

The Politics of Policy Diffusion

Fabrizio Gilardi*

Fabio Wasserfallen**

March 19, 2018

Abstract

We discuss the recent literature on policy diffusion and put forward a new articulation of its political dimensions. Policy diffusion means that policies in one unit (country, state, city, etc.) are influenced by the policies of other units. The literature conceptualises these interdependencies with four mechanisms: learning, competition, coercion, and emulation. This article identifies a standard model of diffusion based on these mechanisms in which policies spread because decision makers evaluate the policy implications of the actions of other units. We argue that the role of politics remains in the background in this model, and we show how going beyond a narrow focus on policy adoptions helps us to consider the politics of policy diffusion more explicitly.

*Professor of Public Policy, University of Zurich, Switzerland, URL: www.fabriziogilardi.org.

** Associate Professor of Political Economy, University of Salzburg, Austria & Guest Professor, University of Zurich, Switzerland, URL: www.fabiowasserfallen.ch.

1 Introduction

In an ever more interdependent world, diffusion has become a defining feature of politics. Countless diffusion phenomena shape the everyday lives of people all over the globe. Prominent examples are the diffusion of free-market policies (Simmons and Elkins, 2004; Meseguer, 2009), same-sex marriage (Kollman, 2007; Fernandez and Lutter, 2013; Mitchell and Petray, 2016), protests in the Arab spring (Weyland, 2012), and national conservative forces (Rooduijn, 2014; Van Hauwaert, 2018), to name just a few. A vast and growing scholarly literature sheds light on these processes with rich and detailed accounts of how policies and political developments diffuse. This paper summarises the conceptual state of the field, takes stock of the findings of the literature, and shows how, quite surprisingly, the political aspects of diffusion have not been in the foreground.

A cornerstone of the literature is the distinction between learning, competition, coercion, and emulation as the mechanisms driving policy diffusion (Braun and Gilardi, 2006; Shipan and Volden, 2008). These mechanisms summarise the main forces of diffusion as policymakers are influenced a) by the success or failure of policies elsewhere, b) by policies of other units with which they compete for resources, c) by the pressure from international organisations or powerful countries, and d) by the perceived appropriateness of policies. Based on these mechanisms, we identify a standard model of policy diffusion in which policies spread because decision makers evaluate the policy implications of the actions of other units. In this model, the political side of diffusion is not clearly articulated and remains in the background. We recognise this blind spot as a significant weakness and present conceptual arguments to study the political side of policy diffusion more systematically.

To that end, we discuss the politics of policy diffusion by highlighting several elements that are in contrast to the idea that diffusion prioritises the spread of policies through fact-based evaluations of policy consequences. First, the diffusion of policies is not restricted to successful policies because policymakers also pay attention to the political effects of policies. Second, policy learning is heavily mediated by politics, and decision makers filter the policy experiences of others through their ideological stances. Third, policies are also promoted at the issue definition stage, when the nature, causes, and solutions of problems are discussed. Finally, policymakers react to the decisions of others also based on assumptions that are empirically false. These arguments emphasise that diffusion is a political process. Using the policy cycle, we show how going beyond a narrow focus on policy adoptions helps us to consider political processes more explicitly.

2 Policy Diffusion: The Standard Model and Its Limits

At the core of the policy diffusion literature is the question of why and how policymakers react to decisions made elsewhere. This analytical focus was introduced by the work of Simmons, Dobbin and Garrett (2006), who set the stage for an abundant and still growing new wave of diffusion research. In their seminal contribution, Simmons, Dobbin and Garrett (2006, 787) outline the diversity of perspectives in the research on diffusion by stating that the theories “of diffusion encompass a wide array of assumptions about who the primary actors are, what motivates their behaviour, [...] and [what] their ultimate goals [are].” In essence, their core contribution is the elaboration of a common analytical definition of diffusion and the classification of diffusion into four mechanisms.

Following this work, it has become conventional to define diffusion as a process of interdependent policymaking and to distinguish between the diffusion mechanisms of learning, competition, coercion, and emulation (Braun and Gilardi, 2006; Shipan and Volden, 2008; Wasserfallen, 2017). The analytical focus on interdependent policymaking has connected scholarships with a shared research interest in diffusion that have been isolated from one another before. By emphasising the overlap between the different strands of diffusion research across the social sciences and political science sub-fields, such as comparative politics, international relations, public policy, and federalism, this encompassing definition of diffusion has been very productive. We summarise in the following the four diffusion mechanism and show how most of the research on learning, competition, and coercion can be subsumed under a distinct standard model of diffusion that leaves politics in the background. Emulation is often treated as a residual category; although it allows for a stronger focus on the political dimension of diffusion, it does not fully articulate it.

The conventional reference to *learning* in diffusion research builds on the idea that policymakers decide based on the analysis of the consequences of policies that are enacted elsewhere. This perspective is particularly prominent in the study of federalism (Gray, 1973; Volden, 2006). Many scholars have emphasised the advantage of decentralisation as a polity structure that provides the opportunity for policy experiments and innovation. According to this account, policymakers systematically assess the policy experiences of other subnational units. As a result of policy innovation and careful evaluations, successful new policies gain acceptance and spread (Meseguer, 2006; Gilardi, Füglistler and Luyet, 2009).

In the case of the *competition* mechanism, policymakers enact policies to attract investment and taxable resources. The basic models of competition assume that people, businesses, and investors

consider several countries or subnational units as potential locations for their residence and activities. To attract these mobile resources, policymakers anticipate or react to policy changes of their competitors. Competition research has analysed the conditionality of international and subnational tax competition by showing that several political, fiscal, and institutional factors constrain a race-to-the-bottom (Hays, 2003; Basinger and Hallerberg, 2004; Plümper, Troeger and Winner, 2009; Wasserfallen, 2014; Gilardi and Wasserfallen, 2016). Besides the work on tax and investment competition, diffusion scholars have also explored competition in regulatory and social standards, often studying the so-called California effect as an alternative explanation to the race-to-the-bottom hypothesis. The name of the California effect originates from Vogel's (1997) study on automobile emission standards in the U.S., where automobile producers enacted the (comparatively) high standards of California because they did not want to lose that sales market. Further research found similar race-to-the-top effects in the case of process standards and labor rights (Prakash and Potoski, 2006; Greenhill, Mosley and Prakash, 2009).

The diffusion mechanism of *coercion* stipulates that policies are introduced because powerful countries or international organisations enforce policy changes. In terms of the underlying mechanism, the classic example of coercion is conditionality. International organisations like the IMF or the World Bank shape policy change by setting requirements for aid and loans (Mosley, Harrigan and Toye, 1995; Vreeland, 2003). Or the EU asks for the fulfilment of certain criteria in its enlargement and accession procedures (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2004; Schimmelfennig, 2008). The key feature of coercion is that powerful countries or international organisations change the (economic) incentives for policy change in the countries they are targeting. In this sense, the mechanism of coercion is similar to the competition mechanism.

Based on the above discussion of learning, competition, and coercion, we can identify a dominant diffusion model that is prominent in the research on international relations, federalism, and political economy. This standard model of diffusion has a sharp and distinct theoretical core with three defining components, which we summarise in Table 1. First, the key actors of diffusion are governments or the legislature. Second, the model assumes that a government or legislature makes decisions based on information gathered from elsewhere. Third, the government or legislature is expected to process information systematically (that is, policymakers evaluate and analyse policy-relevant information from well-identified other reference countries, cities, or states). Most diffusion studies argue, explicitly in the theory or implicitly in the empirical modelling, that policymakers rationally learn from other units or

<i>Main actors</i>	Policymakers (i.e., the government or legislature)
<i>Assumption</i>	Decisions are the result of fact-based assessments
<i>Mechanisms</i>	Learning from the experience of other units Economic incentives from abroad (competition or coercion)

Table 1: *The standard model of diffusion.*

react to decisions from elsewhere because of economic incentives that are the result of competition or coercion.

The standard model of diffusion has a particular long tradition in research on international relations and federalism. The idea that economic incentives from abroad shape governments' decisions in the international system is as prominent in the international relations scholarship as the argument, in the federalism literature, that federal states provide policy laboratories and learn from the successes and failures of others (Walker, 1969; Gray, 1973; Volden, 2006; Schimmelfennig, 2008). In the last decades, the study of the standard model of diffusion has further grown with the formal analysis of learning, competition, and coercion (Volden, Ting and Carpenter, 2008; Devereux, Lockwood and Redoano, 2008). The standard model of diffusion provides a stylised and analytically precise account of how policymakers decide in interdependent policymaking. However, the standard model of diffusion is selective in that it does not easily accommodate emulation as an alternative logic of diffusion (Gilardi, 2013; Graham, Shipan and Volden, 2013).

Inspired by sociological research, the diffusion mechanism of *emulation* focuses on the social construction of appropriate policies (as a contrast to the objective properties of policies). Accordingly, norms and conventions are socially constructed, and policymakers conform to these norms with the adoption of appropriate policies (Tolbert and Zucker, 1983; March and Olsen, 1998; Finnemore and Sikkink, 2001). Prominent examples are the diffusion of educational and human rights policies (Meyer, Ramirez and Nuhoglu, 1992; Simmons, 2009; Greenhill, 2010). Also, emulation scholars focus on international agencies and organisations as venues where the norms fostering the appropriateness of policies are constructed and diffusion is promoted (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998; Bearce and Bondanella, 2007).

How this process of social construction unfolds empirically is difficult to trace. Following the argument that networks, powerful countries, and widespread adoption drive diffusion, scholars use, as

empirical measures for diffusion, the number of adopting countries, shared membership in international organisations, and the adoption by leading countries, which in many cases is not an empirical strategy that clearly distinguishes emulation from learning or coercion (Maggetti and Gilardi, 2016). Overall, the theoretical perspectives and empirical approaches are very diverse in the research on emulation. As a common denominator, the literature on emulation bundles a large number of diffusion studies that explicitly deviate from the standard model of diffusion. Therefore, emulation serves as a residual diffusion mechanism, encompassing all the research that does not subscribe to the standard diffusion model of rational and fact-based assessments of policy consequences.

The scholarly work on emulation provides an important corrective to the standard model, but, at the same time, the studies grouped under the umbrella of emulation lack a distinct theoretical grounding in political science (not unsurprisingly, given that emulation has its origins in sociology). Consequently, although emulation emphasises that diffusion is very often not the rational search for the best policy alternatives, it is not focused on the political side of diffusion. The next section discusses how we can put the politics of policy diffusion front and center in the diffusion literature.

3 The Politics of Policy Diffusion

3.1 Political Learning

Policy learning is often understood (and sometimes criticised) as technocratic, implying the smooth diffusion of best practices defined by experts, disconnected from politics. This perspective is partial. The concept of learning is much more complex and multifaceted (Dunlop and Radaelli, 2013; Dunlop, Radaelli and Trein, 2018). For our purposes, we focus on the idea that policy learning is heavily mediated by politics. Policymakers can be significantly biased against policies countering their ideologies and unwilling to learn from them, and they take more cues from their co-partisans than from governments controlled by opposing parties (Butler et al., 2017). Gilardi (2010) shows that policymakers learn from political (particularly electoral) consequences (not only from policy effects) and that they filter this information through ideological lenses (Volden, Ting and Carpenter, 2008). An example of this are conservative governments that may rely on evidence that cuts in welfare spending have no negative electoral consequences, while ignoring information suggesting the opposite.

Moreover, it is entirely possible that bad policies spread. In fact, this is very common particularly because policymakers pay as much attention to the political effects of policies (do they please their

constituencies? Do they threaten their re-elections?) as they do to policy effects (do they help solve the problems they were designed to address?). If the former dominates, popular policies that do nothing to solve actual problems or that may even be counterproductive, can spread very widely as policymakers learn that a given idea is a good way to enhance their political profiles or support. Of course, what is good or bad is essentially contested. Therefore, it would be a mistake to see policy learning either as a technocratic tool or an unambiguous benefit of experimentation at the local level.

3.2 Diffusion as Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

Some findings of the literature on investment and tax competition also illustrate that policymakers do not gather and process information on policy consequences systematically. They often make political decisions based on the false assumptions that the location decisions of individuals and businesses are sensitive to tax changes. Some empirical evidence suggests that we find competition also when there is little, if any, tax-induced mobility. For example, several analyses report abundant evidence of international tax competition for foreign direct investment, whereas Jensen (2012) finds no evidence that investment decisions are correlated with corporate tax rate changes. Similarly, in Switzerland, almost all cantons have abandoned bequest taxation since the 1980s. By far the number one argument that proponents of these reforms put forward in the parliamentary debates was cantonal competition, although the location decisions of elderly high-income residents are not responsive to bequest taxation, as Brühlhart and Parchet (2014) show. They conclude in their analysis that the pressures for tax reforms were alleged, not real. Tax competition without (or with very low) tax base mobility is real, yet self-induced. In this case, competition becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. As with political learning discussed above, we should expect that policymakers with strong ideological priors in favour of tax competition are less sensitive to evidence of low tax mobility, but may nevertheless strongly react to tax changes of other units.

3.3 Diffusion and Issue Definition

The most powerful way in which diffusion can shape policymaking is by changing the terms of the political debate, making some ideas taboo or, on the contrary, increasing their acceptance in the mainstream political discourse. The literature has focused mostly on the former—the diffusion of norms such as the abolition of the death penalty (McGann and Sandholtz, 2012; Kim, 2016)—but the logic cuts both ways and is highly relevant for understanding the political side of diffusion. In other

words, diffusion influences policymaking well before the adoption stage—at the issue definition stage, when the nature, causes, and solutions of problems are discussed from competing perspectives. The early stages of the policy cycle, those in which a given definition of the problem gains the upper hand, can be affected by diffusion with profound consequences. There is very little research on this aspect of diffusion, with a few exceptions. Boushey (2016) looks at issue definition as an explanatory variable, finding that policies spread faster when they are framed in ways that are consistent with stereotypes—in the specific case, regarding who is deserving of policy benefits. Gilardi, Shipan and Wüest (2017) study issue definition as a dependent variable and show that the way a policy is framed depends on how widespread it is within a given state’s diffusion network. One of the main findings is that normative frames (rationales for supporting or opposing a policy) are much less sensitive to diffusion than frames focused on practical aspects of a policy such as enforcement.

3.4 Decoupling and Legitimacy

Sociologists and qualitative studies of diffusion point to a question of considerable practical importance, namely, how policymakers implement diffusing policies (Beissinger, 2007; Chorev, 2012). According to the emulation mechanism discussed in Section 2, policies can spread simply because of their symbolic properties. A certain institution, like central bank independence, or a specific policy, like inflation-targeting, may be considered as appropriate and legitimate, and therefore diffuse (McNamara, 2002). However, several studies show that diffusing policies may have the same label, but they are implemented in localised versions (i.e., they are decoupled) (Meyer, Ramirez and Nuhoglu, 1992; Chorev, 2012; Wasserfallen, 2018). Meyer and Rowan (1977) have developed a seminal explanation for this, arguing that policymakers aim to conform with dominant international norms, and they take domestic constraints into account by implementing legislation that is tailored to their specific contexts. The research on decoupling overlaps to some extent with the work on emulation, but we would like to emphasise the (understudied) political dimension of this strategy. After all, policy adaptations to local contexts are attractive for political reasons. By following dominant norms, policymakers signal adherence to international best practice, while local adaptations allow them to either water down the effectiveness of a policy or even pursue goals that are not consistent with the original version of a policy. This way, policymakers can serve, at the same time, an international and domestic constituency.

4 Policy Diffusion Beyond Policy Adoption

The arguments in Section 3 suggest that the standard model of policy diffusion is too narrow and does not sufficiently take politics into account. To develop this point more clearly, we rely here on the policy cycle. The policy cycle is a classic heuristic model in policy analysis, arranging the various stages of a decision-making process—issue definition, agenda setting, policy adoption, implementation, and evaluation—in a circle and illustrating the idea that policymaking has no clear beginning or end. For our purposes, we highlight the two most relevant stages: issue definition and policy adoption. The standard model of diffusion is both focused exclusively on the policy adoption stage and has a narrow understanding of it. The arguments in Section 3 go beyond the standard model in several ways.

First, policy adoption is not a mere technocratic act; it is political of course. Information is processed through ideological lenses. Decision makers are not only interested in what works, but also in what is popular. If policymakers observe that a certain policy is popular elsewhere, they are more likely to adopt it, regardless of the policy consequences. Therefore, policies also spread through political evaluations that are biased by ideological stances and focus on the political consequences of policy adoptions. Second, we should pay attention to the issue definition stage. The example and experience of others change the terms of the political debate by strengthening certain policy options, as the adoption of a policy by other units increases its acceptance and thus changes the political discourse. In addition, the decision to change a policy can be based on perceived pressure that dominates the issue definition, no matter whether the pressure is real or alleged. In that case, diffusion through competition is a self-fulfilling prophecy. Changing the terms of political debates and self-fulfilling prophecies can drive the political diffusion of policies in the issue definition, well before a policy reaches the adoption stage. Of course, the two stages interact and reinforce one another, which is a basic idea of the policy cycle. Politically motivated reasoning at the adoption stage will affect the way the issue is defined. Conversely, as the terms of the debate change, different kinds of policies will reach the adoption stage. Therefore, policies diffuse through a self-reinforcing political cycle.

These arguments are summarised in Table 2. The policy diffusion literature has been focused on explaining policy adoptions using technocratic arguments emphasising the relevance of policy consequences, in terms of either competition or learning in general. A focus on the political aspects of diffusion broadens the scope of the analysis in two ways. First, within the policy adoption stage, political factors such as the electoral consequences of policy adoption and the way ideology biases

	<i>Standard model</i>	<i>Political model</i>
<i>Issue definition</i>		Terms of discussion Self-fulfilling prophecies
<i>Policy adoption</i>	Policy consequences	Electoral consequences Ideological biases

Table 2: *Standard and political models of policy diffusion.*

the assessment of policy consequences can shape policy diffusion. Second, within the issue-definition stage—a blind spot of the standard model—the terms of the discussion are subject to diffusion themselves, can lead to self-fulfilling prophecies, and have a clear impact on policy adoptions and how policies diffuse.

The range of political diffusion processes is greater than in the technocratic model. The latter is dominated by professional technocrats guiding the decisions of policymakers. In political diffusion, all kinds of actors from professionals to politicians, journalists, and pundits seek to influence both the spin of policy evaluations as well as the issue definition with reports, lobbying, interventions in the political debates, campaigning, and the like. The whole process is less structured and more complex because it involves many actors and it spans over the whole policy cycle.

5 Conclusion

In this article, we discussed the recent policy diffusion literature and showed how research in this area has been overly focused on the idea that effective policies spread as policymakers evaluate policy outcomes in other units because either they learn from or they compete with them. While this is one of the main aspects of diffusion, it neglects its more political elements. First, the evaluation of policy consequences is filtered by ideology and electoral consequences matter as much as policy consequences. Second, diffusion can affect the terms of the political debate well before policies are actively considered. Third, perceptions regarding the state of the world can lead to self-fulfilling prophecies (e.g., competitive behaviour as a consequence of beliefs in the presence of competition). Fourth, decoupling can be used to serve different political constituencies on the domestic and international level. Using the policy cycle, we have shown that these arguments reveal a blind spot in the diffusion literature, namely, events occurring outside of the policy adoption stage, and especially those taking place during the issue

definition and implementation stages.

These arguments have a number of implications for ongoing and future research. First, our analysis points to a much broader set of (political) motivations of policymakers in how and why they react to external influences. Future research should seek to provide a more thorough theoretical analysis of these political mechanisms. As a first attempt in that direction, we identified several theoretical arguments, but we need more theoretical work to better understand the political dimension of diffusion. Second, we think that the next generation of diffusion studies should reorient their efforts away from a narrow focus on policy adoptions. The issue definition stage strikes us as particularly important to understanding key diffusion phenomena. Gilardi, Shipan and Wüest (2017) put forward a new approach to study the issue definition stage from a diffusion perspective. Also, the study of underlying assumptions of diffusion and of the ideological use of decisions from other countries are questions of agenda setting and issue definition (not the adoption itself). Not only governments, parliaments, and civil servants, but also parties, think tanks and other political actors are key in these processes (Böhmelt et al., 2016). Third, this proposed broader theoretical and empirical focus should come with greater diversity in research designs and methods, since standard approaches are not necessarily well adapted to studying the new questions outlined in this paper (Gilardi, 2016), not least because they often imply a focus on policy adoption that, as we have shown, prevents researchers from fully exploring the politics of policy diffusion.

Finally, the shift in research perspective that we propose has also a normative dimension. The broader point of political diffusion is that biased evaluations and altered political discourses can push any policy. Whether one criticises or welcomes the diffusion of a certain policy is less a question of how the process of diffusion unfolds, but rather depends on whether one is an advocate or opponent of the policy itself. Liberals support the spread of human and minority rights, while conservatives appreciate the diffusion of stricter immigration rules. In this context, a note of concern is warranted because the playing field of how policies spread has changed substantially in the age of “post-truth” politics. A case in point is the denial of global warming. The evaluations and issue definitions of a whole set of policies change fundamentally when the argument becomes (more) acceptable that the climate is not changing (or that it is changing, but not because of human activity). Whereas the diffusion of a norm or a policy is, as such, not inherently good or bad, it is certainly a problem when the political drivers of diffusion systematically undermine the reliance on facts in policymaking.

References

- Basinger, Scott J. and Mark Hallerberg. 2004. "Remodeling the Competition for Capital: How Domestic Politics Erases the Race to the Bottom." *American Political Science Review* 92(2):261–276.
- Bearce, David H. and Stacy Bondanella. 2007. "Intergovernmental Organizations, Socialization, and Member-State Interest Convergence." *International Organization* 61:703–733.
- Beissinger, Mark R. 2007. "Structure and Example in Modular Political Phenomena: The Diffusion of Bulldozer/Rose/Orange/Tulip Revolutions." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(2):259–276.
- Böhmelt, Tobias, Lawrence Ezrow, Roni Lehrer and Hugh Ward. 2016. "Party Policy Diffusion." *American Political Science Review* 110(2):397–410.
- Boushey, Graeme. 2016. "Targeted for Diffusion? How the Use and Acceptance of Stereotypes Shape the Diffusion of Criminal Justice Policy Innovations in the American States." *American Political Science Review* 110(1):198–214.
- Braun, Dietmar and Fabrizio Gilardi. 2006. "Taking 'Galton's Problem' Seriously. Towards a Theory of Policy Diffusion." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 18(3):298–322.
- Brühlhart, Marius and Raphaël Parchet. 2014. "Alleged Tax Competition: The Mysterious Death of Inheritance Taxes in Switzerland." *Journal of Public Economics* 111:63–78.
- Butler, Daniel M., Craig Volden, Adam M. Dynes and Boris Shor. 2017. "Ideology, Learning, and Policy Diffusion: Experimental Evidence." *American Journal of Political Science* 61(1):37–49.
- Chorev, Nitsan. 2012. "Changing Global Norms through Reactive Diffusion: The Case of Intellectual Property Protection of AIDS Drugs." *American Sociological Review* 77(5):831–853.
- Devereux, Michael P., Ben Lockwood and Michela Redoano. 2008. "Do countries compete over corporate tax rates?" *Journal of Public Economics* 92:1210–1235.
- Dunlop, Claire A. and Claudio M. Radaelli. 2013. "Systematising policy learning: From monolith to dimensions." *Political studies* 61(3):599–619.
- Dunlop, Claire A., Claudio M. Radaelli and Philipp Trein. 2018. Introduction: The Family Tree of Policy Learning. In *Learning in Public Policy: Analysis, Modes and Outcomes*, ed. Claire A. Dunlop, Claudio M. Radaelli and Philipp Trein. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fernandez, J J and M Lutter. 2013. "Supranational cultural norms, domestic value orientations and the diffusion of same-sex union rights in Europe, 1988-2009." *International Sociology* 28(1):102–120.
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52(4):887–917.
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. 2001. "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4:391–416.
- Gilardi, Fabrizio. 2010. "Who learns from what in policy diffusion processes?" *American Journal of Political Science* 54(3):650–666.
- Gilardi, Fabrizio. 2013. Transnational Diffusion: Norms, Ideas, and Policies. In *Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons. London: SAGE Publications chapter 18, pp. 453–502.

- Gilardi, Fabrizio. 2016. "Four Ways We Can Improve Policy Diffusion Research." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 16(1):8–21.
- Gilardi, Fabrizio, Charles R. Shipan and Bruno Wüest. 2017. "Policy Diffusion: The Issue-Definition Stage." University of Zurich and University of Michigan.
- Gilardi, Fabrizio and Fabio Wasserfallen. 2016. "How Socialization Attenuates Tax Competition." *British Journal of Political Science* 46(1):45–65.
- Gilardi, Fabrizio, Katharina Füglistner and Stéphane Luyet. 2009. "Learning From Others: The Diffusion of Hospital Financing Reforms in OECD Countries." *Comparative Political Studies* 42(4):549–573.
- Graham, Erin R., Charles R. Shipan and Craig Volden. 2013. "The Diffusion of Policy Diffusion Research in Political Science." *British Journal of Political Science* 43(3):673–701.
- Gray, Virginia. 1973. "Innovation in the States: A Diffusion Study." *American Political Science Review* 67(4):1174–1185.
- Greenhill, Brian. 2010. "The Company You Keep: International Socialization and the Diffusion of Human Rights Norms." *International Studies Quarterly* 54:127–145.
- Greenhill, Brian, Layna Mosley and Aseem Prakash. 2009. "Trade-based Diffusion of Labor Rights: A Panel Study, 1986–2002." *American Political Science Review* 103(4):669–690.
- Hays, Jude C. 2003. "Globalization and Capital Taxation in Consensus and Majoritarian Democracies." *World Politics* 56(1):79–113.
- Jensen, Nathan M. 2012. "Fiscal Policy and the Firm: Do Low Corporate Tax Rates Attract Multinational Corporations?" *Comparative Political Studies* 45(8):1004–1026.
- Kim, Dongwook. 2016. "International non-governmental organizations and the abolition of the death penalty." *European Journal of International Relations* 22(3):596–621.
- Kollman, Kelly. 2007. "Same-Sex Unions: The Globalization of an Idea." *International Studies Quarterly* 51(2):329–357.
- Maggetti, Martino and Fabrizio Gilardi. 2016. "Problems (and solutions) in the measurement of policy diffusion mechanisms." *Journal of Public Policy* 36(1):87–107.
- March, James G and Johan P. Olsen. 1998. "The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders." *International Organization* 52(4):943–969.
- McGann, Anthony and Wayne Sandholtz. 2012. "Patterns of Death Penalty Abolition, 1960–2005: Domestic and International Factors." *International Studies Quarterly* 56(2):275–289.
- McNamara, Kathleen. 2002. "Rational Fictions: Central Bank Independence and the Social Logic of Delegation." *West European Politics* 25(1):47–76.
- Meseguer, Covadonga. 2006. "Rational Learning and Bounded Learning in the Diffusion of Policy Innovations." *Rationality and Society* 18(1):35–66.
- Meseguer, Covadonga. 2009. *Learning, Policy Making, and Market Reforms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83:340–363.

- Meyer, John W., Francisco O. Ramirez and Yasemin Nuhoglu. 1992. "World Expansion of Mass Education, 1870-1980." *Sociology of Education* 65(2):128-149.
- Mitchell, Joshua L and Elizabeth Petray. 2016. "The march toward marriage equality: Reexamining the diffusion of same-sex marriage among states." *Public Policy and Administration* 31(4):283-302.
- Mosley, Paul, Jane Harrigan and John Toye. 1995. *Aid and Power: The World Bank and Policy-Based Lending*. London: Routledge.
- Plümper, Thomas, Vera E. Troeger and Hannes Winner. 2009. "Why is There No Race to the Bottom in Capital Taxation?" *International Studies Quarterly* 53:761-786.
- Prakash, Aseem and Matthew Potoski. 2006. "Racing to the Bottom? Trade, Environmental Governance, and ISO 14001." *American Journal of Political Science* 50(2):350-364.
- Rooduijn, Matthijs. 2014. "The mesmerising message: The diffusion of populism in public debates in Western European media." *Political Studies* 62(4):726-744.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2008. "EU political accession conditionality after the 2004 enlargement: consistency and effectiveness." *Journal of European Public Policy* 15(6):916-937.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank and Ulrich Sedelmeier. 2004. "Governance by conditionality: EU rule transfer to the candidate countries of Central and Eastern Europe." *Journal of European Public Policy* 11(4):661-679.
- Shipan, Charles R. and Craig Volden. 2008. "The Mechanisms of Policy Diffusion." *American Journal of Political Science* 52(4):840-857.
- Simmons, Beth A. 2009. *Mobilizing for Human Rights*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Simmons, Beth A., Frank Dobbin and Geoffrey Garrett. 2006. "Introduction: The International Diffusion of Liberalism." *International Organization* 60:781-810.
- Simmons, Beth A. and Zachary Elkins. 2004. "The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy." *American Political Science Review* 98(1):171-189.
- Tolbert, Pamela S. and Lynne G. Zucker. 1983. "Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform, 1880-1935." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28:22-39.
- Van Hauwaert, Steven M. 2018. "On far right parties, master frames and trans-national diffusion: understanding far right party development in Western Europe." *Comparative European Politics* online first:1-23.
- Vogel, David. 1997. "Trading up and governing across: transnational governance and environmental protection." *Journal of European Public Policy* 4(4):556-571.
- Volden, Craig. 2006. "States as Policy Laboratories: Emulating Success in the Children's Helath Insurance Program." *American Journal of Political Science* 50(2):294-312.
- Volden, Craig, Micheal M. Ting and Daniel P. Carpenter. 2008. "A Formal Model of Learning and Policy Diffusion." *American Journal of Political Science* 102(3):319-332.
- Vreeland, James R. 2003. *The IMF and Economic Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Walker, Jack L. 1969. "The Diffusion of Innovations among the American States." *American Political Science Review* 63(3):880–899.
- Wasserfallen, Fabio. 2014. "Contextual Variation in Interdependent Policy Making: The Case of Tax Competition." *European Journal of Political Research* 53(4):822–839.
- Wasserfallen, Fabio. 2017. Policy Diffusion and European Public Policy Research. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wasserfallen, Fabio. 2018. "The Global Diffusion of Inflation-Targeting." University of Salzburg and University of Zurich.
- Weyland, Kurt. 2012. "The Arab Spring: Why the Surprising Similarities with the Revolutionary Wave of 1848?" *Perspectives on Politics* 10(4):917–934.