

## NOTES AND RELECTIONS

### ERANETISATION

**ZANE ŠIME**

[zane.sime@rsu.lv](mailto:zane.sime@rsu.lv)

She is a doctoral degree holder (Dr. Philos.) of the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (Norway). From December 2023 until March 2025, she was a Visting Research Fellow at the United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies (UNU-CRIS). Dr. Šime prepared this article during her UNU-CRIS fellowship. Currently, she is an Earth System Governance Fellow and Expert at Rīga Stradiņš University. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4690-3243> , Scopus ID: 57220066789, Web of Science Researcher ID: JAN-4789-2023

'Eranetisation' is the latest term to join the overall academic and policy-making jargon of the European Studies. The term refers to the modalities of the socialisation and acculturation environment faced by various experts who are interested in the cutting-edge, context-specific, and societal challenge-driven advanced research and innovation solutions hosted by the European Research Area framework field. This supranational governance construct has developed its unique milieu with its own Bourdieusian field dynamics, performances grounded in this distinct post-Westphalian habitus, and understandings of its sui generis doxa. To turn towards the European Research Area in various capital pursuits means to expose oneself to the supranational steering structures and channel individual or institutional interests along the lines of the EU-defined issue framings and rules of engagement. However, 'Eranetisation' looks beyond these formalities. The study of 'Eranetisation' is meant to better grasp the full scope of the European Union's intellectual resonance domestically and internationally in the advanced research, science, innovation, and technological advancement domains. 'Eranetisation' explains the attractiveness of the European Research Area. Through an in-depth enquiry into the collegial rapport-building routines, 'Eranetisation' elaborates that the European Research Area is a globally renowned magnet of the leading scientific achievements.

### Introduction

The European integration is ornated with its ability and propensity to generate various effects and incentive structures across multiple domains. The expanding reservoir of terms is fuelled by the perpetual inventiveness of policymakers and the advanced research sector. The 'Brussels Effect,' coined by Anu Bradford, is among some of the most widely debated and studied recent inventions (Eustace, 2024). 'European Dream' retains its appeal as a reference point for an ideal work setting and geopolitical belonging to an integrated space where quality goods, talent, and information circulate freely and securely (Prainsack & Toom, 2013, p. 78). 'Eurocracy' refers to the understanding of European Union (EU) institutions as a united social space with its unique interactive dynamics and quests for an influential position (Gaïti & Georgakakis, 2024, p. 454).



'Brusselisation' retains its enduring saliency. The term facilitates the analytical enquiry into the particularities of the socialisation milieu experienced by officials working or seconded to Brussels (Maurer & Wright, 2021, pp. 858, 861). 'Brusselisation' has a special role because it has served as an inspiration to coin a new term, 'Eranetisation.' The recently introduced European Research Area-related expression is a testimony to the ever-expanding EU capacity and the growing EU international standing. Each of these terms refers to the increasing ability of the EU to adopt and implement a joint stance internally and articulate its supranational interests internationally with an increasing capacity to shape the opinions and preferred action modes among a broad range of interlocutors.

In essence, 'Eranetisation' refers to the intellectual process of a comprehensive socialisation among beneficiaries of the EU-funded initiatives tied to the strategic governance framework of the European Research Area. This ad-hoc or incremental exposure and immersion into the European Research Area results in a better awareness about the valued competencies among various intellectual circles hosted by the European Research Area. Consequently, more engagement in sharing one's expertise with peers fosters like-mindedness and solidifies shared cognisance. Consequently, many of these interactions lead to more consolidated estimations concerning the best or preferable options for joint action. Facilitated by various funding mechanisms that are shouldered by the EU Framework Programmes and routine complementarities brought by other EU funding programmes with some advanced research and innovation support component (for some examples, see Stone, 2024, pp. 193, 198), 'Eranetisation' enables the study of the governance steering mechanisms and specific incentive structures that the EU has put in place to direct the talent flows and collegial networks towards increasingly consolidated efforts in addressing the contemporary grand challenges. 'Eranetisation' offers a more in-depth explanation about the value of bilaterally or multilaterally tailored research-intensive solutions to issues and challenges faced across the globe. 'Eranetisation' is an analytical enabler to study how politically recognised, the most pressing societal issues are faced by adopting tailored supranational policy measures and programming tools to pool the required talent, expertise, and know-how towards resolving these urgent needs. This is accomplished within a single integrated and internationally considerably open intellectual framework field, the European Research Area.

### **Bourdieu-inspired practice theory**

The notion of 'Eranetisation' emerges from the contemporary Bourdieu-inspired practice theory scholarship (Author, 2023). The contemporary reading of fields, habitus, capital, doxa, and agents are essential elements for the study of ever-evolving relationality ties of peer circles in multiple contexts, including the advanced research one. The burgeoning Bourdieu-inspired scholarship is heterogenous. This diversity of current research output does not stem only from the vast choice of chosen research methods and selected empirical contexts (Sus, 2024, p. 437). The way scholars across multiple disciplines and in various parts of the world have reinterpreted and re-actualised Bourdieu's ideas has given way to a myriad of perspectives on the fields, habitus, capital, doxa, and agents. This multitude of new thinking on Bourdieu's intellectual inheritance does not pose a



major challenge for 'Eranetisation.' Instead, it is treated as a valuable repository of diverse and highly relevant considerations that many authors bring into the academic spotlight when addressing intellectual riddles guided by their practice theory reasoning.

To clarify the understanding adopted in the study of Eranetisation, the framework field constitutes several subfields that may change in number and structure over time. Subfields may merge, become obsolete, or multiply. These changes largely depend on two aspects. The first one is centrally or supranational policy-level defined steering measures. The second one is the choices made by agents themselves to seek and maintain temporary or lasting allegiances with certain peers. The second aspect brings into the analytical picture various understandings and configurations of advanced research cores and peripheries shaped by multiple EU funding instruments, including the socio-economic implications that this positionality is claimed to maintain in Europe (Péti et al., 2024, p. 17), its neighbourhood (Góra, 2023, pp. 188-189) and elsewhere in the world (Echeverría-King et al., 2024, p. 405).

Habitus refers to the usual intellectual and social environment where the routine actions of agents occur. Habitus is socially conditioned. The longer the time that the agent has spent in one specific field, the more familiarity with the habitus and its collective rhythms this agent has obtained. Habitus informs the agent about various conditionalities that shape the overall field and a specific subfield or certain subfields at a certain period of time. The temporality is stressed because habitus evolves along with the field. Habitus is not static.

Capital refers to various cherished resources that are at agents' disposal to be exchanged, traded, and converted during their relational encounters and interactions in the framework field. The routines associated with the capital transactions follow the overall predispositions conditioned by habitus and doxa. Thereby, habitus and doxa provide implicit intellectual and social guideposts for capital pursuits exerted by agents. They interact in the field and its subfields in their attempt to increase their centrality and nodality through peer recognition and acclaim.

Doxa is informative about the tacit and perceptive aspects that feed into the relational dynamics among individual researchers and between two or multiple research circles structured as an expert group or a consortium. Doxa provides individually held and collectively upheld understandings of what is self-evident, self-explanatory, and outright obvious. Doxa embodies a certain type of truth that is considered natural by agents and guides their routine practices and relationality to others (Vakalopoulos, 2023, p. 262). One particular doxa governs a framework field and its subfields. However, depending on the length of time spent by an agent within the field and its subfields and individual prior experiences, including their earlier habituses and upheld doxas, the understanding among agents of the governing doxa may vary. The way a doxa of the field and its subfields resonates with each agent may vary because of these unique experiential and socialisation layers they have obtained throughout their academic and professional careers and diverse encounters.

The savviest agents who have the most in-depth understanding of the doxa are the ones who might prove to be the most versatile in capital transactions. Having a clear understanding of the uncontested truths captured by the doxa contributes to the boldness and ambition of an agent to engage in high-value capital acquisition pursuits and



promotion of their own centrality within the field. Agent's doxic aptness offers a sense of firm rootedness in the field, a deeply held appraisal of habitus, certitude of one's prowess in sustaining a central role in the field, and the ability to engage in highly valued capital exchange, trading, and co-creation.

### **Supranational routines**

The dynamic evolution of the EU should be even better reflected in the progression of the European Studies scholarship. While state-centred studies (for example, Abrantes & Vaz-Pinto, 2024) and country comparisons are widespread in European Studies, many supranational and post-Westphalian aspects of the EU deserve to be placed more prominently on the research agenda. Eranetisation is among the intellectual means to accomplish this need for a more supranationally and post-Westphalian-oriented analytical gaze. It is one of the intellectual avenues to make supranationally steered dynamics more understandable and better known among diverse audiences. The full added value of research, public funding, and other types of EU-offered support deserves more scholarly enquiry. Those are distinct incentive and steering measures that should not be equated with the national ones.

The in-built supranational nature of these instruments and strategic frameworks requires a recalibrated intellectual predisposition and commitment to colleagues worldwide that takes as the core commitment the aspirations of the European project, not one EU Member State. The post-Westphalian socialisation processes surpass amicable and close ties among EU Member States. A study of post-Westphalian socialisation processes requires studying in greater depth how agents build rapport with other fellow Europeans when contributing to various initiatives of the EU. The importance of this analytical enquiry is founded on the claim that the EU captures the grandest *sui generis* geopolitical and geoeconomic initiative of the 21st century. This joint endeavour is structured according to specific EU rules, practical guidance, and accountability requirements. The intellectual productivity and multifaceted societal value are not attained simply through accurate execution of the practical guidance and satisfactory completion of the accountability requirements. The full intellectual magnitude of the EU-fostered encounters in various formats, such as the strategic governance frameworks of which the European Research Area is one example, is attained through dedicated service among agents who have obtained an in-depth understanding of the contemporary requirements and nature of the European project and the specificity of several EU instruments tied to their area of expertise. Most importantly, their intellectual predisposition and corresponding actions are guided by the commitment to the post-Westphalian ideals and values. In such a manner, their supranationally-minded engagement facilitates the projection of the EU norms, values, ideas, knowledge, and preferred course of future action in a well-concerted manner with other fellow Europeans towards their colleagues and peers across the world.

It is enduringly important to look beyond the quantitative country comparisons to get a more fine-grained understanding of other allegiances than individually cherished institutional, academic discipline, local, regional, and country-specific ones. Without grasping those interactive components that predefine and anchor agents' motivations to the European Research Area, it is not possible to realise the full value added delivered



by this EU strategic framework. The intellectual virtuosity exerted by the responsible EU institutions in designing and overseeing the governance modalities and funding tools supporting the European Research Area to strengthen the international projection of its post-Westphalian stance deserves to be addressed in more nuance in the future scholarly enquiry. Namely, the European Research Area is an admirable and multi-dimensional resource for putting many commitments presented through the EU external action into practice and tangible actions on the ground across the world.

### **Concluding remarks**

The importance of the continuous study of Eranetisation is linked to the unique administrative and socialisation space created for the strategic steering of advanced research and science to address the contemporary challenges via the European Research Area. The specificities of the governance set-up and the rules of engagement differ from those characterising other EU policies and administrative spaces, such as the meeting rooms and virtual convening spaces of the EU institutions where Brusselisation is fostered among a vast number of officials representing several administrative ranks and institutional affiliations.

The continuous strengthening of European unity with an international outreach component evolves in multiple formats and forums. The European Research Area is one of such essential strategic frameworks. Since its launch in 2000, the European Research Area has experienced a significant expansion and evolution. Thus, the study of Eranetisation should account for the fluid nature of this framework and subfield-specific developments at specific points in time. Only with such attention to the temporality of certain collegial relationality patterns is it possible to properly account for the nature of Eranetisation. At the centre of the Eranetisation scholarly enquiry is a social process of peer ties, expert-level interactions, and reproduction of certain stances and truths through shared practices of capital transactions. These reproduction patterns are not static. This attests to the enduring saliency of the enquiry into the characteristics of Eranetisation and the exploration of what draws most past, present, and aspiring beneficiaries of the EU funding and participation in the project consortiums.

The types of capital exchanged and co-created across the European Research Area are diverse. Scientifically excellent and collegially praised accomplishments are only one of them. The discussions revolving around the third mission of academia are the most emblematic examples of multiple forms of capital. These deliberations refer to the myriad of roles and functions shouldered by the contemporary academic and advanced research sectors. Moreover, the European Research Area is expected to offer solutions to various societal challenges. Thereby, the multitude of expertise brought to, exchanged, and co-created within the European Research Area requires acknowledging that there is no one standardised capital traded across the European Research Area. Those are multiple types of capital or capitals. These are transmutable capitals. They are constantly shuffled across the European Research Area framework field.

The Eranetisation studies will not lose their importance because a better and more nuanced understanding of what drives various entities towards the European Research Area framework field and what keeps the longstanding agents in it are crucial answers to the European project at large. Equally, those who are reluctant to participate after



their first involvements with this governance framework deserve equal attention to better grasp what stands in the way of certain talent and expertise to become 'Eranetised' and fed into the thematically relevant formats shouldered by the European Research Area.

Multiple instruments that support the European Research Area are aimed at offering feasible, pragmatic, and tailored solutions to some of the most pressing contemporary challenges faced in various parts of the globe. Thus, the study of Eranetisation is instrumental to understanding the incentive structure that pools in the EU supranational direction various expertise for it to be channelled in time-bound, action-oriented interventions across the world that cover multiple EU policy areas. The actions hosted by the strategic framework field of the European Research Area address issues across a broad scope of EU policies. Thereby, Eranetisation captures a structural incentive that is not restricted solely to the research and innovation domain. Eranetisation functions as a complementary technique to facilitate the attraction of niche-specific or world-class expertise to the EU-supported action that does not substitute the steering and convening measures adopted for other EU policies. Eranetisation occurs simultaneously to those other processes as a complementary socialisation element to the benefit of concerted action. Therefore, so-to-say, 'going ERA' is among one of the measures of how to contribute to supranationally defined milestones.

Importantly, other EU policies and their corresponding policy steering wheels might deliver incentive measures different from those fostered through 'Eranetisation'. Consequently, future research should attempt to demarcate the boundaries of 'Eranetisation' and distinguish this intellectual and collegiality-driven, result-oriented incentive measure from those projected through the implementation means chosen for other EU sectorial policies or issue-specific frameworks. Complementarities between 'going ERA' and being influenced by other EU supranational incentive structures should be properly accounted for. It is essential to avoid transforming 'Eranetisation' into an overstretched or empty signifier.

The wealth of EU financial resources allocated for diverse programming tools, such as the EU Framework Programmes and other schemes, ensures the required rich empirical sources for this research thread. There are plenty of avenues for a more in-depth enquiry into the multifaceted forms of 'Eranetisation' experienced across diverse professions and experts engaged in the daily collaborative routines of the European Research Area. Notably, scholars and academic staff are naturally placed in the limelight. Nevertheless, other EU beneficiaries, such as academic administrators and private and non-governmental establishments, should not be neglected because of their unique mandates and perspectives on the value and assets offered by the European Research Area.

Most importantly, the open-mindedness characterising the present-day European Studies towards cross- and multi-disciplinary research designs and collective scholarly engagements works in favour of a comprehensive and nuanced future study of 'Eranetisation'. Altogether, this is not a groundbreaking exploratory path for the European Studies. 'Eranetisation' is a noteworthy incremental sign of the overall expansion and evolution of European Studies occurring simultaneously with the development of the EU itself as an ever more capable, increasingly consolidated, and influential supranational entity with a solid international footprint and diverse ties to various parts of the world.



## References

- Abrantes, M., & Vaz-Pinto, R. (2024). 'Science diplomacy in the European Union: mapping the Portuguese case (1986–2021)'. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, 1610: pp. 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-04102-1>
- Echeverría-King, L.F., Vera, N., Ayala, R.E.P., Bonilla, K., & Labraña, J. (2024). 'Science Diplomacy in Semi-Peripheral Countries: Trajectories and Approaches from Argentina, Brazil, and India', in Singh, K., Chongtham, N., Trikha, R., Bhardwaj, M., & Kaur, S. (eds.) *Science, Technology and Innovation Ecosystem: An Indian and Global Perspective*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 383-413. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-2815-2\\_17](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-2815-2_17)
- Eustace, A. (2024). The European Union's forced labour regulation: Putting the 'brussels effect' to work for international labour standards. *European Labour Law Journal*, 15(1): pp. 144-165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20319525231221097>
- Gaïti, B., & Georgakakis, D. (2024). 'What future for EU foresight? A critical perspective on the institutionalisation of foresight'. *European Law Journal*, 30(3): pp. 443-463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eulj.12528>
- Góra, M. (2023). 'What role for the EU? Domestic contestation of the EU's global role(s) in its neighbourhood', in Egan, MP., Raube, K., Wouters, J., & Chaisse, J. (eds.) *Contestation and Polarization in Global Governance: European Responses*. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 179-195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4337/9781800887268>
- Maurer, H., & Wright, N. (2021). 'Still Governing in the Shadows? Member States and the Political and Security Committee in the Post-Lisbon EU Foreign Policy Architecture'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 59(4): pp. 856-872. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13134>
- Péti, M., Salamin, G., Nemes, Z., Pörzse, G., & Csicsmann, L. (2024). 'Asymmetric patterns in territorial cooperation between core and periphery: The participation of Central and Eastern Europe in transnational and interregional cooperation programmes'. *The Geographical Journal*, 190(4): pp. 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12574>
- Prainsack, B., & Toom, V. (2013). 'Performing the Union: The Prüm Decision and the European dream'. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, 44(1): pp. 71-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsc.2012.09.009>
- Author. (2023).
- Stone, D. (2024). 'Asia-Europe Engagements in Science, Innovation and Education Exchange: The Limits of Knowledge in Diplomacy'. *Janus.net, e-journal of international relations*, 15(2): pp. 185-201. <https://doi.org/10.26619/1647-7251.15.2.7>
- Sus, M. (2024). 'Dare scholars look to the future? Academia and strategic foresight for the European Union's foreign policy'. *European Law Journal*, 30(3): pp. 434-442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eulj.12523>
- Vakalopoulos, K. (2023). 'Shedding Some (More) Light in Bourdieu's Habitus and Doxa: A Socio-Phenomenological Approach'. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 53(2): pp. 255-270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12364>



**How to cite this note**

Šime, Zane (2026). Eranetisation. *Janus.net, e-journal of international relations*. VOL. 17, Nº. 1, May 2026, pp. 667-674. DOI <https://doi.org/10.26619/1647-7251.17.1.03>

