

The Politics of Policy Diffusion

Fabrizio Gilardi*

Fabio Wasserfallen**

September 14, 2018

Accepted for publication in the
European Journal of Political Research

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 diffusion literature conceptualises these interdependencies with four mechanisms: learning, competition, coercion, and emulation. This article identifies a model of diffusion that is dominant in the diffusion literature. According to this model 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.

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

**University of Salzburg, Austria, 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 other political phenomena diffuse. This article summarises the conceptual state of the field, takes stock of the findings of the literature, and shows how the political aspects of diffusion have not been in the foreground. In doing so, our purpose is to focus squarely on policy diffusion. We are not primarily interested in closely related, but clearly distinct (Knill, 2005; Benson and Jordan, 2011; Graham et al., 2013), concepts like policy transfer (Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996, 2000) or policy convergence (Bennett, 1991). Similarly, we set aside adjacent streams of research in sociology (Strang and Soule, 1998), economics (Banerjee, 1992), or network science (Valente, 1996). However, we do consider how insights from these related literatures can help to improve the study the political side of policy diffusion.

A cornerstone of the diffusion literature is the distinction between learning, competition, coercion, and emulation (Braun and Gilardi, 2006; Simmons et al., 2006; Shipan and Volden, 2008; Gilardi, 2012). These mechanisms summarise the main forces of diffusion as policymakers are influenced a) by the success or failure of policies elsewhere (learning), b) by policies of other units with which they compete for resources (competition), c) by the pressure from international organisations or powerful countries (coercion), and d) by the perceived appropriateness of policies (emulation). To highlight the core features of the policy diffusion literature, we identify a dominant model of policy diffusion and describe a stylised version according to which policies spread because decision makers evaluate the policy implications of the actions of other units. With the exception of emulation studies, the vast majority of policy diffusion research builds on the core idea of this model. In this literature, 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 this 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 their political effects. 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 shaped at the issue definition stage, where 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: A Stylised Model

At the core of the policy diffusion literature is the question of why and how policymakers react to decisions made elsewhere. In different incarnations, the basic idea underlying this question has been studied in many different literatures in the social sciences, each with its specific focus. Because our goal is to contribute specifically to the policy diffusion literature, we do not primarily look at related concepts like policy transfer (Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996, 2000) and policy convergence (Bennett, 1991). Policy transfer and policy convergence are closely related to, but conceptually distinct from policy diffusion (Knill, 2005, 765–768). They represent a distinct research focus (Benson and Jordan, 2011, 367) and, based on citation patterns, form separate literatures (Graham et al., 2013, 675–684). Moreover, the combination of policy diffusion and policy transfer is not easy and has seldom been attempted (Marsh and Sharman, 2009, 269), and is not the goal of this article. Although policy transfer is not directly within the scope of this article, we do consider how, along with related streams of research in other parts of the social sciences, it can contribute to improving the study of the political side of policy diffusion.

The study of policy diffusion has a long tradition in the context of American federalism (Walker, 1969; Berry and Berry, 1990) but was introduced to the comparative politics and international relations literature more recently (Simmons and Elkins, 2004; Simmons et al., 2006). In their seminal contribution, Simmons et al. (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 where the analytical focus is squarely on “external determinants” (Berry and Berry, 1990), while domestic factors (“internal determinants,” Berry and Berry 1990) are often treated as control variables. Furthermore, the convention is 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, 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 stylised 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 et al., 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 et al., 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 et al., 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 et al., 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 identify a dominant diffusion model that is prominent in the research on international relations, federalism, and political economy. We articulate a stylised version of this model to highlight the distinct theoretical core of the vast diffusion literature. Table 1 summarises the three defining core components of the model. 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 reference countries, cities, or states). Most diffusion studies argue, explicitly in the theory or implicitly in the empirical modelling, that policymakers either rationally learn from other units or react to decisions from elsewhere because of economic incentives that are the result of competition or coercion.

This stylised 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

<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: *A stylised model of policy diffusion.*

failures of others (Walker, 1969; Gray, 1973; Volden, 2006; Schimmelfennig, 2008). In the last decade, the dominant model of diffusion has been extended with the formal analysis of learning, competition, and coercion (Volden et al., 2008; Devereux et al., 2008).

We formulate, for the purpose of this article, a reduced version of the model to highlight the unifying perspective of a diverse literature. Our stylized formulation is not intended to be all-encompassing. For example, the work of Weyland (2009, 2012) on bounded learning makes an important contribution to the literature by integrating cognitive heuristics into the diffusion process that deviate from a fully rational account of learning. However, the model summarised by Table 1 illustrates the dominant approach of the vast diffusion literature, which is useful, we believe, for identifying what is not sufficiently addressed by the current scholarship, namely the political side of diffusion.

The stylised model is selective in that it does not easily accommodate emulation as an alternative logic of diffusion (Gilardi, 2012; Graham et al., 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 et al., 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 stylised model of diffusion. Therefore, emulation serves, to some extent, as a residual mechanism of diffusion, encompassing research that does not assume rational and fact-based assessments of policy consequences.

The scholarly work on emulation provides an important corrective to the dominant 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 explicitly 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 et al., 2018). For our purposes, we focus on the idea that policy learning is heavily mediated by politics, a notion that is explicit in “lesson-drawing” as defined by Rose (1991, 1993). Moreover, as Dolowitz and Marsh (1996, 346), argued, “[b]oth supporters and opponents of various policies use lessons selectively to gain advantage in the struggle to get their ideas accepted.” 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 et al., 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 examined the diffusion of norms such as the abolition of the death penalty ([McGann and Sandholtz, 2012](#); [Kim, 2016](#)), but more generally the logic 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, which [Dolowitz and Marsh \(1996, 357\)](#) identified as a blind spot of the policy transfer literature, too. In the policy diffusion literature, an exception is [Boushey \(2016\)](#), who 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. Moreover, [Gilardi et al. \(2018\)](#) 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, qualitative studies of diffusion, and research on lesson-drawing point to a question of considerable practical importance, namely, how policymakers implement diffusing policies ([Rose, 1991, 1993](#); [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 et al., 1992](#); [Rose, 1993](#); [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 dominant model of policy diffusion is too narrow and does not sufficiently take politics into account. Although most studies do consider political and institutional factors, they do so by including them as control variables or as factors mediating diffusion. To articulate more clearly what the dominant model fails to consider, 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 dominant 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 dominant model in several ways. In particular, they go beyond the dichotomy between “internal” and “external” determinants (Berry and Berry, 1990) and outline a more integrated framework to study the politics of policy diffusion.

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 how the issue is defined. Conversely, as the terms of the debate change, different kinds of policies will reach the adoption stage.

	<i>Dominant 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: *Dominant and political models of policy diffusion.*

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 the assessment of policy consequences can shape policy diffusion. Second, within the issue-definition stage—a blind spot of the dominant 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 and 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. These ideas resonate with those advanced in the policy transfer literature, which is less singularly focused on policy adoptions and identifies a much broader range of actors involved in the process (Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996, 2000). Importantly, these ideas are not adequately captured by the simple inclusion of “internal determinants” (that is, domestic factors) in the analysis.

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 stage. These aspects cannot be addressed simply by considering domestic factors, or “internal determinants” (Berry and Berry, 1990), which most studies already do. Instead, they require new approaches such as those that we have discussed in this article.

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 et al. (2018) 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 article (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

- Banerjee, A. V. (1992). A simple model of herd behavior. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107(3):797–817.
- Basinger, S. J. and Hallerberg, M. (2004). Remodeling the competition for capital: How domestic politics erases the race to the bottom. *American Political Science Review*, 92(2):261–276.
- Bearce, D. H. and Bondanella, S. (2007). Intergovernmental organizations, socialization, and member-state interest convergence. *International Organization*, 61:703–733.
- Beissinger, M. R. (2007). Structure and example in modular political phenomena: The diffusion of bulldozer/rose/orange/tulip revolutions. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(2):259–276.
- Bennett, C. J. (1991). Review article: What is policy convergence and what causes it? *British Journal of Political Science*, 21(2):215–233.
- Benson, D. and Jordan, A. (2011). What have we learned from policy transfer research? dolowitz and marsh revisited. *Political Studies Review*, 9(3):366–378.
- Berry, F. S. and Berry, W. D. (1990). State lottery adoptions as policy innovations: An event history analysis. *American Political Science Review*, 84(2):395–415.
- Böhmelt, T., Ezrow, L., Lehrer, R., and Ward, H. (2016). Party policy diffusion. *American Political Science Review*, 110(2):397–410.
- Boushey, G. (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, D. and Gilardi, F. (2006). Taking ‘galton’s problem’ seriously. towards a theory of policy diffusion. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 18(3):298–322.
- Brühlhart, M. and Parchet, R. (2014). Alleged tax competition: The mysterious death of inheritance taxes in switzerland. *Journal of Public Economics*, 111:63–78.

- Butler, D. M., Volden, C., Dynes, A. M., and Shor, B. (2017). Ideology, learning, and policy diffusion: Experimental evidence. *American Journal of Political Science*, 61(1):37–49.
- Chorev, N. (2012). Changing global norms through reactive diffusion: The case of intellectual property protection of aids drugs. *American Sociological Review*, 77(5):831–853.
- Devereux, M. P., Lockwood, B., and Redoano, M. (2008). Do countries compete over corporate tax rates? *Journal of Public Economics*, 92:1210–1235.
- Dolowitz, D. and Marsh, D. (1996). Who learns what from whom: a review of the policy transfer literature. *Political Studies*, 44(2):343–357.
- Dolowitz, D. P. and Marsh, D. (2000). Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making. *Governance*, 13(1):5–24.
- Dunlop, C. A. and Radaelli, C. M. (2013). Systematising policy learning: From monolith to dimensions. *Political studies*, 61(3):599–619.
- Dunlop, C. A., Radaelli, C. M., and Trein, P. (2018). Introduction: The family tree of policy learning. In Dunlop, C. A., Radaelli, C. M., and Trein, P., editors, *Learning in Public Policy: Analysis, Modes and Outcomes*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Fernandez, J. J. and Lutter, M. (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, M. and Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization*, 52(4):887–917.
- Finnemore, M. and Sikkink, K. (2001). Taking stock: The constructivist research program in international relations and comparative politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4:391–416.
- Gilardi, F. (2010). Who learns from what in policy diffusion processes? *American Journal of Political Science*, 54(3):650–666.
- Gilardi, F. (2012). Transnational diffusion: Norms, ideas, and policies. In Carlsnaes, W., Risse, T., and Simmons, B. A., editors, *Handbook of International Relations*, chapter 18, pages 453–502. SAGE Publications, London.
- Gilardi, F. (2016). Four ways we can improve policy diffusion research. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*, 16(1):8–21.
- Gilardi, F., Füglistler, K., and Luyet, S. (2009). Learning from others: The diffusion of hospital financing reforms in OECD countries. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(4):549–573.
- Gilardi, F., Shipan, C. R., and Wüest, B. (2018). Policy diffusion: The issue-definition stage. University of Zurich and University of Michigan.
- Gilardi, F. and Wasserfallen, F. (2016). How socialization attenuates tax competition. *British Journal of Political Science*, 46(1):45–65.
- Graham, E. R., Shipan, C. R., and Volden, C. (2013). The diffusion of policy diffusion research in political science. *British Journal of Political Science*, 43(3):673–701.
- Gray, V. (1973). Innovation in the states: A diffusion study. *American Political Science Review*, 67(4):1174–1185.

- Greenhill, B. (2010). The company you keep: International socialization and the diffusion of human rights norms. *International Studies Quarterly*, 54:127–145.
- Greenhill, B., Mosley, L., and Prakash, A. (2009). Trade-based diffusion of labor rights: A panel study, 1986–2002. *American Political Science Review*, 103(4):669–690.
- Hays, J. C. (2003). Globalization and capital taxation in consensus and majoritarian democracies. *World Politics*, 56(1):79–113.
- Jensen, N. M. (2012). Fiscal policy and the firm: Do low corporate tax rates attract multinational corporations? *Comparative Political Studies*, 45(8):1004–1026.
- Kim, D. (2016). International non-governmental organizations and the abolition of the death penalty. *European Journal of International Relations*, 22(3):596–621.
- Knill, C. (2005). Introduction: Cross-national policy convergence: Concepts, approaches and explanatory factors. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12(5):764–774.
- Kollman, K. (2007). Same-sex unions: The globalization of an idea. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51(2):329–357.
- Maggetti, M. and Gilardi, F. (2016). Problems (and solutions) in the measurement of policy diffusion mechanisms. *Journal of Public Policy*, 36(1):87–107.
- March, J. G. and Olsen, J. P. (1998). The institutional dynamics of international political orders. *International Organization*, 52(4):943–969.
- Marsh, D. and Sharman, J. (2009). Policy diffusion and policy transfer. *Policy Studies*, 30(3):269–288.
- McGann, A. and Sandholtz, W. (2012). Patterns of death penalty abolition, 1960–2005: Domestic and international factors. *International Studies Quarterly*, 56(2):275–289.
- McNamara, K. (2002). Rational fictions: Central bank independence and the social logic of delegation. *West European Politics*, 25(1):47–76.
- Meseguer, C. (2006). Rational learning and bounded learning in the diffusion of policy innovations. *Rationality and Society*, 18(1):35–66.
- Meseguer, C. (2009). *Learning, Policy Making, and Market Reforms*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Meyer, J. W., Ramirez, F. O., and Nuhoglu, Y. (1992). World expansion of mass education, 1870-1980. *Sociology of Education*, 65(2):128–149.
- Meyer, J. W. and Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83:340–363.
- Mitchell, J. L. and Petray, E. (2016). The march toward marriage equality: Reexamining the diffusion of same-sex marriage among states. *Public Policy and Administration*, 31(4):283–302.
- Mosley, P., Harrigan, J., and Toye, J. (1995). *Aid and Power: The World Bank and Policy-Based Lending*. Routledge, London.
- Plümper, T., Troeger, V. E., and Winner, H. (2009). Why is there no race to the bottom in capital taxation? *International Studies Quarterly*, 53:761–786.

- Prakash, A. and Potoski, M. (2006). Racing to the bottom? trade, environmental governance, and iso 14001. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(2):350–364.
- Rooduijn, M. (2014). The mesmerising message: The diffusion of populism in public debates in western european media. *Political Studies*, 62(4):726–744.
- Rose, R. (1991). What is lesson-drawing? *Journal of Public Policy*, 11(1):3–30.
- Rose, R. (1993). *Lesson-drawing in Public Policy*. Chatham House Publishers, Chatham, New Jersey.
- Schimmelfennig, F. (2008). Eu political accession conditionality after the 2004 enlargement: consistency and effectiveness. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15(6):916–937.
- Schimmelfennig, F. and Sedelmeier, U. (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, C. R. and Volden, C. (2008). The mechanisms of policy diffusion. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(4):840–857.
- Simmons, B. A. (2009). *Mobilizing for Human Rights*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Simmons, B. A., Dobbin, F., and Garrett, G. (2006). Introduction: The international diffusion of liberalism. *International Organization*, 60:781–810.
- Simmons, B. A. and Elkins, Z. (2004). The globalization of liberalization: Policy diffusion in the international political economy. *American Political Science Review*, 98(1):171–189.
- Strang, D. and Soule, S. A. (1998). Diffusion in organizations and social movements: From hybrid corn to poison pills. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24:265–290.
- Tolbert, P. S. and Zucker, L. G. (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.
- Valente, T. W. (1996). Social network thresholds in the diffusion of innovations. *Social Networks*, 18:69–89.
- Van Hauwaert, S. 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, D. (1997). Trading up and governing across: transnational governance and environmental protection. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4(4):556–571.
- Volden, C. (2006). States as policy laboratories: Emulating success in the children’s health insurance program. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(2):294–312.
- Volden, C., Ting, M. M., and Carpenter, D. P. (2008). A formal model of learning and policy diffusion. *American Journal of Political Science*, 102(3):319–332.
- Vreeland, J. R. (2003). *The IMF and Economic Development*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Walker, J. L. (1969). The diffusion of innovations among the american states. *American Political Science Review*, 63(3):880–899.

- Wasserfallen, F. (2014). Contextual variation in interdependent policy making: The case of tax competition. *European Journal of Political Research*, 53(4):822–839.
- Wasserfallen, F. (2017). Policy diffusion and european public policy research. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Wasserfallen, F. (2018). Global diffusion through policy flexibility. University of Salzburg and University of Zurich.
- Weyland, K. (2009). The diffusion of revolution: ‘1848’ in europe and latin america. *International Organization*, 63:391–423.
- Weyland, K. (2012). The Arab Spring: Why the Surprising Similarities with the Revolutionary Wave of 1848? *Perspectives on Politics*, 10(4):917–934.