Knowledge E
enriching | engaging | empowering

Conference

Conceptualization of Policy Adoption in Public Policy Areas

Nanik Lestari*, Yeremias T. Keban, Bevaola Kusumasari and Ely Susanto

Department of Public Policy and Management, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences Universitas Gadjah Mada
ORCID
Nanik Lestari: 0000-0002-3097-4872

Abstract. This article aimed to review how the policy adoption process occurs based on published case studies, and explain the conceptualization of policy adoption, adding a theoretical overview to the conceptual definition. This study was conducted through a literature review. The researchers found 37 relevant articles to map the development of policy adoption. Qualitative descriptive analysis was used. Terms mapping was carried out using VoSviewer. Policy adoption was defined by general conceptualization. The findings showed that policy adoption is a part of the decision to choose policy alternatives after the policy formulation process. Mostly, the policy adoption process is influenced by internal and external determinants, often called policy diffusion. These determinants are each associated with elements that influence a government's decision to adopt a policy.

Keywords: policy adoption, public policy, policy diffusion

Corresponding Author: Nanik
Lestari; email:
naniklestari100@mail.ugm.ac.id

OPEN ACCESS

1. Introduction

This paper aims to explore theoretically what exactly is policy adoption? Since when did this concept appear? This is important to be reviewed theoretically because First: the emergence of the phenomenon of change from all aspects ranging from public problems to policies that must be taken. Second, adoption needs to be understood so that in implementing policies it can be in accordance with the needs and context of the policy.

The policy adoption process in the policy cycle is less well known than the general policy cycle, such as the policy formulation process, policy formulation process, policy implementation process and policy evaluation process. The process of policy adoption is not only interpreted as a process of imitating or transferring policies from one place to another. There is a dimension of policy adoption that really needs to be understood, so that alternative policies are carried out according to the context, environment and needs.

Before going to other countries, the study of policy adoption began to be reviewed from the practice of policy making among states in America. The process of policy adoption is often influenced by the behavior of decision makers outside the country, but that diffusion pressure alone is not sufficient for policy adoption. Policy adoption basically occurs when the influence of neighbors combined with favorable economic and political conditions make the country's policies are made. In general, political scientists seem to have extrapolated from the literature on policy adoption that cases of non-adoption in regions where diffusion of the opposite is complete or almost complete occur in the absence of favorable conditions within states. Study using Event Historical Analysis (EHA) shows that the adoption behavior of border countries has a stronger effect on the likelihood of policy adoption when a country's internal characteristics are favorable.[1]

In the two decades after EHA analysis of state lottery adoption, the study of state policy innovation adoption has grown. [1] As an explanation for the adoption of state policies, the research focuses mostly on internal causes and external diffusion. [2] Instead, two major schools of thought have emerged to explain why policies are adopted. According to the regional diffusion theory, state decision-makers seek policy "solutions" by borrowing ideas from adjacent states. [3] On the other hand, the internal determinant approach asserts that countries adopt policies only when their own political, economic, and social contexts are conducive.[4]

Policy adoption is explained on a case-by-case basis based on the literature review. The Walker research, published in 1969, marked the beginning of the study of policy acceptance in political science. After being explained in the practice of Lotery in America, [1] this study was reviewed in the realm of public policy and then continued to be reviewed in other policy adoption practices such as the lottery [1], taxes [5], abortion [6], school choices [6], and many others.

Therefore, this study aims to review how the policy adoption process occurs based on case studies that have been published in scientific articles, then the researcher tries to explain the conceptualization of policy adoption. This contributes to adding a theoretical overview to the conceptual definition of policy adoption.

2. Methods

The steps taken in answering research questions are literature studies. We do a search for articles on the website www.scopus.com. Researchers identify the keyword "policy adoption". Researchers filter articles with criteria for the type of final reading of English

articles, open access, with environmental science and social science subject areas. This is done by researchers to sort out the selected articles that really show the development of the study of policy adoption from the policy dimension in the social sciences and environmental sciences, so that researchers get a complete picture of the definition and development of the concept. With these keywords, 988 initially appeared from 1969 to 2021. After being sorted gradually year by year with titles and contents that were in sync with the study of policy adoption in the social sciences and environmental sciences, researchers found 34 interesting articles to map the development of policy adoption studies. The analysis used in this study is a qualitative descriptive analysis based on article review. The articles were then filtered based on the following criteria: open access, filter by subject area: environmental sciences, social sciences, decision sciences, multidisciplinary. Then, the articles would be mapped using the VoS Viewer application to see emerging discourses related to policy adoption.

TABLE 1: Summary of extant reviews in the policy adoption domain (1969-2021)

Author(s)	Scope of the review	Type of study
Walker (3)	the Diffusion of Innovations Among the American States	Reviews, case/practical research
Elliott (7)	The policy adoption-implementation spiral	theoretical Research, case/practical research
Canon and Baum (8)	Patterns of Adoption of Tort Law Innovations: An Application of Diffusion Theory to Judicial Doctrines	case/practical research
Berry & Berry (1)	State Lottery Adoptions as Policy Innovations: An Event History Analysis	case/practical research
Feiock & West (8)	Testing Competing Explanations for Policy Adoption: Municipal Solid Waste Recycling Programs	Surveys, case/practical research
Ingle, et al. (10)	The public policy process among southeastern states: Elaborating theories of regional adoption and hold-out behavior	Theoretical research,
Shipan & Volden (11)	The mechanisms of policy diffusion	Theoretical research,
Matisoff (12)	The adoption of state climate change policies and renewable portfolio standards: Regional diffusion and internal determinants	Reviews, case/practical research
Pitt (13)	The impact of internal and external adoption in climate change	Reviews, Meta analysis
Pitt (14)	Harnessing community energy: The keys to climate mitigation policy adoption in US municipalities	Reviews, case/practical research
Nowlin (15)	Theories of the Policy Process: State of the Research and Emerging Trends	Reviews, Theoretical Research
Yi & Feiock (2)	Considering supply and demand innovation. policy adoption needs to give greater consideration to the interrelationships among policy instruments.	Reviews, Event History Analysis (EHA). Case Analysis

TABLE 2: Table contniued.

Author(s)	Scope of the review	Type of study
Wang (16)	systematic analyses of local climate actions in the State of California by comparing cities' adoption	Reviews, Meta-Analysis
Fowler & Breen (17)	Policy Tool Interactions and the Adoption of State Renewable Portfolio Standards.	Reviews, theoretical Reseach
Massey, et al. (18)	Adopting Local Climate Policies: What cities done (case California)	Reviews, case/practical research
De Lancer Julnes & Holzer (19)	The impact of political factors on states adoption of renewable portfolio standards	Reviews, Theoretical research
Biesenbender, Tosun (20)	Climate policy innovation: The adoption and diffusion of adaptation policies across Europe	Reviews, case/practical research
da Conceição (21)	Promoting the utilization of performance measures in public organizations: An empirical study of factors affecting adoption and implementation.	Reviews, case/practical research
Bromley-Trujillo,et al. (22)	Domestic politics and the diffusion of international policy innovations: How does accommodation happen?	Reviews, case/practical research
Fay & Wenger (23)	Comparing policy choices in Brazil, Ecuador, and Peru	Reviews, case/meta-analysis
Marier (24)	The Spreading of Innovation: State Adoptions of Energy and Climate Change Policy.	Reviews, case/practical research
Carley, et al. (25)	The Political Structure of Policy Diffusion	Theoretical research
Boyer, et al. (26)	The politics of policy adoption: a saga on the difficulties of enacting policy diffusion or transfer across industrialized countries	Reviews, case/practical research
Mitchell (27)	Adoption, reinvention and amendment of renewable portfolio standards in the American states	Reviews, case/practical research
Fay (28)	Moves and Countermoves: Countermovement Diffusion of State Constitutional Amendments	Reviews, case/practical research
Kalafatis (29)	Comparing Climate Change Policy Adoption and Its Extension across Areas of City Policymaking	Reviews, case/practical research
Linkous, et al. (30)	Why do counties adopt transfer of development rights programs?	Reviews, Meta-Analysis
Le Mat, et al. (31)	Mechanisms of adopting and reformulating comprehensive sexuality education policy in Ethiopia	Reviews, case/practical research
Yeganeh, et al. (32)	Determinants of climate change policy adoption: A meta-analysis	Reviews, Meta Analysis
Ugyel & Daugbjerg (33)	Successful policy transfer and public sector reform in developing countries	Reviews, case/practical research
Burstein (34)	The Determinants of Public Policy: What Matters and How Much	Reviews, Event historical Analysis (EHA)
Haupt (35)	How Do Local Policy Makers Learn about Climate Change Adaptation Policies? Examining Study Visits as an Instrument of Policy Learning in the European Union	Study Visit, practical research
Kavanagh, et al. (36)	Drivers of health policy adoption: a political economy of HIV treatment policy	Reviews, case/practical research
Abel (37)	the drivers and barriers for the diffusion of the programme (funding scheme for local climate policy in 2008) among German municipalities	Event History Analysis and spatial panel autoregressive models-Case Analysis

Source: obtained from primary data

Figure 1: Meta Analysis of policy Adoption (1969-2021). (*Source: obtained from primary data*).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results of Meta Analyses

Researchers mapped 34 selected articles using VoSviewer. A total of 998 words with the keywords "policy adoption" in 1969-2021, then selected with the provisions of open access and sorted according to title and content relevance, 34 articles were selected. The process of mapping the terms on VoSviewer to see the correlation of terms and gap research in the research period: by selecting 3 terms of accuracy/relationship from 34 articles, from 851 terms, 60 terms were sorted. With a significance relevance of 60%, there are 36 terms. Researchers do sorting terms to remove concepts/terms of conjunctions/prepositions/nouns that are less meaningful. The omitted words such as paper, addition, work, set, area, influence, so that 23 topic items were found with 8 related cluster terms.

In the cluster that has not been studied much related to policy adoption is policy diffusion. Policy diffusion occurs when the government chooses alternative policies driven by several internal reasons such as the environment, geographical conditions, needs, motivation, organizational structure, policy entrepreneur/bureaucrat. Mapping related to external determinants such as competition between regions or related countries, coercion, imitation from outside, and also the learning process.

3.2. Discussion of policy Adoption

Policy adoption is defined in the public policy process that comes after policy formulation. Policy adoption becomes part of the decision to choose policy alternatives. The study of adoption was first mentioned in the study of Elliot (7), this study states that policy adoption and policy implementation are not two separate steps in the policy making process. In policy adoption, ask about how alternative policies are adopted or enacted? What requirements? have to meet? Who adopts the policy?.

When traced further, policy adoption was triggered by the study of Walker (3) that the presence of policy adoption came from the process of diffusion of innovation. The phenomenon of diffusion exists when there are countries that are very innovative and progressive in responding to problems and other countries then follow developments slowly. Walker (3) mentions that some countries have been identified as leaders and others as slow to adopt innovative policies. The presence of the adoption of a policy described in Feiock & West (9) is caused by:

1. Needs/Responsive Policy Making Model,

2. Innovation Diffusion Model

3. Political Institutional Model

4. Federalism Model

5. Economic Model

6. Interest Group Influence Model

7. Administrative Capacity

The question that frequently arises is why policies are adopted so frequently. According to Feiock's research (9), the government, particularly municipal governments, frequently adopts more policy duties. Local government scholars, like state-level studies, strive to find the elements that impact policy adoption. Key decision-makers' support, the new policy's compliance with the local policy climate, the need for the policy or program in question, and the process of competition and emulation, or "cue-taking," from other comparable jurisdictions are all relevant variables highlighted in local case studies (9).

Policy adoption is driven by two forces: the first is internal drivers of policy adoption, and the second is the policy diffusion process that drives policy acceptance. External

diffusion explanations emphasize on the influence of national or regional forces, particularly adoption by neighboring countries, whereas internal determinant explanations identify the political, social, and economic qualities of countries that inspire policy adoption. (3)(1) Much of the research based on this framework has made a substantive rather than theoretical contribution, as the core framework has been expanded to a wide range of state policy issues. This cross-sectional technique, however, is fraught with methodological issues. Some policies are temporarily omitted from the independent variable measurement year because they are adopted over a long period of time. The results can be troublesome depending on the temporal fluctuation of the explanatory features. (1)

Other main schools of policy diffusion study have concentrated on regional state policy dissemination, as governments are more likely to watch policy trials with their neighbors and apply ideas that have proven successful in their own countries.(1)(3) Bureaucrats attend regional conferences and communicate ideas with nearby countries significantly more frequently than they do with faraway states, according to this research program. The regional diffusion concept is shown by programs like the RGGI and the Western Climate Change Initiative.

Event history analysis, which uses panel data to combine both cross-sectional approaches of internal determinants and regional diffusion approaches, is a recent approach to testing regional and internal determinants of diffusion. (1)(6) This approach acknowledges the observations and previous contributions of various researchers who recognized that policy diffusion is a function of motivation to implement policy change, resources to enable policy change, and barriers to policy change (3). According to Pitt (13), the adoption of these plans and policies is primarily motivated by local demographic, economic, environmental, or social factors.

While Feiock (2) mentions that much attention has been paid to policy adoption at the state level in recent years (1), there is a paucity of similar research on policy adoption at the local level. Although there is a large body of government case study literature, there is a paucity of systematic comparative research examining competing explanations across cities. As in state-level studies of policy adoption, local government researchers seek to identify the factors that influence policy adoption. Among the important variables identified in the local case studies were supporting key decision makers; policy conformity with the local policy climate; the need for new or deep policies and program questions; competition and emulation processes, or "cuetaking," from other comparable jurisdictions (1).

While Feiock and West (2) mentions that much attention has been paid in recent years to policy adoption at the state level (1), there is a scarcity of similar research on policy adoption at the local level. Although there is a substantial body of literature on government case studies, there is a dearth of systematic comparative research examining competing explanations across cities. Local government researchers, like those who study policy adoption at the state level, seek to identify the factors that influence policy adoption. Supporting key decision makers; policy conformity with the local policy climate were among the important variables identified in the local case studies.

The study of innovation and policy diffusion has yielded important insights, but the simple framing of internal versus external determinants fails to capture the complexities of diffusion mechanisms that are required to fully understand policy innovation among state or local governments. Internal determinants and regional diffusion can both be used to describe the adoption of state policies in general. The internal determinant model seeks to explain the implementation of state policy as a function. A more specific explanatory theory must be developed in the internal determinant model to allow for the description of the factors that influence internal political mechanisms. Feiock and West (9) identify a series of explanations driving local policy adoption including:

1. Needs/Responses Policy Making Model: government responds to objective needs for a policy. For example, the threat posed by recent coastal storms could increase the drive for climate adaptation in some, if not all, communities.

2. Innovation Diffusion Model: focuses on the degree to which some governments become policy leaders regarding the adoption of innovative approaches to policy problems and the degree to which others are then followed and propagated those innovations.

3. Institutional Models: how electoral competition and governance structures influence understanding of policy choices.

4. Federalism model: examines the extent to which regions adopt and implement policy mandates from above (mostly from state governments).

5. Economic Model: argues that a more affluent society with greater fiscal resources will be a policy innovator.

6. Interest Group Influence Model: competing demands from constituents generate demands for policy change.

7. Administrative Capacity: focuses on expertise and personnel resources as drivers of innovation in adoption and implementation.

Interestingly, Walker (3) notes that, while scholars have acknowledged some important differences in factors influencing adoption, reinvention, and amendment, they have not yet investigated how the external importance of interstate influences themselves may differ across these decision stages. The ease with which policymakers can observe policy adoption in neighboring countries leads to the strong patterns of geographic diffusion that have been noted in the literature, but the importance of other, non-geographical types of "peer" states will grow as state policymakers consider how to adapt policies to meet the needs and preferences of their citizens. Finally, the theory developed here suggests that external influence should play a smaller role during the amendment process, when policymakers can rely on experience and experimentation within their own country for information.

Five mechanisms of external effects on national education policies: harmonization, dissemination, standardization, interdependence installation, and coercion. Scholars from various disciplines have been studying the spatial diffusion, or spatiotemporal properties associated with the diffusion of innovations, for decades. Infectious, hierarchical, and relocation diffusion are some of these characteristics. Each refers to a spatial model that depicts how innovation spreads across geographical boundaries (27). Expanding on this dynamic (5), contend that, depending on the issue at hand, policymaking can be influenced by internal or external determinants.

In other words, in some cases, internal drivers combined with a country's socioeconomic and political conditions can lead to the adoption of new policies, such as a decrease in tax revenues. In other countries, the adoption of new policies and programs may be influenced by factors unrelated to the country's structure or composition, such as neighboring countries raising tariffs. (18) We developed a list of individual but interrelated explanatory variables that are frequently mentioned in the innovation and policy adaptation literature as a means of explaining adaptation policy adoption and diffusion using Berry and Berry's research (5) internal/external framework. This is explained below:

3.3. Internal Determinants

For various types and areas of policy, the standard approach, which focuses on internal social and political determinants as well as diffusion factors, has been repeated.This

approach facilitates the development of simple explanations that can be tested empirically (1), but it overlooks the fact that policy decisions are made within the context of existing policies and programs (2).

3.3.1. Opportunity Structure

Domestic factors that interact with and moderate the effects of international learning mechanisms, including competition, coercion, and economic competition. The first refers to the organizational structure of political opportunity. It describes how institutions act as "filters" or conditioning factors for stimuli originating in international contexts. In the medium and long term, the electoral business cycle has been found to be an important determinant of the timing of policy decisions (see, for example, Franzese, (39)). Scientists refer to the allocation of costs and benefits of specific policy decisions, as well as their visibility, in this context (see, for example, Jordan et al., (40)).

Environmental regulations frequently result in dispersed benefits and concentrated costs because they typically target specific polluters (large incineration plants in this context). Decision-makers seeking re-election are expected to enact costly policies early in the legislative session and avoid such measures later in the session for re-election purposes (41). Furthermore, the political role of parties has received a lot of attention in the literature (20). Political parties are important when it comes to the priority of a particular policy issue or the direction of decision making, according to the literature.

3.3.2. Public Request

Two additional domestic factors are expected to influence policymakers' incentives to adopt and adapt policy innovations. These are changes in income and the degree to which certain types of pollution are regarded as problematic. These two factors together have an impact on the level of public demand for the adoption and accommodation of policy innovations. Concerning income effects, we rely on Magnani's argument that increases in income levels influence policy decisions by changing the median willingness of voters to pay for the environment. In other words, rising income levels have the potential to shift median voter preferences away from increased consumption of personal goods and toward environmental quality. In terms of the impact of environmental pollution, policy innovations and subsequent changes can be implemented in response to high levels of pollution. (42)(43)(44)

3.4. External Determinant

External determinant also called by policy diffuson. The observed neighbor-to-neighbor diffusion pattern may be due to similar internal environments among regional units (states) rather than regional emulation. (4) According to Matisoff (12), policy diffusion is tested as a function of motivation, resources, and policy change barriers. Environmental conditions and citizen demands are among the drivers of policy innovation. State finances and geographic resources, such as wind and solar potential, are examples of resources. The country's reliance on carbon-intensive industries such as coal and natural gas is one impediment. The findings show that internal factors, particularly citizen demands, outperform the effects of diffusion from neighboring countries in predicting state policy.

According to Brumley Trujilo et al (22), policy diffusion research has grown significantly since Berry and Berry's seminal work. (1) Scholars have discovered that a number of policies are distributed across states based on geographic proximity using event history analysis. (1). This process is said to be aided by policy learning. (6)(3) Policy success, political gain, and shared characteristics between states are all associated with learning.

Policy diffusion research examines how similar policy innovations are adopted across states in the United States or across countries in a comparative setting. Diffusion research has a long history in political science (3); however, diffusion as a method of understanding the policy process is largely credited to Berry and Berry (1)(5). One criticism leveled at policy diffusion is the lack of a clear causal mechanism describing how innovation moves across states and/or countries. (11) Several recent articles have proposed specific mechanisms that can lead to policy change.

Policy movements across governments are explained by the policy diffusion model. One criticism leveled at this model is the lack of a clear causal mechanism explaining diffusion and adoption. Several mechanisms are proposed in the papers presented here. (11) conducted empirical research on four diffusion mechanisms: policy learning, economic competition, imitation, and coercion. Gilardi (45) investigated learning as a diffusion mechanism and discovered that learning occurs but is mediated by ideology. These discoveries have far-reaching implications for how knowledge spreads through learning. Finally, two papers investigate the role of entrepreneur policy in the diffusion of policy. The first paper, which characterizes bureaucrats as policy entrepreneurs, discovers that bureaucratic mobility acts as a diffusion mechanism, while the second

paper discovers that policy entrepreneurs, as knowledge intermediaries, are critical for policy adoption on less visible issues.

The goal of regional diffusion models is to explain why a country's policy is adopted as a result of neighboring countries' policy success, which is observed and then replicated. However, Matisoff (12) discovered "strong support for the internal determinant model but no support for the internal determinant model" using an event history analysis approach. Walker's regional diffusion model proposes that jurisdictions with similar socioeconomic and political profiles tend to imitate and/or imitate one another, with the jurisdictions of certain leaders within these blocs acting as early adopters of certain laws and policies.

The process of policy copying is based on open lines of communication between policymakers in non-adoptive countries and those in adopted countries commensurate with policy adoption. In addition to emulation and learning, it has been demonstrated that politicians and public officials can face pressure from constituents, other states, or supranational authorities, effectively forcing them to implement new policies.(3)(5) Another motivator for policy adoption and diffusion is the notion that countries compete for the most innovative policies in order to gain some form of economic advantage. (11)(5) Essentially, policy adoption via policy diffusion is part of the internal political agenda. According to Dobbin et al. (46) and Biesenbender & Tosun (20), the policy diffusion mechanism exists as a result of learning, emulation, economic competition, and coercion.

Learning

As stated in the introduction, policy innovations are typically based on extensive scientific evidence and should thus represent the 'best option' taking into account the characteristics of the respective policy problem as well as the state of the technology available to address the issue. "Policy innovation spreads after the diffusion of shared (often technical) knowledge among elites about what is effective," according to this logic (46).

In other words, governments that implement certain policy innovations tend to believe that it is the best solution to the policy problem at hand.(45) Governments rely on solutions recommended by international organizations rather than embarking on an expensive search for appropriate solutions at the national level. In Bayesian terms, Gilardi (45) defines learning as "the process by which policymakers change" their beliefs about the impact of policies.

3.4.1. Emulation

The concept of social acceptance is linked to policy diffusion (46). Policy innovations can be socially acceptable in a variety of ways. The emulation process, which involves policymakers in one country mimicking the actions of policymakers in another country because they are peers or because they are considered a "high status country that is thought to know best." The motivation for emulation is a desire for social acceptance by demonstrating conformity to the behavior of other countries and 'not falling behind'. (43) Emulation's rationale is convincingly linked to policy innovations that involve a high degree of uncertainty in terms of short- or medium-term regulatory costs and long-term benefits. (5) Because determining which countries have 'high status' is methodologically difficult, it is compared with countries that share certain characteristics or are geographically close.

3.4.2. Coercion

Situations in which a country's policy options are restricted. Dobbin et al. (46) discuss coercion in terms of requirements, policy leadership, and hegemonic ideas. Our focus deviates from this rationale because we are more interested in how supranational integration in the EU affects policy adoption and accommodation. Supranational harmonization, in our opinion, can be compared to other coercive instruments because member states are required to follow EU rules. Member states' policy behavior is monitored, and instruments exist to punish noncompliance with EU rules. In this way, supranational laws can compel EU member states to implement and adapt policy innovations.

3.4.3. Economic competition

The logic underlying this mechanism is that trade and investment competition affects policymakers' incentives to adopt and then modify policy innovations, particularly if the innovations are expected to affect national industries' ability to compete in global markets (46). The degree of economic openness of a country and hopes that it can explain whether policy innovations are adopted or not and how they are accommodated. When making policy decisions, the degree of openness of the economy is appropriate for assessing which priority the government gives to competition issues. All else being equal, the more open an economy is, the less likely it is to adopt and further tighten NOx

emission standards. Economic competition, on the other hand, includes competition for inward investment. Economies that rely heavily on inward investment are less committed to enacting or upholding stringent environmental regulations. Indeed, policymakers may seek to attract industry by enacting relatively lax environmental regulations. (10)

This is consistent with Shipan and Volden's (11) description of four policy innovation mechanisms. Learning, economic competition, imitation, and coercion are examples of these mechanisms. They discovered that when similar policies are implemented in other countries and nearby cities, learning can occur. Second, they discover that economic competition makes cities less likely to implement anti-smoking policies, which are perceived to be costly if the city isn't already present. Third, it has been demonstrated that cities are more likely to adopt a policy if the nearest largest city has a similar policy. Finally, cities are less likely to implement anti-smoking policies if statewide anti-smoking policies are in place. Gilardi (45)suspects that bureaucrats' career mobility has an impact on the types of policies that are adopted throughout the city. Gilardi (45) discovered that agency heads who hire from within their organizations are less likely to initiate policy innovations, whereas those who hire from outside are more likely. Policy diffusion is also discussed in (2). Studies on innovation and policy diffusion have yielded important insights, but the simple dichotomy of internal versus external determinants fails to capture the complexities of diffusion mechanisms required to fully understand policy innovation among state or local governments.

Rather than relying on a single instrument, most policy arenas are characterized by multiple programs and instruments that can complement and positively influence the likelihood of adoption of other policy innovations, or require resource, personnel, and expertise shifts that reduce the likelihood of other policies. This conceptualization is consistent with(2) classic argument that innovation is negatively related to barriers to innovation and positively related to motivation to innovate and available resources to overcome barriers.

The study of innovation and policy diffusion has yielded important insights, but the simple framing of internal versus external determinants fails to capture the complexities of diffusion mechanisms that are required to fully understand policy innovation among state or local governments. instrument that influences the size of the renewable energy market. (2) Because existing tax policies and incentives can change the costs and benefits of implementing a new policy, path dependence limits options. (1)

Path dependence also cultivates the policy's special interests into protective and organized groups. This approach differs from internal determinants in that internal determinants are political, social, and economic factors that exist independently of

policy decisions, whereas policy interaction explanations combine dynamics between different policies with standard internal determinants and diffusion factors to explain policy adoption choices. Internal and external factors influence policy adoption.(18) Expanding on this dynamic, Berry and Berry (5) contend that, depending on the issue at hand, policymaking can be influenced by internal or external determinants. In other words, in some cases, internal drivers combined with a country's socioeconomic and political conditions can lead to the adoption of new policies, such as a decrease in tax revenues. In other countries, the adoption of new policies and programs may be influenced by external factors unrelated to the country's structure or composition, such as tariff increases by neighboring countries.

4. Conclusion

Policy adoption is part of the public policy process. This process is present in a series of policy formulations, especially decisions in the selection of policy alternatives. The study of policy adoption emerged from the study of Walker (3) and then developed in the discipline of public policy through the study of Berry & Berry (1). Basically, policy adoption is based on internal determinants and the process of policy diffusion. Internal determinants include politics, economy, environment. Meanwhile, policy diffusion begins with incentives such as learning, emulation, coersion, and economic competition.

References

[1] Berry FS, Berry WD. State lottery adoptions as policy innovations: An event history analysis. American Political Science Review. 1990;84(2):395–415. https://doi.org/10.2307/1963526

[2] Yi H, Feiock RC. Policy tool interactions and the adoption of state renewable portfolio standards. Review of Policy Research. 2012;29(2):193–206. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-1338.2012.00548.x

[3] Walker JL. The diffusion of innovations among the American states. Princeton Readings in American Politics. 1969;1967:212–240. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1mjqv11.16

[4] Gray V. Competition, emulation, and policy innovation. New Perspectives on American Politics. 1994; 54(3):650–666

[5] Berry F, Berry W. Theories of the policy process. 2nd ed. Sabatier P, editor. Boulder: Westview Press; 2007. Innovation and diffusion models in policy research

[6] Mooney CZ. Modeling regional effects on state policy diffusion. Political Research Quarterly. 2001;54(1):103–24.

[7] Elliott RH. The policy adoption-implementation spiral. International Journal of Public Administration. 1981;3(1):113–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900698108524398

[8] Canon BC, Baum L. Patterns of adoption of tort law innovations: An application of diffusion theory to judicial doctrines. American Political Science Review. 1981;75(4):975–987. https://doi.org/10.2307/1962297

[9] Feiock RC, West JP. Testing competing explanations for policy adoption: Municipal solid waste recycling programs. Political Research Quarterly. 1993;46(2):399–419. https://doi.org/10.1177/106591299304600211

[10] Ingle WK, Cohen-Vogel L, Hughes R. The public policy process among southeastern states: Elaborating theories of regional adoption and hold-out behavior. Policy Studies Journal. 2007;35(4):607–628. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2007.00239.x

[11] Shipan CR, Volden C. The mechanisms of policy diffusion. American Journal of Political Science. 2008;52(4):840–857. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2008.00346.x

[12] Matisoff DC. The adoption of state climate change policies and renewable portfolio standards: Regional diffusion or internal determinants? Review of Policy Research. 2008;25(6):527-546

[13] Pitt D. The impact of internal and external characteristics on the adoption of climate mitigation policies by us municipalities. Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy. 2010;28(5):851–871. https://doi.org/10.1068/c09175

[14] Pitt D. Harnessing community energy: The keys to climate mitigation policy adoption in US municipalities. Local Environment. 2010;15(8):717–729. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2010.509388

[15] Nowlin MC. Theories of the policy process: State of the research and emerging trends. Policy Studies Journal. 2011;39(suppl.1):41–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2010.00389_4.x

[16] Wang R. Adopting local climate policies: What have California cities done and why? Urban Affairs Review. 2013;49(4):593–613. https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087412469348

[17] Fowler L, Breen J. The impact of political factors on states' adoption of renewable portfolio standards. Electricity Journal. 2013;26(2):79–94.

[18] Massey E, Biesbroek R, Huitema D, Jordan A. Climate policy innovation: The adoption and diffusion of adaptation policies across Europe. Global Environmental Change. 2014;29:434–443. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.09.002

[19] De Lancer Julnes P, Holzer M. Promoting the utilization of performance measures in public organizations: An empirical study of factors affecting adoption and

implementation. Perform Meas Build Theory, Improv Pract Build Theory, Improv Pract. 2014;166–89

[20] Biesenbender S, Tosun J. Domestic politics and the diffusion of international policy innovations: How does accommodation happen?. Global Environmental Change. 2014;29:424–433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.001

[21] da Conceição RH, Börner J, Wunder S. Why were upscaled incentive programs for forest conservation adopted? Comparing policy choices in Brazil, Ecuador, and Peru. Ecosystem Services. 2015;16:243–252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2015.10.004

[22] Bromley-Trujillo R, Butler JS, Poe J, Davis W. The spreading of innovation: State adoptions of energy and climate change policy. Review of Policy Research. 2016;33(5):544–565. https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.12189

[23] Fay DL, Wenger JB. The political structure of policy diffusion. Policy Studies Journal. 2016;44(3):349–365. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12122

[24] Marier P. The politics of policy adoption: A saga on the difficulties of enacting policy diffusion or transfer across industrialized countries. Policy Sciences. 2017;50(3):427–448. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-016-9269-6

[25] Carley S, Nicholson-Crotty S, Miller CJ. Adoption, reinvention and amendment of renewable portfolio standards in the American states. Journal of Public Policy. 2017;37(4):431–458. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X15000379

[26] Boyer MA, Meinzer M, Bilich A. The climate adaptation imperative: Local choices targeting global problems?. Local Environment. 2017;22(1):67–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2016.1160372

[27] Mitchell JL. Does policy diffusion need space? Spatializing the dynamics of policy diffusion. Policy Studies Journal. 2018;46(2):424–451. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12226

[28] Fay DL. Moves and countermoves: Countermovement diffusion of state constitutional amendments. Policy Studies Journal. 2018;46(2):354–377. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12214

[29] Kalafatis SE. Comparing climate change policy adoption and its extension across areas of city policymaking. Policy Studies Journal. 2018;46(3):700–719. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12206

[30] Linkous E, Laurian L, Neely S. Why do counties adopt transfer of development rights programs? Journal of Environmental Planning and Management. 2019;62(13):2352–2374. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2018.1559044

[31] Le Mat MLJ, Altinyelken HK, Bos HMW, Volman MLL. Mechanisms of adopting and reformulating comprehensive sexuality education policy in Ethiopia. Journal of Education Policy. 2020;35(5):692–712. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2019.1618918

[32] Yeganeh AJ, McCoy AP, Schenk T. Determinants of climate change policy adoption: A meta-analysis. Urban Climate.2020;31

[33] Ugyel L, Daugbjerg C. Successful policy transfer and public sector reform in developing countries. Policy and Politics. 2020;48(4):603–618. https://doi.org/10.1332/030557320X15786631116992

[34] Burstein P. The determinants of public policy: What matters and how much. Policy Studies Journal. 2020;48(1):87–110. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12243

[35] Haupt W. How do local policy makers learn about climate change adaptation policies? Examining study visits as an instrument of policy learning in the European Union. Urban Affairs Review. 2020;0(0):1-33. doi:10.1177/1078087420938443

[36] Kavanagh MM, Parish K, Gupta S. Drivers of health policy adoption: A political economy of HIV treatment policy. Policy and Politics. 2021;49(3):343–368. https://doi.org/10.1332/030557321X16108172938639

[37] Abel D. The diffusion of climate policies among German municipalities. Journal of Public Policy. 2021;41(1):111–136. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X19000199

[38] Adnane S. Economic Freedom and Women's Emancipation in the MENA Region. Economic Affairs. 2015;35(3):416–27.

[39] Franzese Jr RJ. Electoral and partisan cycles in economic policies and outcomes. Annual Review of Political Science. 2002;5:369–421.

[40] Jordan A, Bauer MW, Green-Pedersen C. Policy dismantling. Journal of European Public Polic. 2013;20(3):795-805.

[41] Cazals A, Sauquet A, Cazals A, Sauquet A. When does cooperation win and why ? E´tudes et Documents n?20. 2013;.

[42] Holzinger K, Knill C. Cross-national policy convergence: Causes, concepts and empirical findings. Journal of European Public Policy. 2005;12:764–774.

[43] Holzinger K, Knill C, Sommerer T. Environmental policy convergence: The impact of international harmonization, transnational communication, and regulatory competition. International Organization. 2008;62:553–587.

[44] Magnani E. The environmental kuznets curve: Development path or policy result? Environmental Modelling and Software. 2001;16:157–165.

[45] Gilardi F. Who learns from what in policy diffusion processes? American Journal of Political Science. 2010;6(1):1-17.

[46] Dobbin F, Simmons B, Garrett G. The global diffusion of public policies: Social construction, coercion, competition, or learning? Annual Review of Sociology. 2007;33:449–72.