly than men's. Sergey took on Alla because her diploma won a prize in a Belarussian national contest, so he was sure she "has good brains." Semen (1977) recruited Alina because she had outstanding credentials. She had won international competitions and had experience in international collaboration. In contrast to male PhDs, often recruited with average qualifications and without particular achievements (a recommendation, interest and a proper background suffice), it is only bright young women who are incorporated in DKNs.

Second, young females find it easier to secure diasporic supervisors not directly, but through their colleagues: they are connected to senior RCS by their Russian-speaking husbands or their non-diasporic female supervisors, who are also senior scholars. For instance, Veniamin agreed to become Alena's (1986, PhD student) supervisor after speaking with Boris, his former postdoctoral fellow and Alena's husband. Grigoriy started supervising Anna (1975) partly out of obligation to Viktor, his closest and most important companion and Anna's husband. Liza and Marina were connected to a Russian-speaking professor and his diasporic colleagues through their female Bulgarian supervisor.

Senior RCS recruit postdoctoral fellows from the post-Soviet region more rarely than they do PhD students, but the opportunities for female and male researchers at this academic level seem relatively equal. Deep knowledge of a topic and prior

acquaintance and collaboration with senior RCS are prerequisites for recruitment as a postdoctoral researcher. Often senior RCS have already acted as the postdoctoral researchers' advisers or informal supervisors while they were completing their PhDs, so they become disciples before they left post-Soviet countries: "It is a working scheme, such that they are formally there, in Russia, but in fact working on my topic. It is necessary to find a supervisor in Russia who agrees to this. It is beneficial for everyone. And I sometimes bring them here, for two, three, or five months" (Khariton). Successful crossborder cooperation can lead to job offers and subsequent migration. It seems that in these situations female and male candidates are judged similarly. For instance, Nina was recruited from the Ukraine because "we knew her" and "she was the most suitable for the position," because "her dissertation was precisely on this topic" (Bogdan, 1957). Similarly, Egor (1985) received an offer from a UK-based scientist, with whom he had been in contact in Russia, during his doctoral years: "By the end of my studies, my PhD program, we had written two or three joint articles …. Then, after I finished my PhD, I continued to work at the Higher School of Economics, and we kept collaborating. And after a year, he suggested I come, to be exact, he told me, that he has a grant and asked whether I would like to apply."

Once admitted as disciples, female and male RCS are appreciated for different skills and qualities. Male students are described as researchers with outstanding mental abilities and skills, where the masculine epithet "strong" is associated with being clever and capable of remarkable achievements: "an exceptional programmer" (Bogdan) and "high-class programmers" (Grigoriy), "trained guys" and "clever guys" (Dmitriy), "strong guys," "clever guys," and "good guys" (Anatoliy, 1954), "the strongest [student]" (Mikhail), "my main star" and "extraordinary man" (Evgeniy), "a generator of ideas" (Anatoliy), "a crazy man (in Rus. - бешеный), who calculates quickly, very quickly" (Grigoriy). Females are either not awarded particular epithets or described with general adjectives that do not pertain to their professional abilities: "very good girls" (Grigoriy), "very good, very nice, attractive girl (in Rus. - очень симпатичная)" (Mikhail), "good student" (Sergey). The highest praise is "a technically very useful girl" (Grigoriy) or "a good theoretician" (Semen). If a female PhD student writes a good thesis and defends it in a timely manner, it is not considered a particular achievement: "Here, only a lazy person doesn't defend. Here, it is very easy to do" (Sergey). But if a male student struggles with completing his thesis, he may be viewed as "too clever for the PhD" (Dmitriy).

Prejudices against young female researchers, albeit surprising for migrant scien-

tists from post-Soviet regions, is likely one reason men's and women's career paths diverge after their doctoral defenses. While male PhD students are often aided by their supervisors, either offered another position or assisted in finding employment elsewhere, female junior researchers are typically deprived of such support. After completing their PhDs, females either leave their supervisor to work in a different university or obtain an academic position in a different country: Liza moved to a top three UK university, after winning a postdoctoral fellowship; Ksenia left the UK and found a good job at a Russian IT company. Even when female researchers remain in the same British university, their collaboration with the former supervisors does not develop into a close, long-term partnership. Only male RCS may increase their status in DKNs and progress from disciple to a partner, while females seem to leave the network with the same status with which they entered it.

In sum, the dynamics of DKN formation and development is profoundly gendered. The main roles in DKNs, founding fathers, companions, good friends, and disciples, are occupied and performed by male RCS, while women encounter various barriers to accessing and integrating into the networks, which become more severe as their status increases. Primarily men form, maintain, and develop DKNs. They are the key figures who make major decisions, build alliances with each other, recruit new members, and dismiss others. As a result, DKNs mitigate the difficulties of migration and integration for male RCS, but they are much less effective for females. In the process of network building, migrant relationships (pioneer-follower) become conflated with academic hierarchies (senior-junior researcher, supervisor-student) and gender asymmetries. Mobilizing dominating, "sucking up," and supporting masculinities (Martin 2001), men establish specific male-to-male bonds and mutual obligations as migrants and colleagues, assisting and promoting each other. Mobilizing masculinities disrupts women's authority, when they sponsor migrations. It also subordinates and disadvantages women, when they are companions or disciples.

The Cultural Mechanisms of the Gendered Reproduction in DKNs

I identified several cultural mechanisms responsible for the gender inequality in DKNs, which help sustain male preferential bonding and the exclusion of women. These include: specific language use, informal interactions duirng leisure time, and the reproduction of Soviet academic and computer science culture.

The Comfort of Speaking Russian

First, female and male RCS tend to have a different attitude towards Russian language use, which reflect a general difference in adaptation strategies. Men feel at home in Russian circles and appreciate the substantial presence of diasporic colleagues in the workplace: "I liked the milieu, that was here, namely, the faculty consists of Russian-speaking [people] for the most part" (Vasiliy). Men often surround themselves with diasporic colleagues and speak Russian at work, especially during the first years after they arrived in Britain: "In the beginning, my entire social circle consisted of Russian-speaking colleagues …. Before I did not even bother to speak English at work. I simply did not need it. I spoke Russian everywhere" (Matvey 1989). Female RCS typically do not seek out a Russian-speaking environment, but establish ties with British and European peers and colleagues: "I did not have Russian-speaking friends there at all. All the guys I socialized with, they all were foreigners" (Ksenia). Except for women who are deeply incorporated in their husbands' diasporic networks, female RCS are not eager to speak Russian at work, feel embarrassed hearing presentations in the Russian language at international conferences (Yana), and sometimes intentionally reduce communication in Russian because they deem it improper in a professional setting (Darya).

The Russian language of male RCS is distinguished by a specific masculine vocabulary: military metaphors, slang expressions, and a special Russian dialect of curse words that are taboo for women to say and hear. PhD students and postdoctoral fellows might be called "my esauls" [the head of a unit of Cossacks] (Grigory). A group of supervisors and his male disciples can be a "team of bayonets" (in Rus. - команда штыков), who successfully "stormed" (in Rus. - "штурмовать") serious professional tasks. To establish a new scientific paradigm is to "chop through" (in Rus. - "прорубать"). Scientists working on this paradigm may be called an "army" (in Rus. - "рать") (Mikhail). To apply for a grant that is approved is to "run through" or "pierce" (in Rus. - пробивать). If grant proposals are rejected, the slang expression "crack" (in Russian - "отлуп" and "отлупливать") is used (Viktor, Anatoliy). Finally, obscene words make communication between male RCS exclusionary and confidential: "When you speak to another Russian, you can say: "Fuck (in Rus. - "бл..ь"), Lesha, I think this is bullshit (In Rus. - "ху..я")), for example, let's check. And that's it! … the sacred meaning of Russian words, men get it. And the discussion and decisions happen much quicker" (Matvey). Thus, speaking Russian with masculine markers enables male RCS to reach speedy understandings, establish close ties, and render diasporic interactions largely male territory, uncomfortable and unwelcome for women.

Informal Interactions Outside the Workplace

Spending free time together engaged in masculine leisure also helps create informal, intimate relationships among male RCS. Whether quietly drinking tea together, consuming alcohol, watching or playing sports together, the total or partial exclusion of women is constant. Women are either not aware of the events because they are not invited, or they are confined to the role of wives, or good-naturedly ridiculed when they attempt to take part. Cultivating friendships can occur in quiet university rooms, when nothing interrupts leisurely interaction between two scientists: "We came by in the evening, when everybody was leaving. The department was empty. And we sat there, drank tea and talked. And it was absolutely wonderful .... We started to collaborate and it was a totally remarkable experience" (Roman). Matvey (1989) informally interacted with his manager and industrial adviser by visiting his home and going climbing and bouldering with him. Bicycle riding and hiking were the favorite pastimes of Dmitriy, Leonid, and other junior male researchers at M. University before they started their families. Once female partners appeared, the "friends" changed their leisure activities, reviving their exclusively male character: they started playing football or going to the gym together one or twice a week, complementing this with occasional evening card games: we "played preference [card game]. We gathered together to play and spent the whole night sitting together" (Fedor 1983).

At S. university, there was a remarkable tradition of Friday night football games followed by excessive drinking parties in a local pub. This case is remarkable because a DKN founding father established the tradition, which became a regular practice for many years, facilitating bonding among Russian-speaking male scientists: "It was a big friendship. Certain relationships were formed there. With many people, with whom I would never have become acquainted in life, in higher positions than me, I switched to the informal you" (Semen). But women were excluded from the game and only invited to the drinking part: "Wives could go out once a week, talk in Russian, and discuss all their problems" (Semen). When the scientists played football together on Sunday mornings, then more a family rather than a professional event, women still either did not play or their participation was not viewed as serious: "When young girls came, it was especially funny because we gave them running shoes, and they also ran and played football with us" [laughs] (Semen). Thus, in in leisure activities, men slotted women into traditional female roles and excluded them from the male-to-male interactions during which male friendship and companionship were consolidated.

Spending leisure time together allowed RCS to reproduce specific modes of post-Soviet informality and friendship, marked by greater warmth and reduced social distance than non-diasporic informal ties. This mode includes visiting each other's homes, drinking and eating together there or in a comfortable environment, knowing each other's family members, assisting in family matters, performing informal favors, and giving presents. RCS especially appreciated these acts as true friendship, which they contrasted with the "cold" relations they had with British colleagues. Though in some cases Englishmen were socialized and integrated into Russian-speaking networks, when they "were already not confused by Russian language" and were also invited to take part in leisure activities (Semen).

Familial Connotations of (Post)-Soviet Mentorship

Shared (post)-Soviet academic culture also binds male RCS together. Patronage in DKNs is rooted in a scientific supervision "mentor-protege" model, formed in Soviet times. Then, it was part of informal social structures ("parallel worlds") that sustained technical disciplines under the conditions of formal restrictions (Gerovitch 2013). When (post)-Soviet scientists went abroad and faced difficulties, the model was revived, but for other purposes. As noted above, senior RCS grant substantial informal assistance to junior researchers' migration and integration. In turn, junior RCS are expected to be loyal and substantially contribute to their supervisor's work. This relationship is inherently paternalistic, relying on the patriarchal authority of a mentoring father figure and the disciple's son-like submissiveness. "A man who is not a father to his children can never be a real man," says Don Corleone in the famous novel, Godfather. For RCS, the ability to raise disciples connotes being a fully fledged scientist. Establishing a scientific school becomes akin to starting a family:

> *"I had an intern. From Petersburg, they sent me an intern, Ivan Aleksandrov. … An intern is still not a son, not a PhD student, but a nephew. Then … he had his own internships. And he took Vitya Musin as an intern. So Vitya is an intern of my intern, i.e., my grandnephew. And I'm very pleased to have not such descendants, but relatives …. I have been teaching Levin since he was fifteen and Muravyov since he was twenty …. They are my direct offspring"*
>
> **Grigoriy**

Responsibility, financial provision, education, and "raising" someone in the academic community characterize paternal mentorly affection as a father to his disciples, though sometimes the mentors feel this is a heavy burden:

> *"I do not like PhD students because I treat them too seriously. If I take a man, the first thing I do with him, I get him to such a level, so it is interesting for me to work with him …. But too much health is spent on them. So much is spent, it is difficult. Because I just can't let myself, like some of my colleagues, take PhD students, and then not see them and, well, you swim [by yourself]"*
>
> **Sergey**

Paternal care and attention can also be devoted to female disciples: "He has children approximately my age. And once he introduced me to his daughters. And they would take me shopping or give me advice, and it helped a lot for sure …. He constantly asked, not only, how are your studies? But, for example, if he saw I was sad or worried, he always asked, asked about my parents" (Ksenia 1986). Though senior RCS do not speak about it directly, their reluctance to support females in their career advancement signals that they do not treat and appreciate female PhDs as their disciples in the same way as they do their male students. My guess is that, seeking to reproduce themselves in their scientific descendants, senior RCS establish a male lineage in DKN. They view male "offspring" as the ultimate carriers of their scholarly names in the academic world and thus prospective founding fathers of new scientific schools. Consequently, women may be admitted and even raised in the scientific "family," but as "daughters" and not true inheritors.

Gendered Aspects of (Post)-Soviet Professional Culture

(Post)-Soviet computer science culture provides an additional basis for developing a specific masculine commonality among RCS. RCS use values such as prioritizing fundamental science and theoretical enquiry, universalism and versatility, and independent and original thinking[115] for professional identity-building and to differentiate themselves from British and other non-Russian colleagues. Thus, Vadim praises the Russian fundamental approach and expresses indignation with applied research

115 Some values are common to Russian engineers as a professional group (for more details, see Abramov 2016).

in his research centre: "We are not science, we are a service …. What we do here is simply a shame. I was given a task, and I began solving this task on a phystech scale (in Rus. - "с физтеховским размахом").[116] But they immediately instructed me that my business is to dig with a spade (in Rus. - грести лопатой)." Universalism and versatility in contrast to narrow specialization is another common value, which serves as a source of professional pride for RCS and even feelings of superiority over British colleagues:

> *"Those [Russians], who work here, have ambitions towards universalism. But here it is fencing: here is my area, my expertise, but to step to the side – no …. Take John, for instance. He is a specialist in functions approximation of radial basis functions. But I solve any tasks (laughs) also using radial basis functions, if it turns out to be necessary"*
>
> **Konstantin**

Independent thinking, freedom, and creativity are viewed as other distinctive features of Russians: "It seems that they [non-Russian PhD students] can't think by themselves. They need the professor as God to constantly tell them what to do …. So they do not have such a… spirit of research, to try this or that, to compare" (Dmitriy). Remarkably, it is mostly men who are involved in reproduction of these professional values, while women are largely excluded from such narratives or produce alternative ones. Women do not emphasize original thinking as an inborn talent, but speak more about learning and the difficulties of mastering some areas of expertise: "This area is based on the theory of computational complexity, so I had to learn a lot of everything (In Rus. - до фига всего)" (Elena 1989). In contrast to prioritizing "blue sky research," female RCS typically appreciate the opportunity "to do something practical" (Yana).

Importantly, unlike their male counterparts, female RCS do not mobilize professional culture to create diasporic solidarity with other RCS or claim their distinctiveness and superiority as Russian-speaking scientists in comparison to non-Russians. They do not reproduce "the legend of the exceptionality of Russian migrant," present-

116 The Moscow Physical Technical Institute is an elite technical university ("phystech"), famous for its strong sense of alma mater loyalty and solidarity among its graduates, commonly referred to as "phystechi." For more information see MIPT.RU, "The phenomenon of phystech", n.d., https://mipt.ru/about/istoriya-fiztekha.php.

ing Russian-speaking scientists as "the cleverest, the most experienced, the best of the best" (In Rus. - самые-самые) (Matvey), a sentiment common among male RCS. They also do not feel threatened by non-Russians in academic environments, in contrast to male RCS who feel uncomfortable when their colleagues gossip "about the Russian mafia gathering here" (Mikhail) or become concerned with the fate of the department because it is "too Russian" (Grigoriy). Thus, female RCS reveal an international outlook and adopt to integration and assimilation strategies. They are barely involved in sustaining (post)-Soviet computer science culture abroad and prefer to draw on different cultural resources in their professional identity-building. They might intentionally seek to "become local" and "not feel like a migrant anymore" (Daria) or identify as British and even defend the advantages of the British scholarly system:

> *"I observe that Russia, Belarus, and Ukraine look at the British and think, they are given everything. We start talking and they say, but you have so much funding. Therefore, you can do these things. I showed them my robotic hand, our invention, and [Russian] professors come and say, it's easy for you, you're funded by the university …. I say, let's look at the funding: these things I got from the company, and here I had a self-funded PhD student. As a result, the university hasn't given me anything. Do you understand? You say you need thousands to make such technology, but I did it for much less money."*
>
> **Galina**

Mobilizing professional culture and its actualization in the new context of the UK serve to sustain boundaries between Russian-speaking scientists and their British colleagues, as well as between male and female RCS. Mobilization helps to build and sustain relationships among male scholars, supporting a feeling of commonality and atmosphere of comfort among them. It creates the basis for easy understanding and close interactions. But there can be rifts in the reproduction of (post)-Soviet professional culture, if young scholars do not internalize the values and attitudes of their senior Russian-speaking colleagues, if they become cynical and think more about financial gain and pragmatic concerns than about scientific enquiry.

To sum up, various cultural mechanisms facilitate male bonding in DKNs and allow male RCS to create an exclusive space for diasporic interactions. In this space, men

recognize each other as "the same" and build meaningful homosocial ties. By contrast, women find it difficult to identify and sustain the narratives of diasporic belonging, due to the markedly masculine Russian language of diaspora RCS and their masculinist post-Soviet computer science culture.

Conclusion

My analysis shows that DKNs are gendered in structure, dynamics, and reproduction mechanisms. Gender disparities intersect with academic hierarchies and the disadvantages migrants face, giving rise to particular roles and interaction patterns in DKNs. Mentorship, friendship, and spousal collaborations emerging as a result of these intersections are characterized by a gendered division of labor and corresponding gender ideologies, such that men are entitled to more powerful and influential roles than women are. Primarily men initiate and expand DKNs. Women may be admitted to the networks, but mostly excluded from leading or managing activities. If women attempt to act as leaders in a DKN, they find their authority contested. Built largely of male-to-male ties, DKNs should not be viewed as a network of Russian-speaking colleagues, but primarily as a network of male scientists from the former Soviet Union, which present various barriers to women's inclusion and participation. DKNs privilege men both in terms of being migration and scientific collaboration networks, enabling them to derive substantial benefits from their involvement. Unfortunately, female RCS rarely enjoy the same benefits from their involvement in DKNs.

Moreover, commonality shared by being members of the same diaspora itself turns out to be a highly gendered phenomenon. This commonality is formulated by men in interactions with other men, thus becoming one of the main foundations of their bonding and a site for mobilizing and performing their masculinities. (Re)produced in markedly masculine language, activities, and professional values, diasporic commonality functions as a gender ideology that justifies existing gendered divisions of labor and serves men's purposes. Voluntarily or involuntarily, women generally refrain from participation in creating diasporic solidarity and seek out other resources to achieve their goals. Diasporic solidarity among migrant scientists fails to become a means of mitigating gender inequalities and challenging academic patriarchy from within. Instead, men seize control of the process of diasporic commonality's (re)production, mobilizing it as a site and a tool for establishing their dominance and reinforcing their power.

These findings have implications for several scholarly debates. First, they demonstrate that the ethnic divisions are not the only ones to consider when studying DKNs, as they intersect and interact with other important axes of social inequality (gender, academic rank, migrant position). Second, revealing the principal role of gender relations in the construction of diasporic belonging among RCS, the study also contributes to discussions of the gendered dimensions of ethnic collectivities, nationalisms, and citizenship (Anthias and Yuval-Davies 1989; Yuval-Davis 1993, 2010). In particular, my study underlines the crucial role of male-to-male ties, interactions among men, and masculinities in the (re)production of DKNs and of diasporic solidarity. Third, my findings make a vital contribution to debates on the origins and foundations of academic patriarchy. Like other studies, it shows that mobilization of masculinities and male homosocial bonding are central to the maintenance of gender inequalities in academia (Fisher and Kinsley 2014; Vettese 2019). My contribution to these debates is to show that these processes are also pervasive in ethnic minority and migrant groups, even though they rely on a different set of cultural norms to enable informal networking and connection-building among men. Fourth, disclosing the crucial role of mentor-proteges relationship in DKNs and their culturally specific and gender-specific character, my research contributes to the body of literature on intersectional analyses of mentorship and indicates the necessity of unpacking the practices and meanings of seemingly neutral forms of scientific cooperation.