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boundaries. The know-how of other nations is increasingly conceived as essential and relevant for the economic competitiveness of nations and for the welfare of their citizens. Epistemic communities, international organizations, and policy entrepreneurs thus transfer this “know-how” to the domestic economic, political, and social settings that are often radically different from the original. The benefits, costs, and implications of these policy transfers are the subject of this special issue. Specialists in public policy, public administration, and public management have joined together to explore the role of policy transfers in the promotion of more reflective and efficient public policies across the world. In doing so they aim to advance our knowledge on the new conditions of management, administration, and policy in a global world.

What we are trying to capture in this volume is only partially new. Globalization of knowledge and international policy transfers were discussed in early political science literature. Take, for example, Ernest Barker’s classic study of state expansion in Europe between 1660 and 1930. Barker’s major attention was concentrated on the particular history of different countries but he was well aware of their interdependence and existence as a “social community”:

> When we consider the history of the Modern State… we cannot but recognize the debt which all States owe to one another. Each country has developed according to its own genius; and each has produced its own fruit. But each has produced some institution, or some method of public service, which has served as an example to others; and each, in turn, has borrowed from each. There has been a rivalry of methods, but it has not been unfriendly; one country has studied, adopted, or tried to improve the methods of another; and all have combined, however unconsciously, to promote the growth of a common Europe standard of administration and public service.[1]

So policy transfers are an old phenomenon; yet what makes our era unique is the downsizing of geographical distance in general and national borders in particular, hence the increase in the quantity and arguably the quality of these policy transfers. We are more exposed, and therefore arguably may learn more and might be able to go through the learning process with a somewhat better grip on the difficulties of innovating on others’ experience. The issues at stake are increasingly documented and reflected in the literature of the social sciences at large and of organizational studies, law, politics, sociology, social psychology, and economics in particular.[2,3] In all these disciplines the issues discussed in this special issue are subject to extensive scholarly debate. At one side stand proponents of globalization, who advocate cross-national policy learning (and convergence) and perceive it as a great promise for the advance of management techniques, administrative controls, and policy effectiveness. At the other side are globalization’s critics, who identify emulation, manipulation,
and coercion as the major forces behind the changes that are widely evident across countries and policy spheres.

This debate, then, touches first on the meaning and origins of policy learning, on the necessary and sufficient conditions that propel it, on the autonomy and motives of the agents that promote it, and on the institutional and other constraints on the implementation of imported ideas in different contexts. At a second level we face the question of the effects of transfer, and here we explore the suggestion that the dramatic expansion of policy transfers documented in this volume and in numerous others shapes a “new public policy.” Perhaps the clearest statement to that effect was made by Ginadomenico Majone, who suggested that far-reaching ideological, political, and economic changes begun in the late 1970s brought about “the transformations of the process and substance of policy making.”[4] We hope that this volume, which looks at public policy beyond the nation state (though not without it), will add new insights to future work that tries to characterize this new public policy.

We start this article by setting out the common conceptual grounds for a discussion of the nature of cross-national and cross-cultural interaction with the help of two paradigms: policy transfer and policy diffusion. We then move in the second part to a presentation of some of the major insights and issues that the authors of this special issue offer.

PUBLIC AND MANAGEMENT IN A GLOBAL WORLD: DIFFUSION AND POLICY TRANSFER

Our point of departure is the supposition that cross-cultural and cross-national policy transfers and diffusion are reshaping the way public policy is formulated, expressed, and implemented.While these processes are not new they seem to be on the increase to the extent that they remold the ways public policy is shaped, consolidated, and implemented. Social scientists often rely on two different paradigms to capture this process of change: the policy transfer and the policy diffusion paradigms (see Table 1). While the first is prevalent among political scientists and is methodologically oriented towards case analysis, the second is prevalent among sociologists and enjoys a rich tradition of quantitative research. We find both paradigms fruitful and to some extent complementary, and therefore we embark on a discussion that aims to clarify some of their strengths and weaknesses. Let us start with definitions. Policy transfers are concerned with “the process by which knowledge about how policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in one political setting (past or present) is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in another political setting.”[5]

Diffusion is commonly defined as “the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among members of social system. It is a special type of communication in that the messages are
concerned with new ideas."[6] What differentiates these definitions is mainly the sociological emphasis of the diffusion paradigm. All other differences, including the methodological orientation, are marginal by comparison and there is no reason to believe that these two research traditions can not be brought together. In fact, it might well be that in the future the major differences as to central issues such as their rationality and autonomy of actors will be within each of these paradigms rather than between them.

The paradigm of diffusion, especially formulations grounded in sociological institutionalism, has three advantages. First, sociology has an impressive
tradition of diffusion analysis at the national\(^7\) and international level,\(^8\) which does not have any equivalence in political science and the policy transfer literature.\(^\text{ii}\) Second, the emphasis on transfer among “members of social system” in the diffusion literature seems to allow us to look at the process outside the hierarchies of the top-down and bottom-up approaches to change. It figures clearly in the literature on policy networks\(^9,10\) and on governance,\(^11\) which emphasizes the fragmentation of political structures and the volatility of power. It connects naturally to the notions of epistemic communities,\(^12\) webs of influence,\(^13\) and transnational policy communities\(^14\) as “channels of policy transfer” across nations.

Finally, we see some value in the “contagious” aspect of the diffusion perspective, that is, in the willingness of scholars within this research tradition to look beyond the structural aspects of the process to its internal dynamics.\(^\text{iii}\) Contagious-focused research examines how prior adoption of a trait, policy, institution, or practice in a population alters the probability of adoption for any remaining non-adopters.\(^15\)\(^\text{325}\) Diffusion scholars often treat the process as organic and evoke the idea of contagion as major source of change. Causality is not external but internal to the population in question. Unlike structuralists, who look at “independent observations” and treat interdependency as a problem of control (the Galton problem), diffusion studies perceive the evidence of interdependence as a major theoretical focus of study. This distinction between structural and contagious causes has notable implications for the way we conceive causality in the social and political system. It may suggest that variations and similarities are explained not by structural factors such as the configuration of actors’ interests and relative power but by the solutions and models that are shaped by former events:

Hence, in Australia we have laws criminalizing rape not because of any titanic struggle between a women’s movement (or some other actor) which demanded rape laws and others who resisted them; rather, we acquired them without debate from British criminal law. Having occurred, it is now nearly impossible for any actors with any amount of political power to argue for a way of dealing with rape that disposes of the criminal-law model in favor of a radically different strategy.\(^16\)

While the “policy transfer” approach is open to the idea that “emulation” or “copying” might be a distinct and independent source of change there is no effort to look at it as a contagious, dynamic process of change. The policy transfer literature is essentially structuralist in its causal imagination. As against these two advantages of the diffusion perspective it is often criticized as being politically neutral or uninformed. As diffusion analysis often focuses on broad historical, spatial, and socio-economic causes for a pattern of policy adoption, it neglects the political dynamics involved.\(^17–19,\) pp. 4,8,76
Here the policy transfer literature that distinguishes between coercive and voluntary mechanisms of transfer seems to have the upper hand. Power in the “sociological-institutional” diffusion perspective is confined almost solely to the power of ideas, norms, and symbols. Yet these “ideational” forms of power are hardly coercive and interest-driven, and frequently are not the major focus of the diffusion analysts.

Policy analysis is to be enriched from both perspectives, and it is possible to demonstrate how these two approaches may inform each other. This is evident in the work of Diana Stone, who suggests that global policy networks make a major impact on the way policy is shaped on the global as well as national level. She distinguishes three models that combine the assertions about the power of ideas and knowledge with network approach: the epistemic community approach, the embedded knowledge networks framework, and the transnational discourse community approach. She then places her “knowledge actors” in a framework of analysis that combines the policy network approach and the policy transfer literature, and in doing so open a new frontier for policy analysts. The move to the global level raises repeatedly the question about the centrality of the state vis-à-vis international organizations, nongovernmental organizations, corporations, and cities in these networks of power. As will be discussed shortly, our contributors diverge on this point as do the two paradigms of diffusion and policy transfer. In general, policy transfer seems to reflect the dominance of the state in political science while the diffusion perspective reflects the notion that states are recipients of a normative order that is created outside them, and they are therefore secondary in importance to international norms.

One major issue in the policy transfer and diffusion literature touches on the degrees and types of rationality that are involved in the process of change. Some versions of the policy transfer literature, such as lesson-drawing and the social learning, seem to perceive the process of transfer as a learning process. In this literature the emphasis is on cognition and the redefinition of interests on the basis of new knowledge that affects the fundamental beliefs and ideas behind the policy. In some way related, though more demanding, are models of Bayesian learning. By contrast, sociological interpretations of the process of change emphasize a group’s norms rather than individual rationality. See, for example, Marta Finnemore’s argument about the notion of “state interests”:

State interests are defined in the context of internationally held norms and understandings about what is good and appropriate. That normative context also changes over time, and as internationally held norms and values change, they create coordinated shifts in state interests and behavior across the system… states’ redefinitions of interest are often not the result of external threats or demands by domestic groups. Rather they are shaped by internally shared norms and values that structure and give meaning to international political life.
This emphasis on the normative side of supposedly rational action suggests that emulation may be of some importance as a mechanism of policy change. It also necessitates a distinction between “learning” and “emulation” as major features of the process of policy transfer. The distinction between the two may be based on the scope of information involved in the decision making process. Policy learning is defined as the redefinition of one’s interest and behavior on the basis of newly acquired knowledge, after watching the actions of others and the outcomes of these actions. Policy emulation, by contrast, is the redefinition of one’s interest and behavior on the basis of newly acquired knowledge and after watching only the actions of others. We distinguish between the learners and the emulators by the extent to which adaptation to new behavior involves information not only about the actions of others but also about the consequences of those actions. The crucial difference is that the learner processes a greater amount of information than the emulator and is therefore less dependent and more autonomous.

Finally, the outcomes of policy transfers and diffusion are often presented through the expectation of convergence. Convergence theories postulate that growing international integration will have direct (e.g., a change in the domestic distribution of political power) and indirect (e.g., influence on government policy) implications for domestic policy that will lead to similar policies and institutions. This is usually contrasted with divergence theories that suggest that growing international integration will not deflect states from their historically rooted trajectories, so that not convergence, but constant and perhaps even increasing variations will be the result for policies and institutions. The expectation of convergence in diffusion theory reflects a scholarly bias that is not necessary implied and embedded in the theories of transfer and diffusion. Indeed, Gabriel Tarde, one of the founding fathers of sociology and author of the Laws of Imitation, describes the process of diffusion as one in which agents simultaneously converge on a fashion and distinguish themselves from others. The process of change may involve convergencies and divergencies at the same time. The bias inherent in some of the diffusion and policy transfer literature towards a sort of “convergence” might best balanced by a notion of change that takes both convergence and divergence as important dimensions.

**THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF PUBLIC POLICY AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT**

One of the most important debates in the social sciences in the last decade has focused on the “future of the nation-state.” Various scholars argue from different point of view that the power of the state is expected to decline and that new types of actors and political organization are gradually taking over responsibilities and policy capacities that were once the exclusive domain of
the nation state.\textsuperscript{[29,30]} A forceful argument to that effect was made recently by Braithwaite and Drahos,\textsuperscript{[31]} who argue that most states outside Europe and the United States “have become rule-takers rather than rule makers”:

The extent to which states have become rule-takers rather than rule-makers is greater than most citizens think, largely because when governments announce new regulatory laws they are somewhat embarrassed to disclose that the national legislature voted for those laws without having any say in shaping them … for years some of Australia’s air safety standards have been written by the Boeing Corporation in Seattle, or if not by that corporation, by the US Federal Aviation Administration in Washington. Australia’s ship safety laws have been written by the International Maritime Organization in London, its motor vehicle safety standards by Working Party 29 of the Economic Commission for Europe and its food standards by the Codex Alimentarius Commission in Rome. Many of Australia’s pharmaceuticals standards have been set by a joint collaboration of the Japanese, European and US industries and their regulators, called the International Conference on Harmonization. Its telecommunications standards have been substantially set in Geneva by the ITU. The Chair (and often the Vice-Chair) of most of the expert committees that effectively set those standards in Geneva are Americans.\textsuperscript{[32]}

David Dolowitz’s article on the state and the process of globalization takes issue with the arguments on the decline of the state, and suggests that the growth of policy transfers opens and not only constrains the policy options of the state. Dolowitz, one of the pioneers of the policy transfer literature\textsuperscript{[33–35]} suggests that there are at least three good reasons why we should take the state seriously when we examine the role of policy transfers in the context of globalization. First, it is clear that the nation state has continued to be an important, if not the predominant, entity in international governance. Second, few within the globalization debate acknowledge, let alone discuss, the importance of the state for the very development and survival of “globalization.”

Finally, few have discussed the processes inherent in globalization in light of the fact that any state can utilize these processes to strengthen its own position in relation to domestic and international governance. Globalization in this formulation is an opportunity to learn from other political systems. States can learn from each other to (a) enhance or reduce the international effects of globalization; (b) expand or reduce the impact of globalization on individual political systems; (c) use the rhetoric of globalization to justify actions based on ‘foreign’ actions and ideas; (d) utilize institutions such as the European Union (EU) to harness the forces of globalization to their advantage; and (e) use international governing bodies (e.g, the EU) to weaken the impact of globalization. Restricting policy transfer, Dolowitz suggests, is to restrict
globalization. To facilitate policy transfer is to facilitate globalization. What we should place on the research agenda are questions of how to govern transfer so as to maximize the social benefits. Embedded in Dolowitz’s analysis is the supposition that the policy process is governed, or at least can be governed, and that states, at least some of them, are the most important actors in this process.

A somewhat different perspective is offered by Robert K. Christensen, who focuses on international non-governmental organizations (INGOs). Although not sovereign entities, INGOs possess a vast potential to influence international, national, and local policy, and they have demonstrated that potential in many instances. The most recent decades have witnessed remarkable growth in the numbers of these organizations, with nearly one-sixth of today’s approximately 37,000 INGOs being formed in the 1990s. Possibly more significant than the expanding number of these organizations, he presents a datum that indicates that where nongovernmental organizations handled $1 billion in world development funds in 1970, by 1997 these organizations were handling more than $7 billion. The proliferation of these organizations, he suggests, raises the question of whether they are most appropriately placed in or outside the traditional worldview that recognizes nation-states as the primary and legitimate institutions of global policy making (the “Westphalia paradigm,” in his terminology). As an alternative to this dominant paradigm he suggests that of “global society” (or “transnational society” or “world community”). This emerging paradigm refers to “a society of State actors and non-State actors like NGOs, multinational corporations, and individuals on a global scale, which is characterized by a multitude of decentralized lawmaking processes in various sectors, independent of nation-states.”[36]

Christensen moves on to suggest some ways in which the two paradigms can be evaluated. While in his focus on INGOS he differs from Dolowitz, and while he contends that the “state’s policy-making ability is being redefined by non-sovereign entities,” he does not go as far as to dismiss the importance of state actors in policy transfer. What both he and Dolowitz share is a recognition that both actors are important, and even more notably that policy transfers by both state and non-state actors are important enough to become a major focus for students of social, political, and economic change.

Peter Humphreys’ article moves the discussion of the effects and nature of policy transfers from banking to telecommunications and broadcasting. While Dolowitz and Busch focus on states as actors, and while Christensen’s focus is on INGOs, Humphreys examines the European Union (EU) in this process of change. The supranational institutions of the EU have mediated this process of change, deploying policy transfer and learning mechanisms that range from coercive to voluntary. They do so in the attempt to achieve a harmonized European response to these pressures of globalization, technological change, and international regulatory competition, and in this way perhaps to increase the legitimacy of the EU as a political institution.
In Humphreys’ analytical framework the EU falls between the “global” and the “national” (that is, the member states) and can reinforce or moderate globalization pressures. Globalization induces regulatory competition where states have had to develop “competitive” policies on a whole range of fronts: tax regimes, employment and social legislation, regulatory policy in a host of economic sectors, and more. The purpose is to attract or retain investment, and thus to be able to compete in the global economy. A creative and dynamic process of policy learning is therefore necessary for success.

Europeanization does not cause policy transfer or regulatory competition; rather Humphreys regards EU action as an intervening variable, coordinating, synchronizing, and mediating a joint European response. This suggestion is then examined against the “social” and “domestic” characteristics of the broadcasting sector and against the “economic” and more “international” characteristics of telecommunications. He points out that in both sectors globalization pressures, technological change and regulatory competition have driven a process of a paradigmatic change of regulatory policy from state monopoly to a liberal, pro-competitive regulatory order.

Still, EU regulatory harmonization has advanced considerably farther in the “technocratic” sector of telecommunications than in the much more “politically sensitive” sector of broadcasting, where the promotion of socio-cultural goals has been a factor for continuing national divergence. This conclusion seems to draw some of the limits of the EU as a political institution, and of policy transfer in general. When policy transfers are perceived as problematic from the national point of view they are less likely to be adopted even if they represent a better model of regulation.

Jacint Jordana and David Levi-Faur’s article on the rise of the regulatory state in Latin America looks at the policy transfer of “one particular institution”: autonomous regulatory agencies in 19 Latin American countries and 12 different sectors between 1920 and 2003. The chapter, which is based on the authors’ unique database reveals the explosive growth of regulatory agencies across different sectors and nations in Latin America. From a paltry 43 agencies in 1979 (mostly in the financial sectors) the overall number tripled to 133 by the end of 2002. While in 1979 only 21 of the agencies were nominally autonomous, the total number of nominally autonomous agencies has multiplied almost sixfold to 119 agencies by the end of 2002. While this number represents only about 60% of the total potential adoptions in these countries and sectors, and while in only 53% of the potential cases is there nominal commitment to autonomy, this is still a sweeping success for the idea of governance through regulatory authorities. A particular institutional design of regulatory governance via autonomous agencies of the state that was confined for a long time to the United States (at the country level) and to central banking (at the sectoral level) is well on the way from “best practice” to a hegemonic institution grounded in a new convention on the best way to govern the economy. [37] In fact, not one sector studied here, and not one country in the region,
including Cuba, has remained untouched by the process. Yet countries and sectors vary in their reception of the reforms, and the paper uses these variations to shed some light on the process of globalization as a diffusion process.

One of the important contributions of Jordana and Levi-Faur's article is the emphasis on the multi-dimensional characteristics of the processes of policy transfer in general and policy learning in particular. Instead of the common design of examining the transfer across nations they distinguish sectoral from national patterns of diffusion. This distinction is further grounded in a distinction between the National Pattern Approach and the Policy Sector Approach for comparative analysis.\[38\] It is common practice in the study of politics in general and of diffusion processes in particular to treat the nation as the major or even the exclusive unit of analysis. The majority of these studies focus on decisions relating to a single sector (or issue) and are oblivious to the presence of significant sectoral variations.

Jordana and Levi-Faur emphasize sectoral variations in the creation of regulatory agencies and therefore facilitate a more refined account of the process of regulatory reform. They believe in the need for this approach as in an earlier study, after controlling for a battery of variables they found that sectoral diffusion was as strong as, or stronger than, country-level diffusion. Their article provides empirical support for the use of compound research designs in general and for combining the analysis of sectoral and national variations and similarities in particular.\[39\] Using a qualitative comparative approach in the current chapter, they were able to point to the increasing importance of national patterns of diffusion in the 1990s compared with 1920–1978. They could also indicate the importance of the sectoral dimension in the study of the origins of policy change and policy transfers.

Donley Studlar's article examines the extent of policy learning in tobacco control instruments. Before the mid-1980s only in a handful of countries was tobacco control policy the subject of government legislation and regulation, rather than voluntary agreements between the tobacco industry and the government, or sometimes only among tobacco companies themselves. This situation has changed dramatically in the past quarter century, especially in advanced industrial democracies. There has been an increase in political advocacy by anti-tobacco groups, including professional and voluntary health organizations. Governments have become more willing to take regulatory action to limit tobacco consumption, including taxation and litigation as well as education, sales, advertising measures, and restricting smoking areas. The specific policies, as well as their degree of enforcement, vary by country, as does the amount of anti-tobacco activity conducted by NGOs. But governmental tobacco control activities have become so pervasive that they are now the subject of international initiatives and agreements, including air travel treaties, European Union directives, World Bank reports, UN conferences, and, most recently, the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control of the World Health Organization.
Studlar’s article discusses patterns of similarity and difference in adoption and impact of tobacco control instruments over time, utilizing three theoretical orientations: convergence, emulation, and globalization, and applied to the adoption and impact of tobacco control policies since 1960 in 14 advanced industrial democracies.

There was a small flurry of activity in a few countries in the mid- to late 1960s, more activity in the 1970s, especially in European countries, and a marked increase since the mid-1980s across most countries. The last coincided with the rise of anti-tobacco groups and political concern about the effects of second-hand smoke. The findings attest to a great deal of convergence in the instruments used for tobacco control, especially since the mid-1980s, but less in outcomes. Nevertheless, even among advanced industrial countries, considerable differences remain in the instruments employed to try to reduce tobacco use. Heretofore the major agents of convergence were cross-border policy learning and emulation, including transmission of scientific information, epistemic communities, government-to-government contacts, and nongovernmental organizations. The availability of Internet and e-mail communication, as well as periodic meetings such as the World Conference on Tobacco or Health, held twelve times since 1967, and the international journal *Tobacco Control* have facilitated international communication of “Best Practices” on this issue. Increased activity by the EU and the advent of the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control by the World Health Organization in 2003 indicate that these globalized anti-tobacco forces may now be better able to harmonize policies and counter the influence of the still powerful transnational tobacco companies. In addition, these developments indicate the potential for even greater policy learning in tobacco control among these countries.

Dana Lee Baker’s article discusses the extent of convergence of children’s disability policy among the United States, Canada, and Mexico. The political landscape of this policy arena seems to have similar characteristics to those of other policies studied in this special issue, namely internationalization of policy activity and formalization and consolidation of new international norms. At the end of the 20th century thousands of international organizations focused on problems of disability. Their goals vary, with a marked divide between organizations of the disabled (which tend to be rights-based and constructivist in approach) and organizations for the disabled (which tend to be older organizations that are not generally led by individuals with disabilities). The most common goals of these organizations include the promotion of disability rights, civic education about disability, social networking for individuals with disabilities and their families, and the promotion and advocacy of disability services. This activity may well lead to the creation of global norms about what is disability and how governments should deal with it. One indication of this process is an expression of intent by 92 governments in 1994 to improve opportunities for children and youth with disabilities through inclusive education. This intention was formalized in the United Nations Salamanca Statement on the Education of All Disabled Children.
While the concept of disability has become relatively transcendent and universal, the person described as disabled varies greatly across national and social contexts. Still, it is possible to identify a “paradigm shift” in this regard, and with it new demands are placed on the social and political agenda of governments all over the world. The new paradigms tell governments how to deal with this constituency of disabilities as well, and at the same time inform the organizations for the disabled and of the disabled how to best define their interests, goals, and strategies. Baker examines the change and its limits through a study of three cases: Mexico and the United States, where the issue is dealt with at the federal level, and Canada, where it is under the authority of the provinces. In all three cases she identifies convergence of national perceptions as to what disability means and how this change in meaning reflects on policies on disabled children. At one level there are good reasons for optimism. Material prosperity and advanced technological capabilities have dramatically decreased the percentage of jobs that cannot be adapted to accommodate disability. At another level different degrees of prosperity and various measures of awareness of the problems of disabled children limit the pace of policy transfers.

Ian Bartle’s article on political participation and market citizenship explores the relationship between economic integration and the development of markets and pressures for political participation and citizenship with particular focus on the EU. Markets are extending their reach into more and more areas of the economy; globalization and regional integration are distinctive trends of our time. The market is also increasingly encroaching on government and public administration. At the same time, and apparently paradoxically, citizenship and participation, together with notions of transnational and global civil society, have become prominent political themes. Bartle’s paper draws on work which suggests that markets and civil society are complementary and mutually dependent, and that while the rise of the market may threaten some forms of participation, new possibilities of political participation have arisen.

From evidence primarily in the EU it is argued that spillover pressures exist from new markets that can create pressures for political participation and citizenship. In the EU, the limited idea of “market citizenship” has developed into something resembling political citizenship. In the emerging single European market, pressures for participation have led to the proposals in the EU’s White Paper on Governance for the increased participation of “civil society.” Similar, though much more inchoate, processes are evident in other world regions and in the systems of global governance. Comparison of different transnational arenas indicates that markets per se do not explain the forms of developing participation. Political and institutional contexts are necessary to understand the ways in which the pressures are manifested and citizenship and participation are realized.

The effectiveness of new forms of transnational political participation is, however, somewhat limited. In the most developed transnational arena, the
EU, proposals associated with the White Paper, such as incorporating stakeholders in co-regulation arrangements and extending the role of the Economic and Social Committee do not significantly enhance participation, though ideas such as better consultation offer more promise. In other much less institutionalized regions, participation is correspondingly more limited. The problems of participatory governance are, however, not limited to the transnational level, and as within nations, significant improvements may require an “authentic discourse” between citizens and the policy elite. This may exist within social subgroups, but transferring it to larger national polities entails great difficulty. If transferring the discourse to larger and highly institutionalized national polities is hard, transferring it to less institutionalized transnational arenas is a mammoth task.

All in all, the articles point to the increasing importance of policy transfer and diffusion within transitional policy communities in the shaping of national and the international policies. In doing so they contribute to a better understanding of the process of policy change and governance in a global polity by improving cross-cultural collaboration to maximize the benefits of knowledge and experience from other polities and sectors.\[^{[40]}\]

**NOTES**

i Cf. “In scholarship on institutional change, imitation has become nearly invisible, relegated to the status of curiosity mentioned in historical footnotes or superficial prescriptive asides. I believe that imitation should in fact be acknowledged as crucial to many cases of institutional change. Surely, the idea that the fortunes of societies have no influence on choices beyond their own borders is implausible.”\[^{[41]}\]

ii The pioneering work on diffusion research across the American states is an exception.\[^{[42,43]}\] It is only with the policy learning/policy transfer literature of the 1990s that the issue became again a major focus of research in the discipline.

iii This does not mean that all diffusion analysis pays attention to the contagious aspects of the process.

iv It might well be that we all wear jeans to work; but we will make an effort to distinguish ourselves from others either by the sort of jeans we use or by adding accessories to them. We want to be similar to others and at the same time to differ.
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