Usable environmental knowledge from the perspective of decision-making: the logics of consequentiality, appropriateness, and meaningfulness

Dewulf, A., Klenk, N., Wyborn, C., & Lemos, M. C.

This is a "Post-Print" accepted manuscript, which has been Published in "Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability"

Please cite this publication as follows:

Dewulf, A., Klenk, N., Wyborn, C., & Lemos, M. C. (2020). Usable environmental knowledge from the perspective of decision-making: the logics of consequentiality, appropriateness, and meaningfulness. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 42, 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.10.003

You can download the published version at:

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.10.003

Usable environmental knowledge from the perspective of decision-making: the logics of consequentiality, appropriateness, and meaningfulness

Art Dewulf[a], Nicole Klenk[b], Carina Wyborn[c], Maria Carmen Lemos[d]

[a] Public Administration and Policy Group, Wageningen University and Research, Hollandseweg 1, 6706KN Wageningen, The Netherlands, art.dewulf@wur.nl (corresponding author)

[b] University of Toronto, Departments Physical and Environmental sciences and Political science, 1065 Military Road, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M1C1A4, nicole.klenk@utoronto.ca

[c] Luc Hoffmann Institute, IUCN Conservation Centre, Rue Mauverney 28, 1196 Gland, Switzerland; Department of Society and Conservation, University of Montana, 32 Campus Drive, Missoula MT, 59801, USA, cwyborn@wwfint.org

[d] School for Environment and Sustainability, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, 48103, USA, lemos@umich.edu

Abstract

Environmental knowledge is a critical input for public and private decision-making, yet often useful environmental knowledge appears to be unusable for decision-makers. To better understand how usable knowledge can be produced, we need to build on a better understanding of decision-making processes. We distinguish three different logics of decision-making and discuss their implications for knowledge use: (1) the logic of consequentiality, rooted in theories of rational choice, in which environmental knowledge is used because of its utilitarian value; (2) the logic of appropriateness, rooted in institutional theories, in which environmental knowledge is used because it fits existing rules and routines; and (3) the logic of meaningfulness, rooted in theories of sensemaking and interpretation, in which environmental knowledge is used because it makes sense to decision-makers. The theory and practice of environmental knowledge (co-)production can profit from considering these different logics of decision-making.

Keywords

environmental knowledge use; decision-making logics; usable knowledge; sensemaking

1. Introduction

In the quest for environmental knowledge that is not just potentially useful but actually usable [1,2] or actionable [3–5] for decision-makers, a range of different approaches have been developed by scholars and practitioners, including co-production [6–9], transdisciplinarity [10–12], and citizen science [13–15]. While these approaches are built on in-depth understanding of environmental knowledge making [16], they are not always based on a thorough understanding of environmental decision-making processes and contexts [17]. Moreover they tend to scope knowledge within a narrow pathway from production to use rather than the more disconnected and disperse landscape of knowledge, ideas and use that happens when producers and users of knowledge do not interact with each other. For example, in the multiple streams model of decision-making [18–20], problems, solutions and participants are disconnected and may only get together when at the right time a choice opportunity emerges for decision-makers. Indeed, scholars in organization science, management science, economics, policy science, public administration, and political science have studied individual, organizational and governmental decision-making for decades [21] but relatively little of this interdisciplinary field has influenced current scholarship on actionable knowledge.

In this review we argue that insights from this vast literature can critically inform both theories and the practice of actionable knowledge making. Public administration and policy scholars have distinguished two logics of decision-making [22–24]. The first one is the *logic of consequentiality*, according to which decisions are made based on the expected consequences of decision options in terms of a given set of preferences. For example, climate-savvy city planners may expect to be better prepared for the impact of climate change if they create and implement a climate adaptation plan [25]. The second one is the *logic of appropriateness*, according to which decisions are guided by institutionalized rules that prescribe what needs to be done by particular people in particular situations. For example, water managers in three US regions often underplay the role of climate information in their planning given their strong professional routines and tight regulatory context surrounding drinking water supply [26]. While these two logics are essential in understanding the use of environmental knowledge in decision making, we argue that there is a need for a third decision-making logic, namely the *logic of meaningfulness [27]*, which considers at its core, the ideas of sensemaking and interpretation. Decision-making here is guided by how decision-makers make sense and interpret the meaning of a decision problem, its context and the decision options. For example, in the Netherlands between 2007 and 2010, a substantial decrease in the relative importance of climate change as a meaningful concept in policy circles went along with decreased interest in climate science and reliance on moderate rather then extreme climate change scenarios [28].

In the next sections, we briefly discuss each of the logics and their implications for knowledge production and use, based on recent literature. Each logic is build on different assumptions about human decision-making, with consequentiality reflecting an instrumentalist perspective or the *homo economicus* [29,30], appropriateness reflecting a institutionalist perspective or the *homo sociologicus* [29], and meaningfulness reflecting an interpretivist perspective or the *homo semioticus [31,32]*. As such, each of the logics represents a body of knowledge about decision-making processes, and understands decision-making as guided by a different set of questions (see Table 1) [22]. Considering these three logics of decision-making in inquiries into the use of environmental knowledge in

decision-making may lead to pursuing different research questions, identifying different mechanisms of knowledge use, and providing alternative explanations of success and failure.

Table 1. Key questions in three logics of decision-making

Logic of consequentiality	Logic of appropriateness	Logic of meaningfulness
What are the decision options? What are my preferences? What are the consequences of the alternatives for my preferences? Choose the decision option that has the best consequences	What kind of situation is this? What kind of role do I have in the situation? Which rules apply to this decision? Choose the decision option that is most appropriate	What is going on here? Who can I interact with to discover what the situation means? Which interpretation of the situation makes most sense? Choose the decision option that is most meaningful

2. The logic of consequentiality: is the knowledge consequential?

Many attempts to foster the use of environmental knowledge in decision-making subscribe to the logic of consequentiality, conceiving decisions as rational choices [22,33–35]. The assumption here is that decisions are taken based on the anticipation of the future effects of current actions, and that alternative decision options are evaluated in terms of their expected consequences [22]. Early on, the assumptions of rational choice theories have been challenged by studies of real-world decision making [33,36], where not all alternatives are known and where there is uncertainty about their consequences. Moreover, decision makers do not have the time to consider all the possible consequences, have incomplete and inconsistent goals, and satisfice rather than maximize [22,37]. As a result, rational-synoptic [38] or rational-comprehensive [39] approaches have given way to theories of bounded rationality [40], portrayed decision-makers as operating under more or less severe constraints, but still intending to make rational decisions guided by the expected consequences of decision options. For example, deciding about water conservation measures in the Peruvian highlands can be guided by a cost-benefit analysis of the expected consequences for upstream and downstream stakeholders [41,42].

In this logic, scientific knowledge is supposed to provide a more comprehensive list of decision options, better estimates of the consequences of decision options, and/or more sophisticated ways of valuing the options in terms of the preferences of decision-makers and potentially a larger group of stakeholders. The continued relevant of this decision-making logic is evident in approaches like environmental cost-benefit analysis [43], evidence-based policy [44,45] and ecosystem service valuation [46,47]. Whether an organization utilizes

information or not stems from the perceived utility of information [48–50]; how it fits decision contexts [51,52] and of the characteristics of knowledge itself in terms of credibility and salience [53]. However, working from the assumptions of the logic of consequentiality alone makes it difficult to understand why environmental knowledge that is ostensibly useful in terms of enhancing the knowledge base about options and consequences for certain decisions, often fails to be usable for decision-makers [54–56].

3. The logic of appropriateness: is the knowledge appropriate?

Taking into account the logic of appropriateness allows us to understand how knowledge use is affected by the formal and informal rules and norms that guide decision-making processes [57–59]. Particularly in well-structured decision situations, a combination formal and informal rules may preclude the uptake of new information because there is no way to fit it into existing rules, or because bringing new knowledge in well-established decision contexts can be perceived as negative [26,51]. Hence, the decision-making logic of appropriateness takes an institutional perspective [29,60,61] and assumes that decision-makers act according to what they consider to be appropriate in their specific role and situation.

Theories that regard decisions not so much as intendedly rational choices but as rule-based actions [22,60,62] pay much more attention to organizational routines and institutionalized rules as drivers of decision-making. A complex mix of regulations, standard operating procedures, professional standards, cultural norms and/or informal rules guides the choices of decision-makers [36]. Decision-making in the logic of appropriateness revolves around rules, obligations and what others expect from decision-makers in particular situations. For example, deciding about water conservation measures in the Peruvian highlands can be guided by a new national rule that water utilities have to invest in benefit-sharing mechanisms with highland communities [41,42].

Empirical research focusing on the usability of climate information in urban adaptation in the UK and Germany has shown that that climate information use is critically influenced by the broader institutional and regulatory environment in each country [63]. A study of climate information use by water managers in two river basins in the Great Lakes region of the US identified lack of a strong regulatory signal as a main barrier to climate information uptake [64]. At the organizational level, rules and norms influence an organizations' capacity to absorb new information [65]. Whether an organization uses information or not stems from the organizational attitude towards using new and, in particular, external information [48,66], and from how new information interplays with other information already in use [62]. The use of knowledge by organizations and individuals is influenced by institutional "rules of the game", such as incentive systems, regulatory frameworks, or informal rules and social expectations [2,67]. These rules shape what questions are asked, what methods are used, and how knowledge is generated, shared, and used, in the broader context of knowledge governance [68].

4. The logic of meaningfulness: is the knowledge meaningful?

In more complex decision-making situations characterized by uncertainty (incomplete knowledge) and ambiguity (conflicting views), clarity about the consequences or

appropriateness of decisions options is usually lacking [69,70]. Ambiguity can be understood as “the simultaneous presence of multiple valid, and sometimes conflicting, ways of framing a problem” (p. 78) [70]. What exactly is the problem remains vague and constantly shifts, due to fluid participation, problematic preferences and unclear technology [71]. Interpretive policy analysts interested in decision-making have stressed that ambiguity is not always a nuisance for decision-makers – vague and ambiguous goals can unite different groups who otherwise would disagree on specifics [72]. Defining decision problems, listing alternative options and evaluating them are highly amenable to interactional framing [73], through which the meaning of the decision is negotiated between the key players in the decision-making process. Decision-making in collaborative settings depends on connecting frames [74,75], while in competitive settings decision-makers strategically manipulate ambiguity by employing labels and symbols that affect meaning, highlighting one dimension of the problem over others [20]. Providing meaning and clarity in a world replete with ambiguity and problematic preferences is a powerful political tool. Decision-making, then, is often more like a struggle over meaningfulness than like an orderly process of assessing consequences or following rules.

To understand decision-making and knowledge use in these circumstances, we argue for a third logic of decision-making, namely the logic of meaningfulness. This logic builds on sensemaking theory [76,77], where the emphasis is on how people make sense of complex situations through acting in those situations and constructing what the meaning of the situation might be, usually through interacting with others. Here, decisions become strongly driven by how the decision-makers make sense of the decision problems in terms of what the decision is really about, what it means, and what the meaningful options are. For example, deciding about water conservation measures in the Peruvian highlands can be guided by the meaning of highlands as sources of water for cities downstream, their meaning as living space of local communities, or their meaning as hotspots of biodiversity [41,42].

According to the logic of meaningfulness, knowledge use depends on whether new knowledge fits with the frames of decision-makers or provides a meaningful new perspective. When environmental knowledge gets implicated in policy controversies [78], knowledge use seems to be driven strongly by what is considered meaningful by decision-makers. For example, in a controversy about the necessity of a policy for managing eel populations in the Netherlands [79], the national government leaned towards the “fishery sector is not the main cause” view, and did not rely on scientific knowledge on declining eel populations. Interestingly, at a later point decision-makers at the EU level who were sympathetic to the “closed fishing season is the best solution” view did take these numbers very seriously and enforced EU regulation that required member states to draw up eel management plans [79]. It is also difficult to understand why certain governments or administrations rely on climate science in their policy development, and why others do not, when only consequentiality and appropriateness logics are considered [28,64]. Climate change is such an all-encompassing policy issue that polarized political and ideological frames on how to address it seem to drive what people accept or reject as relevant scientific knowledge [80–83]. Sensemaking is not a neutral activity but a political process in which meanings are promoted, contested, and negotiated [84,85]. The use of particular types of information may itself take on specific meanings for decision-makers. For example, water

managers may perceive using climate information as a sign of weakness because it communicates to consumers the potential vulnerability of the water supply system [62].

5. Discussion and conclusion

A fuller understanding of environmental knowledge use in decision-making requires insight into the different logics that guide decision-making. The rational choice assumptions that underpin much of the thinking about policy-relevant environmental knowledge provide an important but narrow view on decision-making. Complementing this logic of consequentiality with insights from the logic of appropriateness increases our understanding of the institutional drivers of environmental knowledge use. We have argued that adding the logic of meaningfulness is necessary to understand how sensemaking, meaning and interpretation drive environmental knowledge use, particularly in decision-making contexts characterized by uncertainty and ambiguity.

When scientists leave the ivory tower and interact more closely with a variety of societal actors, the opportunities to generate knowledge that is highly meaningful to those actors multiply [86]. Creating meaning can be for example, through engaging on a dialogue about the role of knowledge in solving problems, or exploring different ways knowledge can foster meaningful change. At the same time, there is no neutral ground anymore: conflicting frames and ideological divides might lead to controversies about the very knowledge that is being produced. Therefore, reflecting about the frames [87] implied by environmental knowledge and dealing with controversy also becomes part and parcel of the knowledge creation enterprise.

The decision-making logic of meaningfulness requires decision-makers, scientists and practitioners to become responsive to and take responsibility for meaning making in science-policy interfaces. To do this requires skills in discerning what matters to whom, to what extent, in what manner, in particular problematic situations [88]; being responsive to the differences that punctuate our tidy methodologies, objectives and normative programmes [89]; and, evaluating the impacts of science in addressing complex problematic situations [90]. Meaningfulness is not an automatic outcome of science-policy encounters nor of transdisciplinary research involving stakeholders. Rather, meaning is an achievement. Conditions of success are hard to know in advance, because addressing the question of meaning, participants encounter obligations, constraints, claims and demands that influence and compose their roles, institutional norms and objectives. For science-policy scholars and practitioners looking for a clear, predictive and generally application formalization of the conditions of success in producing knowledge and meaning that is actionable in any and all science-policy interfaces, the logic of meaningfulness may be disappointing. Yet the path of sensemaking as an approach to decision-making in the context of complex environmental problems offers a promising trajectory in environmental knowledge production and use.

Conflict of interest

None declared.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center (SESYNC) under funding received from the National Science Foundation (DBI-1639145). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Annotated references

* 2. This overview paper distills lessons for people aiming to produce usable knowledge for sustainable development. They need to know about innovations systems, complex systems, political systems and adaptive systems, and they need to build capacity for knowledge governance, stakeholder collaboration, social learning and researcher training.

* 7. Based on review of published case studies, this identifies broad factors that inhibit or facilitate the co-production of environmental knowledge, highlight specific practices, and identifies necessary competencies for undertaking co-production.

* 16. This paper reviews the theoretical foundations of different disciplinary approaches to co-production and find enough convergence for strong conceptual foundation.

* 34. This paper discusses the need to consider both ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ choice, the importance of multiple theories to portray the multifaceted nature of complex contexts, and advocates the combination of applied and basic research.

* 39. This analysis of water governance in central Peru shows how differently framed policy storylines (‘urbanshed’-level investment in water supply infrastructure, community-level cultural restoration for improved local agricultural production, or nationwide watershed-level financial mechanisms for highland ecosystem conservation) intersect and generate momentum for conservation-based watershed investments.

* 60. This paper analyses the impact of institutional context on the use of climate change projections by local governments in England and Germany, and find that there is little demand for climate projections in local adaptation planning due existing policy, legal and regulatory frameworks.

* 77. This paper finds that despite tailored climate information availability, actual use by resource managers remains low, because of perceptions of climate change as politically risky, lack of formal mandates to use information, problems with the information itself and lack of demand by managers.

* 80. This paper examines the way empirical findings are translated into political knowledge in the context of the post-truth debate, and illustrates these points with the case of climate change denial.

References

1. Lemos MC: **Usable climate knowledge for adaptive and co-managed water governance**. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 2015, **12**:48–52.

2. Clark WC, van Kerkhoff L, Lebel L, Gallopin GC: **Crafting usable knowledge for sustainable development**. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2016, **113**:4570–4578.

3. Beier P, Hansen LJ, Helbrecht L, Behar D: **A How-to Guide for Coproduction of Actionable Science**. *Conservation Letters* 2017, **10**:288–296.

4. Brunet L, Tuomisaari J, Lavorel S, Crouzat E, Bierry A, Peltola T, Arpin I: **Actionable knowledge for land use planning: Making ecosystem services operational**. *Land use policy* 2018, **72**:27–34.

5. Vogel J, McNie E, Behar D: **Co-producing actionable science for water utilities**. *Climate Services* 2016, **2-3**:30–40.

6. Harvey B, Cochrane L, Van Epp M: **Charting knowledge co-production pathways in climate and development**. *Env Pol Gov* 2019, **79**:387.

7. Djenontin INS, Meadow AM: **The art of co-production of knowledge in environmental sciences and management: lessons from international practice**. *Environ Manage* 2018, **61**:885–903.

8. Lemos MC, Arnott JC, Ardoin NM, Baja K, Bednarek AT, Dewulf A, Fieseler C, Goodrich KA, Jagannathan K, Klenk NL, et al.: **To co-produce or not to co-produce**. *Nature Sustainability* 2018, **1**:722.

9. Vera C: **Farmers transformed how we investigate climate**. *Nature* 2018, **562**:9.

10. Klenk NL, Meehan K: **Climate change and transdisciplinary science: Problematizing the integration imperative**. *Environ Sci Policy* 2015, **54**:160–167.

11. Mauser W, Klepper G, Rice M, Schmalzbauer BS, Hackmann H, Leemans R, Moore H: **Transdisciplinary global change research: The co-creation of knowledge for sustainability**. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 2013, **5**:420–431.

12. Liu J, Bawa KS, Seager TP, Mao G, Ding D, Lee JSH, Swim JK: **On knowledge generation and use for sustainability**. *Nature Sustainability* 2019, **2**:80–82.

13. Bonney R, Shirk JL, Phillips TB, Wiggins A, Ballard HL, Miller-Rushing AJ, Parrish JK: **Citizen science: Next steps for citizen science**. *Science* 2014, **343**:1436–1437.

14. Schröter M, Kraemer R, Mantel M, Kabisch N, Hecker S, Richter A, Neumeier V, Bonn A: **Citizen science for assessing ecosystem services : Status , challenges and opportunities**. *Ecosystem Services* 2017, **28**:80–94.

15. Paul JD, Buytaert W, Allen S, Ballesteros-Cánovas JA, Bhusal J, Cieslik K, Clark J, Dugar S, Hannah DM, Stoffel M, et al.: **Citizen science for hydrological risk reduction and resilience building**. *WIREs Water* 2018, **5**:e1262.

16. Miller CA, Wyborn C: **Co-production in global sustainability: Histories and theories**. *Environ Sci Policy* 2018, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2018.01.016.

17. Dilling L, Lackstrom K, Haywood B, Dow K, Lemos MC, Berggren J, Kalafatis S: **What Stakeholder Needs Tell Us about Enabling Adaptive Capacity: The Intersection of Context and Information Provision across Regions in the United States**. *Wea Climate Soc* 2015, **7**:5–17.

18. Cohen MDMD, March JGJG, Olsen JP: **A garbage can model of organizational**

choice. *Adm Sci Q* 1972, **17**:1–25.

19. Kingdon JW: *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies (2nd Edition)*. HarperCollins College Publishers; 1995.

20. Zahariadis N: *Ambiguity and choice in public policy*. Georgetown University Press; 2003.

21. Morcol G: *Handbook of Decision Making*. Routledge; 2006.

22. March JG: *A primer on decision making. How decisions happen*. The Free Press; 1994.

23. Newark D: **Leadership and the Logic of Absurdity**. *AMRO* 2018, **43**:198–216.

24. Green F: **The logic of fossil fuel bans**. *Nat Clim Chang* 2018, **8**:449–451.

25. Woodruff SC, Stults M: **Numerous strategies but limited implementation guidance in US local adaptation plans**. *Nat Clim Chang* 2016, **6**:796.

26. Lach D, Rayner S, Ingram H: **Taming the waters : strategies to domesticate the wicked problems of water resource management**. *Int J Water* 2005, **3**:1–17.

27. Dewulf A: *Taking meaningful decisions: sensemaking and decision-making in water and climate governance*. Wageningen University and Research; 2019.

28. Vink MJ, Boezeman D, Dewulf A, Termeer CJAM: **Changing climate, changing frames: Dutch water policy frame developments in the context of a rise and fall of attention to climate change**. *Environ Sci Policy* 2013, **30**:90–101.

29. Searing DD: **Roles, Rules, and Rationality in the New Institutionalism**. *Am Polit Sci Rev* 1991, **85**:1239–1260.

30. Urbina DA, Ruiz-Villaverde A: **A Critical Review of Homo Economicus from Five Approaches**. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 2019, **78**:63–93.

31. Salvatore S, Valsiner J, Veltri GA: **The Theoretical and Methodological Framework. Semiotic Cultural Psychology, Symbolic Universes and Lines of Semiotic Forces**. In *Symbolic Universes in Time of (Post)Crisis: The Future of European Societies*. Edited by Salvatore S, Fini V, Mannarini T, Valsiner J, Veltri GA. Springer International Publishing; 2019:25–49.

32. Weick KE: **Organized sensemaking: A commentary on processes of interpretive work**. *Hum Relat* 2012, **65**:141–153.

33. Jones BD: **Bounded rationality and public policy: Herbert A. Simon and the decision foundation of collective choice**. *Policy Sci* 2002, **35**:269–269.

34. Cairney P, Weible CM: **The new policy sciences: combining the cognitive science of choice, multiple theories of context, and basic and applied analysis**. *Policy Sci* 2017, **50**:619–627.

35. Robert D: **Expected Comparative Utility Theory: A New Theory of Rational Choice**. *The Philosophical Forum* 2018, **49**:19–37.

36. March JG: **How decisions happen in organizations**. *Human-Computer Interaction* 1991, **6**:95–117.

37. Schwartz B, Ben-Haim Y, Dacso C: **What Makes a Good Decision? Robust Satisficing as a Normative Standard of Rational Decision Making**. *J Theory Soc Behav* 2011, **41**:209–227.

38. Bendor J: **Incrementalism: Dead yet Flourishing**. *Public Adm Rev* 2015, **75**:194–205.

39. Scott J Ronald J: **The Science of Muddling Through Revisited**. *Emergence : Complexity and Organization* 2010, **12**:5–18.

40. Jones BD: **Bounded Rationality**. *Annual Review of Political Science* 1999, **2**:297–321.

41. Grainger S, Hommes L, Karpouzoglou T, Perez K, Buytaert W, Dewulf A: **The development and intersection of highland-coastal scale frames: a case study of water governance in central Peru**. *J Environ Policy Plann* 2019,

42. Ostovar AL: **Investing upstream: Watershed protection in Piura, Peru**. *Environ Sci Policy* 2019, **96**:9–17.

43. Feuillette S, Levrel H, Boeuf B, Blanquart S, Gorin O, Monaco G, Penisson B, Robichon S: **The use of cost–benefit analysis in environmental policies: Some issues raised by the Water Framework Directive implementation in France**. *Environ Sci Policy* 2016, **57**:79–85.

44. Head BW: **Toward more "evidence-informed" policy making?** *Public Adm Rev* 2016, **76**:472–484.

45. Adam C, Steinebach Y, Knill C: **Neglected challenges to evidence-based policy-making: the problem of policy accumulation**. *Policy Sci* 2018, **51**:269–290.

46. de Groot R, Brander L, van der Ploeg S, Costanza R, Bernard F, Braat L, Christie M, Crossman N, Ghermandi A, Hein L, et al.: **Global estimates of the value of ecosystems and their services in monetary units**. *Ecosystem Services* 2012, **1**:50–61.

47. Costanza R, de Groot R, Braat L, Kubiszewski I, Fioramonti L, Sutton P, Farber S, Grasso M: **Twenty years of ecosystem services: How far have we come and how far do we still need to go?** *Ecosystem Services* 2017, **28**:1–16.

48. Oh CH, Rich RF: **Explaining use of information in public policymaking**. *Knowledge and Policy* 1996, **9**:3–35.

49. Landry R, Amara N, Lamari M: **Utilization of social science research knowledge in Canada**. *Res Policy* 2001, **30**:333–349.

50. Choo CW: *The knowing organization: how organizations use information to construct meaning, create knowledge, and make decisions*. Oxford University Press; 2006.

51. Lemos MC, Kirchhoff CJ, Ramprasad V: **Narrowing the climate information usability gap**. *Nat Clim Chang* 2012, **2**:789–794.

52. McNie EC: **Reconciling the supply of scientific information with user demands: an analysis of the problem and review of the literature**. *Environ Sci Policy* 2007, **10**:17–38.

53. Cash DW, Clark WC, Alcock F, Dickson NM, Eckley N, Guston DH, Jäger J, Mitchell RB: **Knowledge systems for sustainable development**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2003, **100**:8086–8091.

54. Cairney P: *The Politics of Evidence-Based Policy Making*. Palgrave Macmillan; 2016.

55. Kirchhoff CJ, Carmen Lemos M, Dessai S: **Actionable Knowledge for Environmental Decision Making: Broadening the Usability of Climate Science**. *Annu Rev Environ Resour* 2013, **38**:393–414.

56. Marre J-B, Thébaud O, Pascoe S, Jennings S, Boncoeur J, Coglan L: **Is economic valuation of ecosystem services useful to decision-makers? Lessons learned from Australian coastal and marine management**. *J Environ Manage* 2016, **178**:52–62.

57. March JG, Olsen JP: **The logic of appropriateness**. In *The Oxford handbook of political science*. Edited by Goodin RE. Oxford University Press; 2011.

58. Hiekkataipale M-M, Lämsä A-M: **What should a manager like me do in a situation like this? Strategies for handling ethical problems from the viewpoint of the logic of appropriateness**. *J Bus Ethics* 2017, **145**:457–479.

59. Raymond M: *Social Practices of Rule-Making in World Politics*. Oxford University Press; 2019.

60. March JG, Olsen JP: *Rediscovering institutions. The Organizational Basis of Politics*. The Free Press; 1989.

61. Gardner R, Ostrom E: **Rules and games**. *Public Choice* 1991, **70**:121–149.

62. Rayner S, Lach D, Ingram H: **Weather Forecasts are for Wimps: Why Water Resource Managers Do Not Use Climate Forecasts**. *Clim Change* 2005, **69**:197–227.

63. Lorenz S, Dessai S, Forster PM, Paavola J: **Adaptation planning and the use of climate change projections in local government in England and Germany**. *Regional Environ Change* 2017, **17**:425–435.

64. Rasmussen LV, Kirchhoff CJ, Lemos MC: **Adaptation by stealth: climate information use in the Great Lakes region across scales**. *Clim Change* 2017, **140**:451–465.

65. Amara N, Ouimet M, Landry R: **New Evidence on Instrumental, Conceptual, and Symbolic Utilization of University Research in Government Agencies**. *Sci Commun* 2004, **26**:75–106.

66. van de Vall M, Bolas C: **Using social policy research for reducing social problems: an empirical analysis of structure and functions**. *J Appl Behav Sci* 1982, **18**:49–67.

67. van Kerkhoff L: **Developing integrative research for sustainability science through a complexity principles-based approach**. *Sustainability Sci* 2014, **9**:143–155.

68. Gerritsen a. L, Stuiver M, Termeer CJAM: **Knowledge governance: An exploration of principles, impact, and barriers**. *Sci Public Policy* 2013, **40**:604–615.

69. Dewulf A, Biesbroek R: **Nine lives of uncertainty in decision-making: strategies for dealing with uncertainty in environmental governance**. *Policy and Society* 2018, **37**:441–458.

70. Brugnach M, Dewulf A, Henriksen HJ, Van der Keur P: **More is not always better: coping with ambiguity in natural resources management**. *J Environ Manage* 2011, **92**:78–84.

71. Zahariadis N: **Ambiguity and multiple streams**. In *Theories of the policy process*. Edited by Sabatier PA, Weible CM. Westview Press; 2014:25–58.

72. Stone D: *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. W.W. Norton & Company; 2012.

73. Dewulf A, Gray B, Putnam L, Lewicki R, Aarts N, Bouwen R, van Woerkum C: **Disentangling approaches to framing in conflict and negotiation research: A meta-paradigmatic perspective**. *Hum Relat* 2009, **62**:155–193.

74. Dewulf A, Mancero M, Cardenas G, Sucozhanay D: **Fragmentation and connection of frames in collaborative water governance: a case study of river catchment management in Southern Ecuador**. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 2011, **77**:50–75.

75. Gray B, Purdy JM: *Collaborating for Our Future. Multi-stakeholder Partnerships for Solving Complex Problems*. University Press; 2018.

76. Weick KE: *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage; 1995.

77. Weick KE, Sutcliffe KM, Obstfeld D: **Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking**. *Organization Science* 2005, **16**:409–421.

78. Eeten MJGV: **"Dialogues of the deaf" on science in policy controversies**. *Sci Public Policy* 1999, **26**:185–192.

79. van Herten ML, Runhaar H: **Dialogues of the deaf in Dutch eel management policy. Explaining controversy and deadlock with argumentative discourse analysis**. *J Environ Planning Manage* 2013, **56**:1002–1020.

80. McCright AM, Dunlap RE: **The Politicization of Climate Change and Polarization in the American Public's Views of Global Warming, 2001–2010**. *Sociol Q* 2011, **52**:155–194.

81. Dunlap RE, McCright AM, Yarosh JH: **The political divide on climate change: Partisan polarization widens in the US**. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development* 2016, **58**:4–23.

82. Fischer F: **Knowledge politics and post-truth in climate denial: on the social construction of alternative facts**. *Critical Policy Studies* 2019, doi:10.1080/19460171.2019.1602067.

83. Maibach E, Leiserowitz A, Cobb S, Shank M, Cobb KM, Gulledge J: **The legacy of climategate: undermining or revitalizing climate science and policy?** *Wiley Interdiscip Rev Clim Change* 2012, **3**:289–295.

84. Marshall N, Rollinson J: **Maybe Bacon Had a Point: The Politics of Interpretation in Collective Sensemaking**. *British Journal of Management* 2004, **15**:71–86.

85. Hope O: **The Politics of Middle Management Sensemaking and Sensegiving**. *Journal of Change Management* 2010, **10**:195–215.

86. Briley L, Brown D, Kalafatis SE: **Overcoming barriers during the co-production of climate information for decision-making**. *Climate Risk Management* 2015, **9**:41–49.

87. Schon D, Rein M: *Frame Reflection. Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*. 1994.

88. Savransky M, Stengers I: *The Adventure of Relevance: An Ethics of Social Inquiry*. 2016.

89. Klenk NL, Fiume A, Meehan K, Gibbes C: **Local knowledge in climate adaptation research: Moving knowledge frameworks from extraction to co-production**. *Wiley Interdiscip Rev Clim Change* 2017, **8**:e475.

90. Turnhout E: **The politics of environmental knowledge**. *Conservation and Society* 2018, **16**:363–371.