AN EXPLORATION OF INSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES IN PURSUING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Abstract

The institutional setting within which consumption and production occurs has profound influence on preferences and forms of production, and substantially shapes resource throughput of economies, pollution and land use. Institutional economics is arguably the most important subdiscipline of economics in enabling an inter-disciplinary and systems approach to ensure sustainable economy solutions. The purpose and academic contribution of the paper is to conduct the first systematic review of existing institutional economics frameworks that can be applied to explore sustainable development. The scientific value added of the review is to draw out, cluster, compare and contrast: the focus, contribution, use and institutional approaches of studies, as well as sector applicability, and aims of sustainable development addressed; and finally to identify key gaps. Results show that most frameworks can be classed as applying new institutional economics approaches (or similar) and focus on common property or social ecological systems. Most of these frameworks see institutions as rules and often have a strong focus on formal rules. Another key finding is that most frameworks address the environmental aim of sustainable development, but few address all three aims. There was also found to be a lack of frameworks with a foreground focus on the end consumer and downstream supply chains that drive resources use and environmental impact. Classical institutional economics is largely neglected by most frameworks, yet classical institutional economics can inform the cultural shift to more sustainable economies, because of its focus on a wider range of informal institutions.

1. Introduction

Dasgupta 2021 building on literature summarise that many of the planets natural systems are now on the verge of breakdown. WWF 2020 identify population sizes of wild mammals, birds, fish, amphibians and reptiles have on an average dropped 68% since 1970. This ecological degradation often arises due to poor management and decisions about economic activities. Pollution, land use changes and over extraction are among some of the key drivers of ecosystem loss (Steffen et al 2015). Ecosystems help regulate the planet and provide the oxygen we breathe. The environment provides all inputs to the economy and deals with the wastes that economies produce. Further, Allwood et al 2011 identify that it is the scale of use of key resource flows that is driving global environmental pressures such as climate change. Secondly, Lenzen et al (2007) and Wiedman et al (2020) show that in the industrialised world the main drivers of the level and growth of resource use and environmental impact are final consumption and affluence. Therefore, socio economic factors (and context) mediate the speed of flow of resource use and environmental degradation alongside technology. This is also a reason (but not the only one) why economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainable development must be addressed at the same time (WCED 1987).

The academic literature highlights that an integrated systems approach to sustainable development is essential (see Clayton and Radcliffe 1996 amongst others). This is coming though in latest government strategy and policy in some countries such as the UK, see for example Council for Science and Technology 2020. Such whole systems approaches need to be represented in economic frameworks that policy makers apply. The most heavily used framework in economics and often in policy circles (the neoclassical framework) provides in depth theory and understanding on the economy but provides little depth of understandings of the social and is arguably narrow with how it treats the environment (the environment is seen as an external cost or benefit that needs to be priced and incorporated into calculations of the framework). I.e. the environment is conceptualised so it fits the pre-existing model. Sub disciplines of economics however, such as institutional economics, arguably offer frameworks that can better integrate a systems approach to sustainable development. They offer improved integration of social perspectives,

through relaxing or in some cases completely avoiding more rigid assumptions of the human actor from neoclassical economics. Within institutional economics, key social elements of frameworks are largely described or seen as institutions. Yet, definitions of institutions used and applied by different framework can sometimes be defined in different ways, which shapes the degrees of freedom and extent to which the social system is incorporated, alongside the economic. Additionally, the approaches to analysis using different frameworks can also vary substantially, depending on their premise, assumptions, and approaches.

As a sub-discipline of economics, institutional economics is arguably one of the most inter-disciplinary forms. This makes the sub-discipline particularly suited to addressing sustainable development. Paavola and Adger 2005 make the case that institutional economics has the greatest relative advantage in analysing the design, implementation and effectiveness of environmental governance solutions. New institutional economics and its forerunner (classical institutional economics) have made important contributions to sustainability research such as the conceptualisation of environmental problems as instances of interdependence and the acknowledgement of positive transaction costs as critical insights into the nature of environmental problems, understandings of plurality of behavioural motivations and limited cognitive capacity in decision making (Paavola and Adger 2005). Key early works on the institutional economics of the environment and sustainability include (but are not limited to) Kapp 1969 on the subject of social costs. Swaney 1987 who identifies a role for institutional economics in addressing environmental and sustainability challenges; Söderbaum (1990 and 1992) where an exploration of neoclassical approaches and institutional approaches to the environment are undertaken and Costanza et al 2001 on institutions, ecosystems and sustainability. More recently, established authors such as Arild Vatn have provided fundamental insights in the field, and publishing key works on the subject (Vatn 2005; 2010, 2012, 2015 a and 2015b). The Journal of Institutional Economics has also made important contributions see for example: Janssen and Anderies 2013 on the study of robustness of social–ecological systems; Frischmann 2013 on lessons relating to the work of Ostrom; Cole et al 2014 on the 'the tragedy of the commons' and Ostrom's social ecological systems framework. Pennington 2013 on Ostrom and the robust political economy of common-pool resources; Hiedanpää and Bromley 2014 on payments for ecosystem services; Frischmann and Marciano 2015 on understanding the problem of social cost; Roggero and Thiel 2018 on climate change related analysis via transaction cost economics; and Sarker and Blomquist 2019 on misperceptions in governing the commons. The application of institutional economics to address sustainable development is underutilised in academic and policy work, which seems surprising given its relevance. One of the complications is that there are quite a number and range of institutional economics frameworks that could potentially be applied to explore sustainable development, and currently, there is not a systematic review of such frameworks. This is a key gap where the current paper makes a clear contribution to the literature. A key academic contribution of the paper is to conduct the first systematic review of existing institutional economics frameworks that can be applied to explore sustainable development.

The objective of this paper is to review frameworks from New Institutional Economics and Classical Institutional Economics that address sustainable development and to identify exactly the aims of sustainable development that are addressed and how each framework treats with institutions. The novelty and value added of the current work above and beyond the existing literature (including a recent paper by Bradley et al 2021) is to synthesise, draw out, clusters, compare and contrasts the different approaches in the literature. In doing so, the paper identifies the focus, contribution, use, institutional approaches, and extent of sectoral coverage by studies as well as the aims of sustainable development addressed. This is very useful to scholars and policy makers looking to learn about the range of frameworks out there, their nature, coverage and suitability. Additionally, the paper synthesises some key gaps in the field for further development.

The specific research questions of the paper are therefore:

1. What institutional economics frameworks exist to address sustainable development?
2. What aspects of sustainable development are addressed?

3. How do different frameworks treat with institutions? And;
4. What are the key gaps and opportunities for development of frameworks?

2 Method

2.1. Defining institutions and sustainable development

Authors define institutions in somewhat different ways in the literature, the current study applies a definition by Dequech (2002). Dequech (2002) identifies institutions as being partly seen as constraints, as cognitive models, or as normative structures. This definition was used as it has breadth and can broadly pick up on the spectrum of various forms of institutions used in both NIE and classical institutional economics.

Our Common Future (WCED 1987) also known as the Brundtland Report was the watershed publication in terms of transforming societies thinking on environment, development and governance. Sustainable development has been defined in many ways in the literature (see for example Mebratu 1998 and Pezzoli 1997) and there is substantial disagreement, differences in argument and opinion concerning how it should be defined, see for example Lele (1991), Beckerman (1994), Robinson (1997), Sneddon et al. (2006), DesJardins (2015) and Pater and Cristea (2016). The Brundtland definition of sustainable development is currently the most widely accepted starting point for scholars and practitioners focused on environment and development dilemmas: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (WCED 1987).

Aligned with the Brundtland definition, the three main aims of sustainable development are: 1. Economic aim: improved equity in resource distribution across and within societies; 2. Social aim: improving human well-being; and 3. Environmental aim: development that stays within environmental constraints and maintains ecological integrity over intergenerational timescales (Sneddon et al 2006). The three aims are used in the paper and they provide focus and clarity in how the paper assesses sustainable development.

2.2 Systematic review approach

For this review, we broadly followed the systematic review approach that Ostrom (2011) applied for reviewing institutional economics literature. We now lay out the approach. Firstly, a systematic review of peer-reviewed journal papers was conducted from searching scholarly databases such as Scopus, ScienceDirect, Business Source Complete, Wiley online, Emerald, Sage journals online, SpringerLink, Taylor & Francis amongst others. Searches were conducted on these databases to find literature documenting relevant institutional economics frameworks in any context or type of research, to find institutional papers that might otherwise be overlooked if just focusing on just one discipline. Search strings were guided by the search terms "Institutional economics sustainability," "Institutional economics environmental", "Ecological institutional economics", "Institutional economics framework sustainability", "Institutional ecological economics framework", "Institutional economics frameworks environmental". The key word searches, resulted in the following search results:

Table 1: Search results

Search term	Total search results
“Institutional economics sustainability"	103,506 results
“Institutional economics environmental”	275,256 results
“Ecological institutional economics”	76879 results
“Institutional economics framework sustainability”	107,158 results
“Institutional ecological economics framework”	76,658 results
“Institutional economics frameworks environmental”	253,467 results

For each search result, once the first one hundred articles were assessed, it was found that there were few relevant papers, apart from the key word search of the terms: “Ecological institutional economics” and Institutional Economics Frameworks sustainability”. So, on the latter two searches the analyst checked articles up to 184 and 221, as quite a number of relevant articles were found after the first 100 results. A short list of articles to read in depth was developed by reading titles and abstracts, and the exploring the text if necessary, to check whether the paper should be considered for review. To qualify there needed to be high relevance in terms of both sustainable development and institutional analysis and general alignment with the focus of the review (from this initial scoping). The rational for this was to ensure that we captured papers that were likely to be relevant in terms of the review (institutional, sustainability and framework focused). As it was an initial scoping review for inclusion as opposed to in depth review, we did not want to miss or exclude important papers without reading properly.
From the latter shortlisting, one hundred and twenty articles were downloaded and saved in a folder to conduct the next stage of the review process. Checks were then conducted to remove any duplicates.

In order to identify articles that should be included in depth review the criteria were as follows: 1.) Articles needed to be presenting or significantly extending a framework; and 2.) Papers must have a reasonable degree of incorporation of institutional economics (or reasonable degree of terminology and citations that align with institutional economics) or new institutional economics. The rational for the first criteria is that this review was focused on a review of frameworks, so there was a need to only include papers that present of substantially extend frameworks. The rational for the second criteria was that there are literatures on other institutional approaches (from other disciplines), but that are not economics or institutional economics focused (or do not closely align). Given that the review was of institutional economics frameworks, such studies are outside of scope. This resulted in twenty-four frameworks being shortlisted for in depth systematic review. Each article was then read carefully and in depth, evaluated, reviewed, sorted and classified based on the following criteria: 1. Author and date; 2. Primary focus and use of frameworks; 3. Main contributions of the framework; 5. Understanding of institutions and broad institutional approach; 6. Applicability across sectors. And finally, 7. aspects of SD addressed (in line with the three aims outlined).

Once the above process was complete, the frameworks were categorised in a table based on their broad theory alignment. Rutherford 1994 was used by the current author to help identify key characteristics that push a framework to being more towards new institutional economics vesus classical institutional economics, such characteristics as seeing institutions as rules; (or other forms such as habits which would indicate closer alignment with classical institutional economics theory etc); existence of elements of neoclassical theory such as rational choice or net benefits in the approach (suggest a classification more towards new institutional economics) etc. Another indicator that was used for classification was the extent of citations of prominent authors from NIE or classical institutional economics or using or building on theory that are clearly from NIE or mainly classical institutional economics. There were some frameworks that cited and discussed work from institutional economics but that made use of or applied social or psychological theory predominantly in their frameworks. For these studies, they were classified by the predominant broad theory they made use of.

3 Results

This section starts by identifying the primary focus of various frameworks from reviewing the literature in section 3.1. The contribution, main use and function of frameworks as tools is presented in section 3.2 from exploring each paper based on the analysis outlined above in section 2. The approach to institutions taken by

studies from each cluster is then assessed in section 3.3 (an in-depth summary of each framework and its institutional approach is provided in Bradley 2021). Assessment of applicability across sectors is conducted in section 3.4 and section 3.5 assesses the incorporation of the different aims of sustainable development.

3.1 Focus of frameworks found and reviewed

The focus of various frameworks reviewed, is summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary table of studies, theoretical lens and focus

Study	Cluster by broad theory	Key contributions
Dzeraviaha 2018	**Neoclassical**	An integrated macro-model is proposed mainly applying neo-classical economics with some institutional considerations. They suggest that all environmental externalities can be accounted for in the existing production-consumption system. The main approach is to recognise environmental constraints and transform the existing pricing system alongside some institutional reforms to ensure sustainable development.
Ostrom 2011	**NIE: Common pool and social ecological systems**	The paper gives an overview of the structure and evolution of the Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework and discusses the relationship of the IAD to more complex frameworks for the analysis of social-ecological systems.
Anderies et al 2004		The paper proposes a framework that helpshighlight potential vulnerabilities of social economic systems to disturbances. They look at the institutional organisation that affect the interactions between resources, resource users, public infrastructure providers, and public infrastructures.
Rudd 2004		The paper modifies the IAD framework to transparently encompass both process-oriented pressure-state-response (PSR) and structurally direct sustainable livelihood indicator frameworks to enable a template for ecosystem-based fisheries management and policy design as well as monitoring.
Ostrom 2009		This paper presents an updated version of a multilevel, nested framework for analysing outcomes achieved on social ecological systems (Ostrom 2007).
Gerber et al 2009		The article puts forward that a combination of approaches from the political sciences (especially policy analysis) and institutional economics allows the identification of most relevant regulatory dimensions that explain the (un) sustainable uses of resources. From this they develop an innovative theoretical framework - the institutional resource regime (IRR).
Clement 2010		The paper extends the IAD framework to integrate concepts from political ecology, decentralisation studies and discourse analysis. The reason given for doing this was to make it better suited for multi-level policy analysis. The objective of the paper is said to be to enhance the IAD framework with concepts and theories fromother areas of knowledge to make more fit to the analysis of decentralised natural resource policies and multiple governance and government levels.
Feiock 2013		The paper describes the institutional collective action framework, outlining basic assumptions, empirical applications and drawing implications for governance.
McGinnis and Ostrom 2014		The paper extends the Social Ecological Systems framework of Ostrom (2007, 2009 and 2010).
Kolinjivadi et al 2014		The paper addresses the following questions: 1. How do the economic characteristics (e.g. rivalry and excludability) of ecosystem services inform the institutions needed for effective and long term natural resource management? 2. What are the ways that human well-being depends on the resiliency of ecosystem services, especially for achieving social equality in terms of human capabilities? 3. Under what institutional parameters can payment for ecosystem services (PES) policy encourage flourishing socio-ecological watershed systems? In tackling these questions, the paper expands upon a nested institutional framework for social-ecological governance and situates parameters under which a range of policy tools, including PES, are best deployed within this framework. The paper substantially advances the nested institutional framework by reconceiving governance across geographic space according to economic characteristics of rivalry and excludability of ecosystem goods and services. Emphasis is also placed on the hierarchical imperative of governing natural resources by aligning property rights regimes with the characteristics of the ecosystem service. By doing so, it is said that the framework puts forward the enhancement of both individual and social well-being resulting from the effective management of ecosystem services.
Bettini et al 2015		Draws on the intellectual resources of new institutionalism to study empirical cases of urban water transitions. The paper reviews transitions management making the case for understanding institutional dimensions that underly societal transitions. Then an analytical framework is brought together to describe the institutional context of potential transitions. They develop a mapping apprach to use tacit knowledge of experts to populate the analytical framework.
DeCaro et al 2017		Develops an overarching framework to conceptualise and analyse the current and potential role of law in creating favourable conditions for adaptation across multiple stakeholders and centres of governance activity.
Léopold et al 2019		The paper develops a multidimensional analytical framework of governance performance in fisheries management. A set of governance performance criteria is developed and the criteria are scored applying data from an institutional diagnosis of a range of cases.
Garrick et al 2013	**NIE: Cost accounting**	The paper develops a framework for analysis of water policy, building a multilevel typology of transaction costs and institutional change. They synthesise institutional theory primarily from Williamson, North and Ostrom schools, said to result in a unified approach to delineate static and institutional transaction costs as well as institutional lock in costs in the market-based water policy context, along with interactions of the costs over time. These are the costs associated with running and maintaining institutions over time. The approach investigates the levels of transaction cost occurence, and the trade-offs and interactions between these in market based policy design and performance. This is particularly important due to water's mixed good characteristics: private good, public good and character as a common pool resource.
Marshall 2013		An institutional cost effectiveness framework is developed to provide a comprehensive and logical structure for economic evaluation of institutional choices for complex social-ecological systems.
McCann 2013		A broad, pragmatic approach is taken in this paper to collate insights from neoclassical economics, new institutional economics and classical institutional economics to explore the factors affecting both abatement costs and transaction costs of environmental policy. Minimising the sum of these costs for a given level of environmental quality in both a static and dynamic sense is the criteria of evaluation applied in the paper. From this synthesis of the literature a conceptual framework is developed from the analysis of physical and institutional issues and shows the physical and institutional impacts on transaction costs and abatement costs.
Study	**Theory applied**	**Key contribution**
Kim 2007	**Classical institutional economics frameworks**	Neoclassical and institutional economics have different theories and methods for evaluating the environmental and social
Kauko 2012		Via being informed from institutional economics theory, they 1:) Describe the mechanisms of urban property development in particular institutional and geographic situations; 2.) Discuss a range of innovative possibilities for governance intervention for property development projects in urban areas; 3.) Evaluate the sustainable development of a country and city specific cases of property development.
Dupuy et al 2015		The authors identify classical institutional economics frameworks as being relatively underdeveloped to address environmental issues. The authors build on Bruno Theret's interpretation of John R. Commons's transactional model and apply the approcah cases of socio-environmental conflict.
Ishihara and Pascual 2009	**Sociological and psychology frameworks**	The paper theoretically addresses the question of how social capital can help to foster collective action via applying the concept of common knowledge as defined by Chwe (1999) as well as symbolic power (Bourdieu 1990). By bringing the concepts together they argue that the creation of collective action is not only the result of individuals rational calculation on ammounts to invest in collective action, but also results from power relations and social structure.
Grothmann et al 2013		A number of studies show that social factors such as institutions, perceptions and social capital are important in determining capacities to adapt to climate change. The authors identify the adaptive capacity wheel (ACW) (Gupta et al 2010) for assessing the adaptive capacity of institutions as the most comprehensive and operational framework for assessing social factors. They extend this approach to include adaptive motivation (peoples motivation to realise, support and/or promote adaptation to climate) and adaptive belief (peoples perceptions of realisability and effectiveness of adaptation measures). This said, the paper identifies no methods for systematically assessing social impacts.
O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013		The paper develops an analytical framework to describe what happens to mental models of stakeholders when the institutional context changes. By applying the framework, they show how knowledge of the changes in the mental models of stakeholders can increase their ability to respond to change in the operational environment.
Hodgson 2010	**Darwinian theory and Political Geography**	It is said that Darwinism can provide a highly abstract and general meta-theoretical framework to help understand natural and social evolution. The paper argues for application to social context and outlines the framework and suggests that the framework is useful as a common meta-narrative within which more in depth examination of both institutional and ecological mechanisms can be developed.
Ness et al 2010		The paper puts forward an approach to conceptualise issues of a lack of sustainability by embedding the Drivers-Pressure-State-Impact-Response (DPSIR) scheme within a multi-level institutional framework represented by Hägerstrand's system of nested domains. The proposed taxonomy aids in deciphering and understanding key causal chains and societal responses at different spatial scales for sustainability problems.

From review 24 frameworks were found. The review highlights an interesting and wide-range of frameworks with different focuses and sometimes different perspectives. One of the frameworks found was based on neoclassical economics. The majority of frameworks found however, could be classed as being from the field of New Institutional Economics (15 studies). Of these, frameworks, the majority were focused on common pool or social ecological systems, and a small number were focused on cost accounting frameworks. Three frameworks were found that apply classical institutional economics. Five frameworks were found to predominantly use social/psychology related theory and two were from Darwinian theory and Political Geography disciplines. The clustering by broad theory can be seen when looking at the second column of the table.

Dzeraviaha (2018) produce a neoclassical framework to address natural resource and environmental problems. A number of the frameworks focused on addressing common pool resource problems such as Ostrom 2011, Rudd (2004), DeCaro et al (2017), Clement (2010), Bettini et al 2015. All of the latter studies make use of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework (an approach form NIE) or an extension of it. A number of studies develop frameworks specifically focused on Social Ecological Systems, these are Anderies et al 2004, Ostrom 2009, McGinnis and Ostrom 2014, Leopold et al 2019 these can also be largely classified as being from the NIE in terms of approach. Feiock 2013 design a framework to address Institutional Collective Action problems (The Institutional Collective Action Framework) and Gerber et al 2009 a framework to enable the identification of the most relevant regulatory dimensions which can explain the (un)sustainable uses of resources (the Institutional Resource Regime framework). The frameworks of Garrick et al (2013), Marshall 2013 and McCann 2013 all focus on accounting for costs of institutional change. Garrick et al 2013 in relation to transaction costs, performance of water markets and allocation; Marshall 2013 in relation to managing complex social–ecological systems and McCann 2013 in relation to physical and institutional determinants of abatement and transaction costs of environmental policy design. The latter can also be classified as being broadly within the NIE perspective mainly. Kolinjivadi et al 2014 develop an institutional Payment for Ecosystem Services framework to address water management[1].

From reading, Kauko 2012 seemed to lean more towards a classical institutional economics approach (although acknowledges both new and classical), they conducted analysis of planning and property development in an urban setting (including urban sustainability). Dupuy, develop a Commonsian approach and framework to address social environmental conflict and is very much a classical institutional economics approach. The focus of Kim 2007 is on evaluation approaches, they assess the cost benefit framework (neoclassical) versus multi-criteria decision analysis framework (a classical institutional economics approach) to evaluation in address energy-environmental problems.

Three frameworks were found to apply a strong social and psychological perspective. The focus of Ishihara and Pascual (2009) is on extending knowledge on the mechanism of how social capital works to enable or negate collective action, using strong (mainly sociology) related insights in crafting their framework. The focus of the framework by Grothmann et al 2013 is on assessing institutional capacities to adapt to climate change via integrating psychological dimensions into the Adaptive Capacity Wheel. O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013 focus on measuring mental models in environmental governance by key stakeholders and interaction with formal institutions.

3. 2 Key contributions and uses as frameworks

3.2.1 Neoclassical

[1] The latter approach has was included in the New Institutional Economics category, but it departs from more general approaches of New Institutional Economics (for example in applying a capabilities approach to look at outcomes as opposed to a net benefits approach, and also dismissing a good number of neoclassical assumptions around payments for ecosystem services).

Dzeraviaha 2018 provide an integrated macro-model mainly applying neo-classical economics with some institutional considerations. They suggest that all environmental externalities can be accounted for in the existing production-consumption system. The main approach is to recognise environmental constraints and transform the existing pricing system alongside some institutional reforms to ensure sustainable development. The main use and function of the framework as the current author sees it, are to internalise environmental problems into market structures. More in depth summaries of the key characteristics and approach is provided in the longer version working paper, Bradley 2021.

3.2.2 NIE: common pool and social ecological systems

Ostrom 2011 provide an overview of the structure and evolution of the Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework (much used in the literature) and discusses the relationship of the IAD to more complex frameworks for the analysis of social-ecological systems. They provide a multi-tier conceptual map that has external variables and an internal structure (action situation, the unit of analysis). The framework can predict likely behaviour of actors in a given institutional structure. One can also explore the internal structure or how the internal structure changes over time and explore outcomes in different forms. The framework was an early framework upon which quite several other frameworks build or progress (hence identifying first here).

Anderies et al 2004 proposes a framework that helps highlight potential vulnerabilities of social economic systems to disturbances. They look at the institutional organisation (formal institutions) that affect the interactions between resources, resource users, public infrastructure providers, and public infrastructures. The main use and functions of the framework are somewhat similar as outlined in Ostrom 2011. The framework is said to be mainly useful for analysing the internal dynamics within the components of a SES. Two forms of disturbance when assessing robustness, are biophysical disruptions and public infrastructure or socio-economic changes. Design principles are set out and useful.

Rudd 2004 modify the IAD framework to transparently encompass both process-oriented pressure-state-response (PSR) and structurally direct sustainable livelihood indicator frameworks to enable a template for ecosystem-based fisheries management and policy design as well as monitoring. The framework is designed to explore investment decisions in different forms of capital and outcomes of these different forms of capital in addressing societal goals (including wellbeing) and management objectives (extends IAD in these respects).

Ostrom 2009 present an updated version of a multilevel, nested framework for analysing outcomes achieved on social ecological systems (Ostrom 2007). The provided framework aids one to identify the relevant variables for studying a single focal SES. Key variable categories are resource units; resource system; governance system; users. The various arrangements lead to differing interactions and outcomes.

Gerber et al 2009 put forward that a combination of approaches from the political sciences (especially policy analysis) and institutional economics allows the identification of the most relevant regulatory dimensions that explain the (un) sustainable uses of resources. From this they develop an innovative theoretical framework - the institutional resource regime (IRR). The framework enables the identification of the most relevant institutional (formal) dimensions which explain sustainable/unsustainable use of resources. The framework has the capability to describe a range of possible institutional configurations or regimes both theoretically and empirically.

Clement 2010 extend the IAD framework to integrate concepts from political ecology, decentralisation studies and discourse analysis. The reason given for doing this was to make it better suited for multi-level policy analysis. Their work enhances the IAD framework with concepts and theories from other areas of knowledge to make more fit to the analysis of decentralised natural resource policies and multiple governance and government levels.

Feiock 2013 describe their institutional collective action framework, outlining basic assumptions, empirical applications and drawing implications for governance, a conceptual system to explore and research a range of institutional collective action (ICA) dilemmas is provided. The paper provides specific hypotheses about what mechanisms are chosen and effectiveness as solutions to complex ICA dilemmas. A Key part of the analysis is to look at transaction costs and risk.

McGinnis and Ostrom 2014 extend the Social Ecological Systems framework of Ostrom (2007, 2009 and 2010). Although some extensions are made as identified in Bradley 2021, the framework is similar to Ostrom 2009.

Kolinjivadi et al 2014 expands upon a nested institutional framework for social-ecological governance and situates parameters under which a range of policy tools, including PES, are best deployed within this framework. The paper substantially advances the nested institutional framework by reconceiving governance across geographic space according to economic characteristics of rivalry and excludability of ecosystem goods and services. Emphasis is also placed on the hierarchical imperative of governing natural resources by aligning property rights regimes with the characteristics of the ecosystem service. By doing so it is said that the framework puts forward the enhancement of both individual and social well-being resulting from the effective management of ecosystem services. The framework is helpful in contextualising and operationalising integrated water resource management (a heuristic framework).

Bettini et al 2015 Draws on the intellectual resources of new institutionalism to study empirical cases of urban water transitions. The paper reviews transitions management making the case for understanding institutional dimensions that underly societal transitions. Then an analytical framework is brought together to describe the institutional context of potential transitions. They develop a mapping approach to use tacit knowledge of experts to populate the analytical framework. The institutional mapping tool part of the framework is particularly useful.

DeCaro et al 2017 develop an overarching framework to conceptualise and analyse the current and potential role of law in creating favourable conditions for adaptation across multiple stakeholders and centres of governance activity. The framework provides legal design principles of adaptive governance. They conceptualise how legal and institutional factors in particular social-ecological contexts, shape environmental decision making and cooperative aspects of emergent self-organisation.

Léopold et al 2019 develops a multidimensional analytical framework of governance performance in fisheries management. A set of governance performance criteria is developed, and the criteria are scored applying data from an institutional diagnosis of a range of cases. Essentially, this framework provides a multi-criteria institutional diagnosis framework, showing causal relationships within the fishing system, to look at the impact of interventions on the sustainability of the fishery system (in various outcome forms).

More in depth summaries of the key characteristics and approach of each of the frameworks is provided in the longer version working paper, Bradley 2021.

3.2.3 NIE Cost accounting

Garrick et al 2013 develop a framework for analysis of water policy, building a multilevel typology of transaction costs and institutional change. They synthesise institutional theory primarily from Williamson, North and Ostrom schools. This results in a unified approach to delineate static and institutional transaction costs as well as institutional lock in costs in a market-based water policy context (context focus of the paper), along with interactions of the costs over time. These are said to be the costs associated with running and maintaining institutions over time. The approach is useful in investigating the levels of transaction cost occurrence, and the trade-offs and interactions between these in market-based policy design and performance.

Marshall 2013 develop an institutional cost effectiveness framework to provide a comprehensive and logical structure for economic evaluation of institutional choices for complex social-ecological systems. The main use of the framework is in economic evaluation of institutional choices relating to these. This framework is somewhat similar (though with differences) to the previous one that was specific to water. In the paper definitions of different types of costs are reviewed and a table defining six classes of costs (which are part of the cost effectiveness framework) are set out as well as a framework.

In **McCann 2013** a broad, pragmatic approach is taken to collate insights from neoclassical economics, new institutional economics and classical institutional economics to explore the factors affecting both abatement costs and transaction costs of environmental policy. Minimising the sum of these costs for a given level of environmental quality in both a static and dynamic sense is the criteria of evaluation applied in the paper. From this synthesis of the literature a conceptual framework is developed and shows the physical and institutional impacts on transaction costs and abatement costs. The latter is particularly useful.

More in depth summaries of the key characteristics and approach of each of the frameworks is provided in the longer version working paper, Bradley 2021.

3.2.4 Classical institutional economics frameworks

Kim 2007 identify that neoclassical and institutional economics have different theories and methods for evaluating the environmental and social impacts associated with electricity generation (and other types of activity). The paper outlines the theory and methods of two approaches from each field (CBA and multi-criteria decision analysis) in evaluation and apply to the case of electricity generation, they also usefully identify the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

Kauko 2012 draw on institutional economics theory to 1:) Describe the mechanisms of urban property development in particular institutional and geographic situations; 2.) Discuss a range of innovative possibilities for governance intervention for property development projects in urban areas; and 3.) Evaluate the sustainable development of a country and city specific cases of property development. The framework is useful in assesses sustainable development outcomes in property development.

Dupuy et al 2015 identify classical institutional economics frameworks as being relatively underdeveloped to address environmental issues. The authors build on Bruno Theret's interpretation of John R. Commons's transactional model and apply the approach to cases of socio-environmental conflict. The Commons vein of research/approach is a particular form and approach (but not the only) from within classical institutional economics (see discussions in Rutherford 1994). The paper usefully captures relevant facets and dynamics of social-environmental conflicts (and understandings of power). More in depth summaries of the key characteristics of this framework and the others is provided in the working paper, Bradley 2021.

3.2.5 Social and Psychological frameworks

Ishihara and Pascual 2009 theoretically address the question of how social capital can help to foster collective action via applying the concept of common knowledge as defined by Chwe (1999) as well as symbolic power (Bourdieu 1990). By bringing the concepts together they argue that the creation of collective action is not only the result of individuals rational calculation on amounts to invest in collective action, but also results from power relations and social structure. The framework presents a framework showing theoretical routes for social capital to effect collective action which can explored in future studies.

Grothmann et al 2013 illustrate a framework for assesses institutional capacities to adapt to climate change. They do so by extending the adaptive capacity wheel of Gupta et al 2010 for assessing the adaptive capacity of institutions. They extend this approach to include adaptive motivation (peoples motivation to realise, support and/or promote adaptation to climate) and adaptive belief (peoples perceptions of realisability and

effectiveness of adaptation measures). This is useful, as a number of studies show that social factors such as institutions, perceptions and social capital are important in determining capacities to adapt to climate change.

O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013 develop an analytical framework to describe what happens to mental models of stakeholders when the institutional context changes. By applying the framework, they show how knowledge of the changes in the mental models of stakeholders can increase their ability to respond to change in the operational environment. The framework can capture a snapshot of a particular action situation (using IAD terminology) from the perspective of a single stakeholder. The framework is useful as it makes it possible to explain the mental models of different stakeholder groups (attained from interviews) and then to enable comparisons of mental models across groups.

More in depth summaries of the key characteristics and approaches of each of the frameworks is provided in the longer version working paper, Bradley 2021.

3.2.6 Darwinian theory and political geography

Hodgson 2010 identifies that Darwinism can provide a highly abstract and general meta-theoretical framework to help understand natural and social evolution. The paper argues for application to social context and outlines the framework and suggests that the framework is useful as a common meta-narrative within which more in-depth examination of both institutional and ecological mechanisms can be developed. It is unclear what the framework can produce in terms of outputs, but it does lead to interesting research questions and conceptualisations of key variables.

Ness et al 2010 put forward an approach to conceptualise issues of a lack of sustainability by embedding the Drivers-Pressure-State-Impact-Response (DPSIR) scheme within a multi-level institutional framework represented by Hägerstrand's system of nested domains. The proposed taxonomy aids in deciphering and understanding key causal chains and societal responses at different spatial scales for sustainability problems. The framework offers a functional approach for structuring the cause-effect relationships in relation to environmental and natural resource management issues.

Overall from the above sub sections, it can be seen that there is quite a range of contributions and uses of frameworks within and between the broad categories of frameworks that ‘fallout’ from the review. The frameworks also varied in the extent to which they were top down or bottom up approaches, for example Ostrom 2009 and O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013 are very much bottom up frameworks and approaches (particularly O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013), whereas other studies such as Feiock 2013 and particularly Ness et al 2010 are very top down. This can be perceived more fully when looking in depth at the key characteristics and approach of each framework in Bradley 2021.

3.3 Approach to institutions

3.3.1 Neoclassical (institutional) frameworks - Dzeraviaha 2018

The paper takes a neoclassical mindset towards institutions and the approach is quite limited in terms of producing any depth on understanding the functioning of institutions. The paper focuses on specific forms of institutions (Market, taxes and pricing) with a neoclassical approach.

3.3.2 New Institutional: Common pool and social ecological systems frameworks

For the New Institutional: Common Pool and Social Ecological systems frameworks, the Ostrom 2011 framework allows one to explore characteristics and outcomes of Common Pool Resource regimes. Most applications of this framework assume individuals are utility maximising, boundedly rational and selfish.

Profit or net costs and benefits maximisation (payoff) is the assumed goal in analysis using the Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework. Institutions are predominantly seen as rules (formal and informal). Therefore, in such approaches there seems to be at least somewhat of a neoclassical tradition embodied within institutional analysis. Many other studies in this cluster also seem to have an embodied neoclassical tradition with their approach to institutional analysis, such as Anderies et al 2004 who focus on robustness and definition of success in terms of costs and benefits (outcomes), with institutions seen as rules (little focus on informal) and similar rationality approaches embedded. Rudd (2004) see institutions as rules (formal and informal) and the paper advocates the use of marginal cost benefit analysis in assessing outcomes (neoclassical). Gerber et al 2009, focus on institutions as rules (formal). The framework assumes people are rational/boundedly rational and selfish. For Feiock (2013) rational choice and economic efficiency/cost benefits informs the logic of the framework. Transaction costs are seen as a barrier to addressing Institutional Collective Action (ICA) problems, as is the case for many New Institutional Economics (NIE) studies. The framework focuses on institutional structure and impacts on incentives and outcomes (cost/benefit) for ICA dilemmas. Institutions are seen as formal rules. Clement (2010), seem to be of the view like Ostrom 2005 that actors are rational, as they cite that institutions do not only emerge from rational individual decisions led by a set of incentives, but they also see the importance of power. The author identifies institutions as significantly shaped by power distribution at the collective-choice and constitutional levels (following Ribot 2006), the study extends the IAD to incorporate power considerations. Clement 2010, however seem to have a broader understanding of institutions as they look at aspects of power but also how values and attitudes are changed by the prevailing discourse (not just norms), so different to Ostrom 2005. Later studies such as Ostrom (2009) and Leopold et al 2019 seem to have a less embodied neoclassical tradition and look at a broader range of outputs (beyond costs and benefits). Ostrom (2009) still broadly see institutions as rules (formal and informal). In Kolinjivadi et al 2014, institutions are seen in a broader way addressing both formal and informal aspects such as norms and values. The latter paper is quite critical of many neoclassical approaches to payments for ecosystem services and presents an alternative capabilities approach. Leopold et al 2019 also see institutions more broadly in terms of rules, norms, beliefs, roles, laws and mechanisms that constrain and facilitate organisation and actions. As the analysis moved through reviewing these frameworks, they seem to embody less strong assumptions and start to embrace wider definitions of institutions and wider perspectives. The table 3 below provides an overview of the approaches to institutions taken in each paper.

Table 3a: Analysis of approaches to institutions by new institutional economics: common pool and social ecological systems

	Summary of approach to institutions and institutional analysis
Ostrom 2011	**Explore outcomes from varied institutional settings.** Most applications assume individuals are utility maximising, boundedly rational and selfish. Profit or next costs and benefits maximisation (payoff) assumed a key goal. Institutions predominantly seen as rules (formal and informal) - informal institutions in the form of social norms. The authors identify that much much work with the framework takes variables specifying the situation and motivational and cognitive structure as givens and the analyst moves forward to predict likely behaviour of actors in such a structure, although it is clear that one does not necesaily need to assume motivation and cognitive structure.
Anderies et al 2004	**Similar to above but focused on SES.** Focus on robustness and definition of success in terms of costs and benefits (outcomes). Economy, and political system are considered, but as external environment (therefore there is relatively little focus upon) that shock common pool resources. Rules focused, relating to the users (farmers and fishers etc) directly exploiting the common pool resource. Institutions are seen as rules. Similar assumptions regarding rationality etc seem to be predominant.
Rudd 2004	**The Sustainable livelihoods approach using capitals applied in combination with the IAD.** In the IAD framework Institutions are defined as (rules-in-use) that influence actor incentives and behaviour and include formal and informal (seen as norms). Social context not explored beyond social capital. The paper advocates the use of neoclassical analysis and marginal cost, benefit analysis (outcomes).
Ostrom 2009	**They provide a very comprehensive framework for understanding social ecological systems, the range of variables effecting, formal institutional arrangements and informal institutions (rules and norms) in place within the system and outcomes for such systems.** Institutions are not defined but tend to relate to formal rules and informal social norms and rules within social systems (this said mental models are mentioned in the framework briefly). The framework is more in-depth and systems based and interdisciplinary than the IAD. The framework and understanding of institutions is focused on self-organising systems and takes the view that government regulation can often supress sustainability through inappropriate (or badly fitted) top down rules and regulation/governance.
Gerber et al 2009	**The framework provides understanding primarily on institutions via property rights theory and policy analysis.** The application of the IRR frameworkensures that analysts and practitioners look closely at the policy regulations and actual use rights at work. The framework is predominantly focused on formal institutions of policy, regulation and property rights. The framework assumes people are rational/boundedly ration and selfish. The framework is based on three propositions that are clearly set out and range of configurations possible from the IRR are described, this is said to be one of the key contributions. The approach also sets of a series of research hypothesise.
Clement 2010	**Extend the IAD to incorporate power and consider a a broader range on institutions than Ostrom.** Applies a definition of institutions by Ostrom 2005, however the approach of incorporating discourse analysis to analyse the emergence of institutions and the focus on how values and attitudes are changed by the prevailing discourse (not just norms) is different from Ostrom 2005 and seems to incorporate a broader understanding of institutions. The authors seem to be partialy of the view like Ostrom that that actors are rational, as they cite that Institutions do not only emerge from rational individual decisions led by a set of incentives, but they also see the importance of power. The author identifies institutions as significantly shaped by power distribution at the collective-choice and at the constitutional levels
Feiock 2013	**The framework brings together different theory and a range of mechanisms for addressing institutional collective action problems and outlining risk and transaction cost characteristics from different institutional approaches.** The framework provides specific hypotheses about what mechanisms are chosen and effectiveness as solutions to complex ICA dilemma. The framework is very focused on risk and economic efficiency. Transaction costs are seen as a barrier to addressing ICA problems. Institutions sees as higher-level rules (formal), political system structures, local institutions such a clubs etc. Social embeddedness theory is incorporated. Social insights mainly relate to creating social capital, and social embeddedness is seen as providing another basis for creating mechanisms to mitigate ICA dilemmas, through increased trust and legitimacy. The paper focuses heavily on different forms of organisation and structure and impacts on incentives and outcomes, rational choice and cost benefit approach informs the logic of framework. Actors incentives to engage with a mechanism are hypotesised to prefer mechanisms with the greatest gain at least cost.

Table 3b: Analysis of approaches to institutions by new institutional economics: common pool and social ecological systems

	Summary of approach to institutions and institutional analysis
McGinnis and Ostrom 2014	**Provide some extensions for the same framework as in Ostrom 2009, broadly similar in terms of institutional approach.**
Kolinjivadi et al 2014	**The paper is said to illustrate the ineffectiveness of purely market-based trades for regulating, cultural and supporting ecosystem services due to non-rival characteristics.** The paper identifies that payment for ecosystem services can play a useful role for achieving integrated and adaptive water resources, but only if focus is directed to nested governance arrangements which reflect horizontal coordination across space, according to the economic characteristics of watershed goods and services, as well as the hierarchical legitimacy between higher and lower levels of governance. In the paper institutions are not defined, but the institutions are looked at quite broadly, addressing both formal and some kinds of informal institutions (values and norms).
Bettini et al 2015	**For the research the IAD provides a structural understanding of the institutional context. It is said that via day to day interaction and practices of practitioners, cognitive and normative underpinnings of formal institutions are questioned and changed**. Looking at the effects of practitioners activity on the way a system functions, the framework uses institutional work theory to explore three types of institutional activity, or work that actors conduct: "Maintaining work: Activities that serve to maintain current institutions by enforcing or conforming to current rules. Creating work: Activities that create new rules and structures by questioning the assumptions and conventions behind current rules. Disrupting work: Activities that disrupt the order by explicitly challenging the current rules or undermining their legitimacy" (Bettini et al 2015, 67). Institutions are defined by the authors (following structuration theory) as constituting "a range of formal and informal rules which not only shape the behaviour of a system, but provide actors with different forms of agency to change these rules" (in Bettini et al 2015, 67). Explorative social research methods such as interviews and workshops are used to understand the types of institutional work and the institutional context (formal and informal rules based) occuring within a system by different actors. The result is a visial diagram of institutional mapping and collective choice outcomes (the stucture of the diagrams is shaped by IAD categories explicitly). The approach is quite explorative and not too specific in terms of assumptions etc, but applying the IAD does intall a cost-benefit structure and rational within the institutional mapping analysis.
DeCaro et al 2017	The focus is on adaptation and governance, not the study of institutions on their own. The institutional principles set out are partly from Ostrom's work. Legal design principles are set out. Does not address aspects of Common Laws, or foundational aspects of property law or litigation that affect adaptation and self-organising. The advantage of this framework is said to be that when applied it provides insight into broader social-political, co-operative and institutional aspects. The framework is primarily focused on formal institutions (rules and laws focus), resilience and adaptive governance, most relevant to common pool goods. Actors are seen as self interested (and presumably rational although not stated) and the approach seems to broadly fit with new institutional economics appraches to institutional analysis in such ways.
Léopold et al 2019	**Explores institutional interventions and their impact (on fisheries).** It is stated that endogenous or constructed cooperative solutions to manage these resources in terms of institutions, can be defined as sets of rules, norms, beliefs, roles, laws and mechanisms that enable or constrain human organization and actions (Feeny et al., 1990; Ostrom, 1990). Both the framework and the approach to institutions is somewhat similar to Ostrom (2011), looking at a wide range of variables. The framework should allow comparative analysis of institutional interventions. The approach has multi-crietria in terms of outcomes. The framework assumes that actors are rational. Outcomes are looked at in terms of economic returns, actor behaviour and in this sense effiency, but also catches and resource status.

3.3.3 New Institutional: Cost accounting frameworks

For the New Institutional: cost accounting frameworks all three are underpinned by a strong rationality, cost benefit mindset and have an underlying neoclassical/new institutional tradition embodied within their approach to analysing institutions (although McCann states it covers aspects of classical institutional economics, it is largely new institutional in its tone and approach). Institutions are predominantly seen as rules (formal and informal) in the three frameworks and the focus is predominantly on costs from institutional change/institutional options, although each study is somewhat different as explored in depth in Bradley 2021. A summary of the approach to institutions and institutional analysis by this cluster is provided below in Table 4.

Table 4: Analysis of approach to institutions by cost accounting cluster

	Summary of approach to institutions and institutional analysis
Garrick et al 2013	**This work shows transaction and other relevant costs as an important evaluative criterion in institutional change.** Institutions seem to be seen as seen as formal rules and informal rules (norms). Most of the focus of the paper and analysis focuses on how one governs institutions to minimise transaction costs whilst still achieving goals (water related focus in the paper). The approach employs a neo-classically influenced approach in analysis (new institutional economics) and views associated environmental and social problems as externalities. The adaptive efficiency criteria is the one applied by Garrick et al 2013. Adaptive efficiency is defined: "a set of institutions that readily adapt to the shocks, disturbances, and ubiquitous uncertainty that characterize every society over time" (North 2005:78). This is said to build from his initial definition of adaptive efficiency as a condition that "provides the incentives to encourage the development of decentralised decision-making processes that allow societies to maximise the efforts required to explore alternative ways of solving the problem" (North, 1990: 81). Williamson focuses on the criterion of efficiency as defined as (minimisation of transaction costs). The evaluative criteria used by Ostrom et al (1990) are Robustness, Resilience, and sustainability in assessing institutions. It is identified that the traditions of the three approaches (Ostrom, Williamson and North) are bound by a focus on transactions as the unit of analysis.
Marshall 2013	**The focus of the paper is on identifying costs associated with changes in formal institutions (primarily), as compared with not changing.** The approach is somewhat different from the two other cost focused frameworks, through similar. They include not only costs added but costs avoided. The author cites his earlier work (of 2005) that presented a cost-effectiveness framework to fill this need via operationalising North's (1990) concept of adaptive efficiency. The paper is good and helpful in understanding how to identify costs from institutional change to address environmental and natural resource problems. A procedure for bounded rationality application of the framework is also developed and discussed building on Quiggin 2008. It is suggested to apply this if the use of conventional neoclassical economics is not possible (likely to be the case in many situations).
McCann 2013.	**The paper focuses on the physical and institutional determinants of transaction and abatement costs.** Institutions are not defined, but broadly seem to be aligned with many new institutional economics definitions (formal rules and informal rules/norms). In assessing institutional change, the paper predominantly is focused on costs and cost reduction (economic) in environmental policy, this does not account for potential benefits beyond the immediate policy and does not consider the effectiveness of the policy in meeting the environmental objective. In terms of decision making, Ervin and Graffy (1996) are identified as advocating to go for the options with lower total costs first (abatement and transaction costs). The paper asserts and recommend this. The approach to institutions is fairly neoclassical in approach.

3.3.4 Classical institutional economics frameworks

With regards to approaches to institutions by the classical institutional economics frameworks, they recognise the importance of culture in determining institutions (particularly informal), largely missed by quite a number of new institutional frameworks. The framework by Kim 2007, compares neoclassical CBA approaches to classical institutional economics evaluation approaches such as multi-criteria decision analysis. The paper essentially assesses the frameworks as value articulating institutions. Kauko 2012 recognise institutions as being both formal and informal, and informal as being focused on norms and culturally supported practices. They do not recognise the cognitive model aspect recognised by Dequech (2002). The importance of path dependency is also recognised in determining institutions and outcomes. Dupuy et al (2015) bring to life the Commonsian approach to institutions which is an approach quite different to any other in terms of definition and understanding of institutions, institutions are seen as a collective action. A key benefit of the Commonsian approach is said to be in holding all levels and scales of analysis of conflict together. It is a holistic and systems based approach and this is one of the strengths of the classical institutional economics approaches to institutions. Both their ambition and scope to be holistic and inter-disciplinary is important, this is sometimes missing in some of the new institutional approaches as seen earlier, but the NIE approaches can be said be strong analytically. Both qualities, systems based and analytically strength are useful attributes in furthering understanding on the institutional economics of sustainable development. The approach however, by Dupuy et al (2015) is so different from other frameworks that it may be difficult to build knowledge across studies, it was also found to be a difficult framework to follow in terms of institutional analysis. The Commonsian institutional economics is said to rely upon a theory of action that is different from the simplistic model of rational choice, futurity plays a key role in determining behaviour (see discussions in Bradley 2021).

When treating with classical institutional economics frameworks they highlight the importance of culture, values and norms. From review the classical institutional economics approach seems well suited to both recognise and address informal institutions of various kinds rather than analytically focusing down on and studying particular formal institutions. The opposite is often the case with many of the New Institutional economics frameworks, though there are clearly some NIE frameworks that attempt to address both formal and informal (however, informal are often seen as primarily norms e.g. norms regulating behaviour). This suggests that attempting to foster frameworks that together insights from the two fields coherently, may be useful. See Table 5 below for summary table.

Table 5: Analysis of approach to institutions by classical institutional economics cluster

	Summary of approach to institutions and institutional analysis
Kim 2007	**The paper trials CBA (neoclassical) and institutional economics approaches to evaluation (in case study analysis).** We focus on the institutional here as this is the focus of our analysis. The paper highlights the importance of culture, values and norms which the classical institutional approach is geared up to address. It is stated that individual and social values are hierarchical and cannot be reduced to a common yardstick (i.e. money). Classical institutional economics approaches recognise the economic system as open (Kapp, 1970), social and natural systems are mutually interdependent, co-evolving with feedbacks including circular causation. A benefit of classical institutional economics is that that it incorporates considerations of both and in a way that aligns with addressing needs and distributional aspects. In terms of the specifics in relation to the multi criteria decision analysis frameworks these are essentially value communicating appraches. Key to the institutional multi-criteria decision analysis approach is that it does not try to monetise impacts (the focus of CBA).
Kauko 2012	**The paper recognises the importance of path dependency and culture in urban development.** The paper recognises formal and informal institutions as important, seeing informal as focused on norms and culturally supported practices, this is a more in-depth capturing of informal institutions than most other papers, but does not capture the cognitive models aspect recognised by Dequech (2002). From the paper's analysis they identify various types of institutions as being important, crucially rules, but also conventions and individual behaviour of key stakeholders matters. It is said that the importance of path dependency matters for the extent to which a given country or city is on a sustainable development path. The article mainly takes primarily a classical institutional economics approach.
Dupuy et al 2015.	**Paper employs and develops a Commonsian apprach to institutions.** In the paper it is stated (p.901): "Unlike new institutional economics, Commons did not reduce institutions to rules designed to regulate markets. The economy is integrated into an institutional scheme, therefore, it is "necessarily instituted" (Gislain 2010), and institutions are a collective action. "Collective [a]ction is more than restraint and liberation of individual action – it is expansion of the will of the individual far beyond what he can do by his own puny acts" (Commons [1934] 1990, 73)." The understandings of institutions are very different from understandings from many of the New Institutional Economics approaches. The elementary units of economic analysis applying this framework are said not to be individual (like most NIE work), but transactions and collective action. Futurity plays a key role in the framework rather than rational choice. In terms of philosophy and ontology and structure of the framework, it would be somewhat difficult to reconcile with NIE approaches. The compatibility of the institutional approach with other meso-scale economic approaches to environmental conflicts is said to remain to be analysed. The framework could potentially provide insights and analysis not provided or missed by New Institutional Economics approaches. The advantage of a Commonsian approach is said to be in holding all levels and scales of analysis of conflicts together. The paper identifies that it is the complex web of institutions that form a whole that makes society coherent.

3.3.5 Sociological and psychology frameworks

For the Sociological and psychology frameworks there is quite a lot of variance in the approaches to institutions. Ishihara and Pascual (2009) focus on collective action and social capital, but understand institutions in a similar way to classical institutional economists. The framework brings in concepts of 'common knowledge' and symbolic power and look at how these influence collective action and the importance of embeddedness. New Institutional Economics most often ignores embeddedness according to Williamson (2000). This said, we note some frameworks such as Anderies et al 2004 and Rudd (2004) that build in social capital (all be it with a particular conception). Grothmann et al 2013 apply a definition of institutions that is quite broad: "*systems of rules, decision-making procedures, and programs that give rise to social practices, assign roles to participants in these practices and guide interaction among occupants of the relevant roles*" (IDGEC, 1999, p.14). This is a very social practices focused approach to institutions. The perspective that formal institutions give rise to informal institutions is a very different understanding from classical institutional economics (and many sociologists, who tend to emphasise the opposite). Although quite sociologically focused, the framework also uses psychological categories, so more social psychological. The study focuses on outcomes in terms of adaptive capacity instead of costs and benefits, this is very different to most of the new institutional frameworks and quite possibly more appropriate when studying climate change adaptation. These outcomes are important to resilience, which is important in addressing sustainable development. This study and others in this category underlie the importance of qualitative analysis in the study of institutions (particularly to informal institutions). O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013 focus on the feedback mechanisms between institutions and mental models, this is the only study to focus directly on this form of institution (mental models). Such considerations are key to understanding the emergence of informal institutions but largely neglected in new institutional economics frameworks. A nice aspect about this framework is that it does not assume mind (or rationality), it goes and collects empirical data to verify. Interestingly, this type of framework could be nicely applied in tandem to complement and inform the IAD and similar frameworks. This said the conceptual and theoretical underpinning of informal institutions could be stronger at times. A summary of the approach to institutions and institutional analysis by this cluster is provided below in Table 6.

Table 6: Analysis of approaches to institutions by social/psychology cluster

	Summary of approach to institutions and institutional analysis
Ishihara and Pascual 2009.	**The focus is looking at how social capital can help to foster collective action by making use of the concepts of common knowledge as defined by Chwe (1999) and symbolic power (Bourdieu 1990)**. The authors seem to have an understanding of institutions more similar to classic institutional economists. The theory on how social capital can help to foster collective action via making use of the concept of common knowledge as defined by Chwe (1999) and symbolic power is important as such power influences are often missing in frameworks. The paper also critically identifies the role of embeddedness in shaping individual action (beyond just collective action, the focus of Isihara and Pascual's work) and preferences. It is important to note that the New Institutional Economics scholars generally ignore this level of analysis in institutional work (Williamson 2000).
Grothmann et al 2013	**The adaptive capacity wheel (ACW) is said to be the only highly operationalised method for assessing institutional capacities to adapt to climate change, claiming to be appropriate in a wide range of institutional settings.** The study follows Gupta et al 2010 and defines institutions as: "systems of rules, decision-making procedures, and programs that give rise to social practices, assign roles to the participants in these practices, and guide interactions among the occupants of the relevant roles" (IDGEC, 1999,p.14). So the paper seems to take the perspective that formal institutions give rise to informal (different to classic institutional economics) and fairly focused on behaviour in terms of social practices, so quite a sociological viewpoint. This said, the study extends the framework with psychological categories. The framework could have deeper understanding and conceptualisations of institutions and social embeddedness. Grothmann et al 2013 leads the current author to make some observations, firstly that conventional New Institutional Economics analysis most often tends to measure outcomes in the forms of costs and benefits, rather than things such as adaptive capacity (although there are some exceptions), but these outcomes (adaptive capacity) are important to resilience of economies in the longer run and in this way sustainable production and consumption. Secondly the importance of qualitative analysis. The framework has six dimensions or outcomes that it looks at, iclusing such things as fairness, learning capacity and recources (amongst others).
O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013.	**Based on an activity theory approach**. It is said that very little is known of the feedback mechanisms between institutions and mental models in environmental governance. This is one of the few frameworks to really discuss the importance of peoples/actors mental models in a social ecological system. Mental models are key to the development and emergence of social norms, but also identify, values, attitudes and beliefs that are largely neglected by frameworks reviewed so far. Such considerations are key to understanding formal and informal institutions relevant to sustainable consumption and production. The approach does not link to classical institutional economics theory, which could provide rich conceptualisations of informal institutions. Like the IAD the approach is quite focused which is good, but there are gaps in terms of institutional frameworks that provide a rich and deep understandings of informal institutions. Informal institutions and their functioning as institutions if more clearly articulated could inform these useful action-oriented frameworks.

3.3.6 Darwinian theory and Political Geography Frameworks

We now look at approaches to institutions by Darwinian and Political Geography cluster. The Darwinian framework approach by Hodgson 2010 can be useful particularly in studying specific institutions such as social norms. The framework was very helpful to the current author is raising important institutional questions in relation to sustainable economy. There are varying views on whether the Darwinian approach can be applied to study social phenomena, but clearly it can give rise to a different approach and interesting questions and insights. Institutions are seen as rules (formal and informal) and clearly the approach rejects assumptions of neoclassical economies, for example it is stated that the criteria of consumer sovereignty based on existing preferences, overlooks the dependence of individual goals on their cultural and institutional context and that these cannot simply be taken as given as in mainstream economics. These are useful and important observations in relation to sustainable development, as clearly existing consumption patterns in many nations (given current technology) are not in keeping with ensuring ecological sustainability and are now having impacts on human capabilities to flourish. The approach by Ness et al (2010) is on formal institutions, the paper has a very top-down focus, very different from Ostrom's approaches. The definition and understandings of institutions in the paper are primarily of formal institutions, so somewhat similar to some of the NIE approaches in this sense. The paper largely misses informal institutions and their interaction with formal. A summary of the approach to institutions and institutional analysis by this cluster is provided below in Table 7.

Table 7: Analysis of approach to institutions by Darwinian and Political Geography cluster

	Summary of approach to institutions and institutional analysis
Hodgson 2010.	**This framework provides fairly high-level theory. At times the theory is somewhat reductionist, this said reductionist approaches can be useful in understanding or capturing specific aspects of institutions such as a social norms or values.** It would be useful to have conceptualisations of interaction to explore and test before empirical research is began so that relevant metrics can be determined, not just a specific institutions (social norm of value) in isolation as the paper seems to advocate. This said, the paper is informative in building understanding to address the institutional economics of sustainable production and consumption, in quite a number of ways. Firstly in economies, clearly variation is important in giving rise to new more sustainable lifestyles and forms of production and consumption, that are not wasteful economically, materially and environmentally, and that lead to increasing capabilities to flourish and better equality outcomes. Importantly, the paper highlights that variation is shaped by the physical environment, as well as the social and technological environment that exists at any given time. It is said that two of the most important mechanisms to explain speciation identified by Darwin (1859) and retained in modern biology involve location considerations (migration to a different physical environment and creation of different niches). This can inform important institutional questions such as: how does local and regional governance create and develop niches/selection environments that encourage sustainable production and consumption, and what institutions can help bring this forth? What regional and local policies within localities lead to variation and diversity in production and consumption? Inheritance and passing on of knowledge (and institutions) from one generation to the next about how to live, survive and produce, can help but also hinder (depending on the knowledge and advice) sustainable economy. Therefore, knowledge about inheritance and passing on of institutions in their different forms are important to understand in relation to sustainable production and consumption. Explanations are also needed on how information concerning solutions to particular adaptive systems is retained (or not) and passed on. The third aspect of selection is also key in the move towards a sustainable economy, what are the physical, social and economic contexts that lead to the selection of certain types of consumption and production forms? And how do we identify current social, economic and environmental selection environments that hinder sustainable development? The paper identifies that the criterion of consumer sovereignty from mainstream economics, based on existing preferences, overlooks the dependence of individual goals on their cultural and institutional context and that these cannot simply be taken as given.
Ness et al 2010.	**The most detailed level of analysis in the paper is at the country and local levels and the focus is on government municipalities primarily and their regulation.** In some ways it is an opposite approach from the Ostrom IAD approach which have a real focus of self-organising and a very bottom up perspective and low emphasis on the government in resolving environmental problems. The definition and understanding of institutions in the paper is mainly a formal institution understanding, so more similar to the New Institutional Economics approaches in this sense. The focus is on formal institutions which aligns with their government focus, but seems to miss informal institutions operating and their interaction.

3.4 Applicability across sectors

The neoclassical framework by Dzeraviaha 2018 is applicable across sectors of the economy. The NIE: Common pool and social ecological systems framework approaches are largely applicable to common pool resources and extractive sectors. In terms of the NIE: Cost accounting frameworks Garrick et al 2013 is applicable to the water sector, the other two are applicable across sectors. For the Classical Institutional Economics frameworks, Kauko 2012 is focused on property development but the other two are applicable across sectors. For the Sociological and Psychological framework approaches all seemed applicable across different sectors and parts of the economy, the same was true of the Darwinian and Political Geography framework. A summary of applicability across sectors for each study is provided below in Table 8.

Table 8: Analysis of applicability across sectors

Cluster	Study	Applicability across sectors
Neoclassical	Dzeraviaha 2018	The approach is economy wide and can be applied across sectors.
NIE: Common pool and social ecological systems	Ostrom 2011	The framework is primarily designed to look at resource extraction from a resource system (extractive sectors or communities) e.g. common pool resources.
	Anderies et al 2004	The framework is most appropriate to extractive sectors predominantly e.g. fisheries and forestry, water and irrigation (common pool) etc. Design principles are interesting but are difficult to directly apply to many conventional every day private good (non-extractive) producer and consumer environments relevant to sustainable production and consumption.
	Rudd 2004	Fisheries management and potentially other common pool resource environments.
	Ostrom 2009	The framework seems to be predominantly applicable to extractive sectors/communities of common pool resources fisheries, forests, and water resources. The focus is on self-organising systems.
	Gerber et al 2009	The framework applicability tends to focus on extractive sectors predominantly e.g. fisheries and forestry etc.
	Clement 2010	The paper is primarily focused on extending the IAD so similarly is designed to look at resource extraction from a resource system (extractive sectors or communities) e.g. common pool resources, public good typical application scenario.
	Feiock 2013	It seems to be primarily focused on the government sector and the governance of public goods and common pool resources, but can be applied to non government organisations.
	McGinnis and Ostrom 2014	The framework seems to be predominantly applicable to extractive sectors/communities of common pool resources fisheries, forests, and water resources. The focus is on self-organising systems. Many social ecological systems also produce public goods and services (such as ecosystem services) that markets depend on. The authors note, just how broadly the SES framework can be usefully applied remains an open question.
	Kolinjivadi et al 2014	The paper is focused on water related ecosystem goods and services.
	Bertinni et al 2015	The paper is focused on urban water but making use of the IAD could potentially be applied to other common pool resource problems.
	DeCaro et al 2017	The paper is focused on environmental governance and appears most appropriate to common pool resources and goods such as water resources.
	Léopold et al 2019	The applicability is to fisheries although it is identified that the framework may be applicable to other common pool resources of SES. A focus on the consumer is largely emitted with these common pool resource focused approaches, which inhibits
NIE: Cost accounting	Garrick et al 2013	Applicable to the water to the water sector.
	Marshall 2013	The framework seems applicable across sectors.
	McCann 2013	The framework seems applicable across sectors.
Classical institutional economics	Kim 2007	Applicable across sectors of the economy.
	Kauko 2012	Specific to property development.
	Dupuy et al 2015	Applicable across sectors of the economy.
Sociological and psychology frameworks	Ishihara and Pascual 2009	It could be applied to understand social capital within any sector of the economy.
	Grothmann et al 2013	Applicable across sectors of the economy.
	O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013	Applicable across sectors of the economy.
Darwinian theory and Political Geography	Hodgson 2010	Applicable across sectors of the economy.
	Ness et al 2010	Applicable across sectors of the economy.

3.5 Incorporation of sustainable development

In terms of focus on sustainable development we can summarise as follows: Not all frameworks were focused explicitly on sustainable development, many were focused on natural resources and the environment (relating to the third aim of sustainable development). Few frameworks address the 1st and 2nd aims of sustainable development. Ten studies primarily look at ongoing natural resources harvesting/use and or the environment; Dzeraviaha 2018, Ostrom 2011, Anderies et al 2004, Gerber et al 2009, DeCaro et al 2017, Clement 2010, Léopold et al 2019, Dupuy et al 2015, O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013, Hodgson 2008. A number of frameworks did not have an explicit focus on any of the aims of sustainable development, such as Feiock 2013, Garrick et al (2013), Marshall 2013, McCann 2013, Ishihara and Pascual (2009). Grothmann et al 2013 address climate change (3rd aim) and aspects of equity are addressed (1st aim) and Ostrom (2009) and McGinnis and Ostrom (2014) address equity, natural resources and environment (1st and 3rd aim). Rudd 2004, using the five capitals, sustainable livelihoods approach in conjunction with the IAD, address the second and third aims of sustainable development but not the first. Frameworks found to address all three aims were: Kolinjivadi et al 2014, Kauko 2012. The multi criteria decision analysis framework of Kim 2007 has the potential to address all three aims of sustainable development is applied appropriately. The analysis of aspects of sustainable development addressed by each study are provided below in Table 9a and 9b: Analysis of aspects of sustainable development addressed.

Table 9a: Analysis of aspects of sustainable development addressed.

Cluster	Study	Aspects of sustainable development addressed
Neoclassical	Dzeraviaha 2018	The paper largely focuses on the environmental challenge (3rd aim of SD) and there is no definition of SD, social wellbeing aspects of SD are not focused on in the paper. Aspects of inequality (1st aim) are not addressed. Ethical aspects are also not discussed.
NIE: Common pool and social ecological systems	Ostrom 2011	Sustainability is looked at in the same way as Anderies et al 2004. Ostrom concludes that many future institutional studies will continue to use the IAD by itself when the setting to be explained is not heavily affected by ecological variables, so from this it seems the approach is not designed to extensively address ecological and/or environmental aspects. The apprach does seem to look at inequality.
	Anderies et al 2004	Sustainability is seen in terms of on-going productive use of a resource. The approach to sustainability does not look at impacts on inequality, wellbeing and staying within key global environmental pressures (that relate to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd aims of sustainable development).
	Rudd 2004	The paper itself provides little detail on societal goals and objectives although these are said to be addressed. The paper usefully identifies that ideally indicator systems must communicate critical information simply and in a compact way, this may explain the latter. The paper identifies that often financial resources are scarce, yet a variety of investment options may be available to achieve sustainable development objectives. A benefit of applying the extended IAD approach put forward is said to be that all societal responses to pressures on capital assets can be viewed in terms of investments. Different segments of society can make those capital assets available directly or can use institutions to protect and enhance them, in this way one can assess the opportunity for alternative sustainability actions. The paper argues that this can inform the business case for different actions. Some issue with such cost benefit approaches is that it is very difficult to get values for many social and environmental benefits and sometimes values are incommensurable.
	Ostrom 2009	It is said that the framework can help understand the processes that lead to improvements in or deterioration of natural resources. The focus of sustainability in the paper is predominantly on the ability of a forest of water body to sustain on going fish/trees in future etc. Beyond this sustainability understanding, social performance measures are said to be (e.g., efficiency, equity, accountability) and for ecological performance measures are said to be (e.g., overharvesting, resilience, bio-diversity). However, the framework does also recognise externalities to other SESs, which is important. From this, the framework seems to address the first and third aims of sustainable development, but not the second (of measuring impact on wellbeing).
	Gerber et al 2009	The focus of sustainability is pollution and sustainable harvesting of a resource, first and second aims of sustainability such as addressing inequality and wellbeing are not addressed. The study's definition of sustainability is as follows: "The overall regulation of a resource leads to sustainability if the uses of individual goods or services are not carried out at the expense of other uses and if all uses considered in total do not deplete the stock of the resource (global quota)." (p.799). Additonally the paper concludes that: "In our view, the IRR approach presented in this article can be considered as a fairly robust conceptual framework for the analysis and explanation of key elements depicting the degree of sustainability of natural resources uses in Switzerland and Southern and Central European countries." (Gerber et al 2008,p .808)
	Clement 2010	The paper is focused on natural resource governance and not sustainable development per say, so predominantly addresses aspects of the environmental (third aim) of sustainable development.
	Feiock 2013	The paper does not explicitly address any of the three aspects of sustainable development. Positive and negative externalities and public good are mentioned which can relate to environmental and social impacts.
	McGinnis and Ostrom 2014	Same as Ostrom (2009)
	Kolinjivadi et al 2014	The capabilities approach could prove to be a very useful tool to incorporate into frameworks addressing sustainable production and consumption. A capabilities approach may also serve well in picking up on criticality related to certain types of consumptions. An important conclusion from the paper relevant to sustainable development is that in designing a wellbeing focused approach for achieving capabilities improvements, it is importnat to start by understanding the social context, traditional knowledge, current livelihoods, distributional issues, the needs and values of ecosystem service beneficiaries and providers. The capabilities approach helps address inequality and wellbeing (1st and 2nd aims of sustainable development). Both the capabilities approach and understandings in realtion to ecosystem services can inform the appraches to sustainable production and consumption (not just water, the focus of the study).
	Bettini et al 2015	The tool is helpful in understanding and researching transitions management which is important in the move towards sustainable development, although not explicitly addressing or focusing on any one particular aim of sustainable development. Social, environmental and economic objectives are mentioned in a few places by interviewee participants of the paper.
	DeCaro et al 2017	In terms of sustainable development, the framework is focused on environmental governance it does not address inequality (first aim) and wellbeing outcomes (second aim).
	Léopold et al 2019	Multi criteria decision approaches show much promise in sustainability analysis. Benefits of such multi-criteria approaches is that outcomes are not assessed only in terms of exchange values, but physical and other criteria. Focus in terms of sustainability is primarily in terms of the fisheries ongoing potential to harvest fish biomass of high value and provide livelihoods. Pollution issues are not addressed (third objective of SD), or inequality (first aim of SD). The focus on the social is limited as it does not assess impacts on wellbeing (the second aim of SD) or capabilities to flourish (similar to Ostrom 2009 and McGinnis and Ostrom 2014).
NIE: Cost accounting	Garrick et al 2013	Not focused on sustainable development per say, but water management, the paper does however consider associated environmental and social externalities. Citing Colby (1990) the paper identifies that the politics of water allocation entail trade-offs between economic efficiency and other policy goals, for example equity and robustness (Colby, 1990).
	Marshall 2013	The paper adreses the costs of institutional change to address an environmental or natural resource issue. The first, second and third aims of sustainable development are not a focus of the paper.
	McCann 2013	Economic cost aspects in relation to institutional change and environmental policy for environmental and natural resource issues are the focus. The paper identifies that the framework shows the importance of property rights since transaction costs will occur in obtaining or retaining property rights, and since the rights assignment may affect both the magnitudes and distribution of costs. The latter understanding is important in attempting to understand potential distributional impacts on inequality from policies but otherwise aspects or inequality (1st aim of sustainable development) are not substantially addressed. Wellbeing (2nd aim) not a focus of the paper.

Table 9b: Analysis of aspects of sustainable development addressed.

Cluster	Study	Aspects of sustainable development addressed
Classical institutional economics frameworks	Kim 2007	Valuation of social costs and benefits in relation to sustainability analysis is a real challenge in sustainable development and key to making good decisions for sustainable development as opposed to just economic growth with no consideration of social and environmental impacts. The institutional approaches such as multicriteria decision analyses and other methods mentioned in the paper can play a key role in factoring in non-market costs and benefits (although not perfect) and can be developed to assess things such as criticality in terms of certain types of consumptions and productions and associated costs and benefits which would not come through strongly or reliably enough in cost benefit analysis. Such institutional frameworks have good potential to contribute towards sustainable production and consumption decisions on the ground and as alternative or additional evaluation tool to cost benefit analysis. Such approaches can help the analyst to look at both social and environmental aspects and outcomes in development, but do also have some of their own weaknesses in sustainability appraisal as outlined in the paper. Dimensions of equity and fairness are discussed in the paper and the classical institutional economics approach can help address these aspects that are relevant to the first aim of sustainable development. The multi-criteria apprach may also be usefull for picking up on positive and negative impacts of wellbeing (2nd aim of SD), but also has some limitations as discussed in the paper. The study does address the environment (3rd aim of SD).
	Kauko 2012	The paper defines economic sustainability; externalities: green; sustainable development and urban sustainability. The definition of sustainability applies the Brundtland definition, but could be tied down more clearly. In general they do mention environmental, economic and social dimensions, the urban sustainability definition is a little more specific. The paper could employ a more systematic approaching to assessing sustainability as approach to assessment was somewhat unclear. The paper identifies and argues that sustainability has a distinct spatial dimension, and so they argue that the appropriate level to set policy; regulation and incentives is at the local and possibly regional level (as opposed to national or even higher levels of governance). The current author however, notes that if only focusing on the regional level, global effects from policies that may inhibit global sustainability may be ignored. All three aims of sustainable dvelopment seem to be covered at points in the paper, although perhaps not in as comprehensive mannor as ideally would be undertaken.
	Dupuy et al 2015	The paper identifies that political ecology, the analysis of common pool resources, and ecological economics, among others, have provided strong insights into socio-environmental issues. Institutional approaches to these phenomena are identified as still scarce. The paper takes the Commonsian model and attempts to incorporate consideration of the environment (third aim of sustainable development). The paper is focused on natural resource and environmental issues and less focused on sustainable development per say. Sustainable development and relevant metrics to look at etc are not defined as the focus is predominantly natural resources and environment. Elements of power and inequality (first aim of sustainable development) are however recognised and the framework does bring in important social elements of study that need to be addressed. It is said that focussing narrowly in the style of New Institutional Economics on property rights and transaction costs is not sufficient for understanding the complexity of the interplay between rules, norms and their evolution through socio-environmental conflict. The framework provided is said to not be a theory or model but a heuristic framework that can offer a more robust scaffolding for the use of Common's method, framework and insights to socio-environmental issues. Additionally, in relation to sustainable development, the following is informative: Socio-environmental conflicts are said to directly link to place-specific, livelihood-related issues. Such aspects are said to make the local scale pertinent and a key driver of intuitional change. They demonstrate this though their application of the framework to a case study. This said, sustainable development is also a global concept with global considerations such as climate change and others need global action, protocol and international norms and rules. On this point, the framework by Dupuy et al 2015 is also useful, as they state that the defining characteristic of their proposed framework is its global approach that avoids dissociation of scales and levels of rules andis therefore said to escape the micro-macro opposition.
Sociological and psychology frameworks	Ishihara and Pascual (2009)	The paper is not specifically about sustainable development. The paper has a focus on environmental governance so addresses the third aim of sustainable development primarily, but there are some discussion on distributional aspects and inequality (first aim of sustainable development). The framework is highly usefull in understanding social context in realtion to the development of social capital (that can have a positive or negative effect on governance and co-ordination).
	Grothmann et al 2013	The focus is in relation to climate change adaptation, which limits applicability to exploring sustainable production and consumption more widely than beyond this one issue. The study does not define sustainable development, but it is not specifically about sustainable development, so you would not expect it too, some environmental (third aim of sustainable development) and equity (first aim of sustainable development) dimensions are considered.
	O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013	The paper is primarily focused on sustainable use of natural resources and waste management (relating to the third aim of sustainable development). This said the approach seems applicable to exploring social aspects of sustainable development.
Darwinian theory and Political Geography	Hodgson 2010	The paper does not discuss that much in relation to sustainable development, but what there is relates to ecological sustainability (the third aim of sustainable development), but this is limited.
	Ness et al 2010	The paper acknowledges that sustainability science requires approaches that allow for the integration of knowledge through different disciplines and scales. Social, economic and environmental components of sustainability are addressed in the paper. Although said to look at social and economic aspects, using their approach, this is in a fairly particular way. This said the paper is clearly set out to address sustainability science and challenges. This said, the paper does not explicitly seem to look at inequality or wellbeing (1st and 2nd aims of sustainable development).

4 Discussion

This review answers the following three research questions first:

1. What institutional economics frameworks exist to address sustainable development?
2. How do different frameworks treat with institutions?
3. What aspects of sustainable development are addressed?

From review, twenty-four frameworks were found. Most frameworks found could be classed as being from the field of New Institutional Economics (fifteen studies), only three frameworks were found that apply

classical institutional economics. One of the frameworks was based on neoclassical economics. Five frameworks were found to predominantly use social/psychology related theory and two were from Darwinian theory and Political Geography disciplines. Frameworks fell into one of five different clusters: Neoclassical; New Institutional: Common Pool and Social Ecological systems; New Institutional: Cost Accounting; Classical Institutional Economics; Sociological and Psychology related; Darwinian theory and Political Geography. So, this review firstly contributes by providing an overview of where most frameworks exist and remain.

The range and nature of the frameworks vary substantially. The majority of frameworks found in relation to the New Institutional Economics are frameworks designed to look at institutional aspects relating to common pool resources or social ecological systems. The predominant focus of these frameworks seems to be on common pool and or extractive sectors e.g. fisheries, forestry, agriculture etc and often there is a strong focus on the user of the resource. Some of these frameworks are very good at scoping out the range of variables in undertaking institutional analysis of such resource systems, such as Ostrom 2011. In terms of gaps, most of these frameworks lack a focus on the end consumers that may not be involved with the actual direct use and extraction activities of the system (i.e. those far away) or suppliers further downstream that may be processing and producing products purchased from the extractive activity. This was somewhat surprising given the importance of these types of consumers and producers in western societies and their role in driving environmental degradation. In terms of institutional approach it is worth noting that the majority of these frameworks see institutions as rules and often have a particularly strong focus on formal rules. In terms of informal rules, most of the new institutional studies see these in terms of social norms, though some of the later frameworks have started looking at some informal institutions more broadly beyond norms. Few however see informal institutions as cognitive models, values and attitudes. This is an important gap as these types of informal institutions are often particularly important in preference formation and in moving towards more purposeful business and leadership of social entrepreneurs that lead to sustainable development. Many of these frameworks have an embedded neoclassical logic underlying (rationality, selfishness, maximising net benefits) but some diverge somewhat such as Leoplod et al 2019 and Kolinjivadi et al 2014. A small number of the NIE studies have a cost accounting focus, identified by the cost accounting cluster. In terms of addressing the different dimensions of sustainable development (social, environmental, economic etc.) none of these frameworks apart from Kolinjivadi et al 2014, address all three aims of sustainable development. The majority focus on the third aim, and Rudd 2004 address the 2nd aim.

The classical institutional economics frameworks in general tended to have a stronger and broader focus on informal institutions and were quite interdisciplinary. All three frameworks were quite different in how they addressed and conducted institutional analysis, particularly Dupuy et al 2015. This said, the clarity and rigour of two of the three frameworks could be improved as discussed. Some of the NIE frameworks were very good in the latter respects. So, there is an opportunity for future work to improve here in the classical sphere. These frameworks tend to reject many neoclassical economics assumptions about rationality etc. Dupuy et al 2015 apply a theory of action that is very different from the rational choice model and bring in and focus heavily on concepts such as futurity and relatedness. There is however, a focus on transactions as the key unit of analysis, similar to many NIE approaches. Two of the three frameworks seemed capable of addressing all three aims of sustainable development. Frameworks are applicable across different sectors of the economy.

The social and psychology frameworks provided some useful and interesting contributions and good focus and analysis of informal institutions. Within this group there is quite a lot of variance in the approach to institutions. Ishihara and Pascual (2009) focus on collective action and social capital, but understand institutions in a similar way to classical institutional economists. The focus is on the level of embeddedness and power (few other studies address). The framework brings in concepts of ‘common knowledge’ and symbolic power and look at how this influences collective action, and the importance of embeddedness in

shaping outcomes. Grothmann et al 2013 also apply a definition of institutions that is quite broad. Grothmann et al however, have a very social practices focused approach to institutions. The logic in the paper that formal institutions give rise to informal institutions, is however different to classical institutional economics (and many sociological approaches to institutions). Although quite sociologically focused, the framework also uses psychological categories, so it is more social psychological. O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013 focus on the feedback mechanisms between institutions and mental models, it is the only study to focus directly on actors' mental models. The frameworks primarily address the third aim of sustainable development. All of the above frameworks are useful in studying informal institutions and applicable across different sectors and parts of the economy.

The Darwinian framework approach by Hodgson 2008 can be useful particularly in studying specific institutions such as social norms. The definition of institutions as rules is less broad than some frameworks. Similar however, to the classical institutional frameworks they reject many of the mainstream assumptions of neoclassical economics. The approach by Ness et al (2010) is on formal institutions, the paper has a very top down focus, and is very different from the Ostrom or O'Levänen and Hukkinen's approaches. The definition and understandings of institutions in the paper are primarily on formal institutions, so somewhat similar to some of the NIE approaches. The frameworks primarily address the third aim of sustainable development (Ness 2010 look as some social aspects of sustainable development also) and are applicable across different sectors.

The study has highlighted the variety of institutional economics frameworks that exist in relation to addressing sustainable development which is useful to both academics and practitioners who seek to choose and apply institutional frameworks to address sustainability problems. The review shows substantial variance in terms of: contributions and uses of different frameworks and underlying focus on institutions. For example, New Institutional Economics approaches have been largely developed to explore institutions in terms of rules (primarily formal, but also some informal such as norms), whereas the classical institutional economics and sociological and psychological frameworks have often been developed to address informal institutions (in various forms not just norms) as much if not more than formal. Underlying premises also vary, often frameworks assume rationality and have a focus on net benefits maximisation within NIE frameworks, classical and social psychological frameworks have less assumptions of rationality and less focus on net benefits. The Darwinian framework seems to have some similarities with the NIE cluster but also some aspects similar to the classical, the Political Geography framework seem to be more similar in nature to NIE.

In terms of research question 4: What are the key gaps and opportunities for the development of frameworks in this area?

In terms of gaps in addressing sustainable development across studies, most frameworks focus on address the third aim, a contribution of the review is to identify that few address all three aims of sustainable development. This is an important gap given that addressing sustainable development requires the addressing of both social and economic (as well as environmental) dimensions. Additionally, the drivers of environmental degradation relate to the social and economic dimensions: social preferences, levels of consumption and affluence etc, so are particularly important (see Wiedmann et al 2020). Another important research gap that is shown by the review is that few frameworks attempt to combine classical and new institutional economics approaches. This could potentially be fruitful as NIE frameworks offer a predominant focus on formal institutions whereas classical focus and role on informal institutions, the tricky part can be in the reconciliation of approaches. This may however be possible for some, for example applying O'Levänen and Hukkinen 2013 in tandem with the IAD. It is however, likely that some of the different frameworks will be incompatible due to their sometimes very different nature: premise, assumptions or conceptualisations etc. A final gap picked up by the analysis of the paper is the identification of the need for frameworks to have a foreground focus on downstream industrialised supply chains and

consumption. Realising these gaps, the current author recently put forward a first attempt to reconcile a framework making use of both classical and NIE understandings to explore sustainable production and consumption (Bradley et al 2021a).

5 Conclusions

This study systematically reviewed the range of institutional economics frameworks that exist to explore sustainable development. It was found that a wide range of institutional economics frameworks are available and can be applied to address at least one aim or more of sustainable development. From the first literature analysis, four main clusters of studies/frameworks were identified: Neoclassical; New Institutional: common pool and social ecological systems; New Institutional: Cost Accounting; classical institutional economics; Sociological and psychology; Darwinian theory and political geography. The clusters were then compared and contrasted in terms of focus, contribution, use and institutional approaches of studies, as well as sector applicability, and aims of sustainable development addressed. The most important key findings were: Most existing frameworks can be classed as applying new institutional economics approaches (or similar) and focus on common property or social ecological systems. Most of these frameworks see institutions as rules (although not all), and often have a particularly strong focus on formal rules. Another key finding is that most frameworks address the environmental aim of sustainable development but few address all three aims. It will be important for future work to focus on addressing all three aims of sustainable development. There was also found to be a lack of frameworks with a foreground focus on the end consumer and downstream supply chains that drive resources use and environmental impact, yet there is a need for such frameworks, as evidenced in the introduction to this paper. It will be important to see more applied institutional economics studies by academics in tandem with business, government and other stakeholders with a strong foreground focus on consumption and manufacturing, given importance in driving and shaping resource and environmental impact. Future work should also explore the extent to which NIE and classical institutional economics approaches might be combined to enable frameworks to analyse a greater variety of institutions and their interaction (rules based but also non-rules based and various informal) and harness the more inter-disciplinary nature and power of classical institutional economics. Realising the latter gaps of the review the current author recently published a framework to address some of the key gaps (identified at the end of the discussion section). Further development and reconciliation of this and other frameworks that attempt to bring the two fields together to addressing sustainable development is likely to be required as the field progresses. In terms of the contribution of the paper to practitioners the review summarises and highlights a range of excellent existing frameworks, their nature and use, many of these can be applied currently to common pool resource and social ecological systems problems.

References

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., Robinson, J.A. 2002. Reversal of fortune: geography and institutions in the making of the modern income distribution. Quarterly Journal of Economics. 117, 4, 1231–1294.

Anderies, J.M., Janssen, M.A., and Ostrom E. 2004. A Framework to Analyze the Robustness of Social-ecological Systems from an Institutional Perspective. Ecology and Society. 9, 1; 18.

Allwood, M.F., Ashby, T.G., Gutowski, Worrell E. 2011. Material efficiency: a white paper. Resource Conservation and Recycling. 55, 3, 362–381.

Aoki,M. 2001.Community norms and embeddedness: a game-theoric approach. In: Hayami, Y., Aoki, M. (Eds.), Communities and Markets in Economic Development. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 97–128.

Ashley, C., Carney, D., 1999. Sustainable Livelihoods: Lessons from Early Experience. Department for International Development, London.

Bar-On, Y. M., Phillips, R., Milo R. 2018. The Biomass Distribution on Earth, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 115, 25, 6506–6511.

Bebbington, A. 2001. Capitals and capabilities: a framework for analyzing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty. World Development 27, 2021– 2044.

Becker, C. D., Ostrom, E. 1995. Human ecology and resource sustainability: the importance of institutional diversity. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics. 26, 113–133.

Bettini, Y., Brown R.R., de Haan, F.J., Farrelly, M. 2015. Understanding institutional capacity for urban water transitions. Technological Forecasting & Social Change. 94, 65–79.

Bourdieu, P. 1990. The logic of practice. Stanford University Press, Stanford Calif.

Bradley, P. 2019. Integrating sustainable development into economics curriculum: A case study analysis and sector wide survey of barriers. Journal of Cleaner Production. 209, 333-352.

Bradley, P., 2021. A review of frameworks for understanding the institutional eco- nomics of sustainable development. Economics Working Paper Series, University of the West of England. Available at: https://www2.uwe.ac.uk/faculties/BBS/ Documents/Bradley _ Institutional- economics- frameworks _ 2020.pdf . Accessed: 04.11.20.

Bradley, P., 2021a. An institutional economics framework to explore sustainable production and consumption. Sustainable Production and Consumption, 27, 1317-1339.

Catherine B., Petit, O., Romagny B. 2011. Le courant des Common-Pool Resources: Un bilan critique. In Pouvoirs, Sociétés et Nature au Sud de la Méditerranée, edited by T. Dahou, M. Elloumi F. Molle, M. Gassab and B. Romagny, pp. 29-52. Paris: Karthala, 2011.

Challen, R., 2000. Institutions, Transaction Costs and Environmental Policy: Institutional Reform for Water Resources. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

Chwe, M.S.Y., 1999. Structure and strategy of collective action. The American Journal of Sociology. 105, 128–156.

Chwe, M.S.Y. 2001. Rational ritual: culture, coordination, and common knowledge. Princeton University Press, Princeton N.J.

Clayton, A.M.H., Radcliffe, N.J., 1996. Sustainability: a Systems Approach. Earthscan, London.

Clement, F. 2010. Analysing decentralised natural resource governance: proposition for a “politicised” institutional analysis and development framework. Policy Science. 43, 129–156.

Costanza, R., Low, B.S., Ostrom, E., Wilson, J. 2001. *Institutions, ecosystems, and sustainability*. Lewis Publishers, New York, New York, USA.

Council for Science and Technology 2020. Achieving net zero carbon emissions through a whole systems approach. Advice to the Prime Minister on using a whole systems approach to deliver a better transition towards the target of achieving net-zero emissions by 2050. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/achieving-net-zero-carbon-emissions-through-a-whole-systems-approach Accessed: 07.12.21

Cox, M., Ostrom, E. 2010. Applying a social-ecological systems framework to the study of the Taos valley irrigation system over time. Paper presented at the 13th economics of infrastructures conference, Delft University of Technology, May 27-28, 2010, Delft, the Netherlands.

Cleaver, F. 2003. Reinventing institutions: brokerage and the social embeddedness of natural resource management. In: Benjaminsen, T.A., Lund, C. (Eds.), Securing Land Rights in Africa. Frank Cass, in association with EADI, European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes, London.

Collier, P. 2002. Social capital and poverty: microeconomic perspective. In: Grootaert, C., Bastelaer, T.V. (Eds.), The role of social capital in development: An empirical assessment. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Cole, D., Epstein, G., McGinnis M.D. 2014. Digging deeper into Hardin's pasture: the complex institutional structure of 'the tragedy of the commons'. Journal of Institutional Economics, 10, 3, 353–369.

Commons, John R. 1922. A Progressive Tax on Bare Land Values. Political Science Quarterly. 37, 1, 41-68.

Craig, R. K. 2010. Stationarity is dead: long live transformation: five principles for climate change adaptation law. Harvard Environmental Law Review. 31, 9-75.

Daly, H. E. 1974. The economics of the steady state. American Economic Review (Papers and Proceedings). 64, 2, 15–21.

Darwin, C.R. 1859. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life, 1st ed. Murray, London.

Dasgupta P. 2021. The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/957291/Dasgupta_Review_-_Full_Report.pdf Accessed: 05.02.21

DeCaro, D. A., Chaffin, B. C., Schlager, E., Garmestani, A.S., Ruhl J. B. 2017. Legal and institutional foundations of adaptive environmental governance. Ecology and Society. 22, 1, 32.

Dequech 2002. The Demarcation between the "Old" and the "New" Institutional Economics: Recent Complications. Journal of Economic Issues. 36, 2, 565-572.

Diamond, J. 1997. Guns, Germs and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies. W.W. Norton, New York.

Dupuy, R., Roman, P., Mougenot B. 2015. Analyzing Socio-Environmental Conflicts with a Commonsian Transactional Framework: Application to a Mining Conflict in Peru. Journal of Economics Issues. 49, 4, 895 -921.

Dzeraviaha, I. 2018. Mainstream economics toolkit within the ecological economics framework. Ecological Economics. 148, 15–21.

Engeström, Y. 1987. Learning by Expanding: An Activity-theoretical Approach to Developmental Research. Orienta-konsultit, Helsinki.

Ervin, D.E., Graffy, E.A. 1996. Leaner environmental policies for agriculture. Choices. 1996, 27–33 (Fourth Quarter).

Engeström, Y. 1999. Activity theory and individual and social transformation. In: Engeström, Y., Miettinen, R., Punamäki, R.L. (Eds.), Perspectives on Activity Theory. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 19–38.

Engeström, Y. 2001. Expansive learning at work: toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. Journal of Education and Work. 14, 1, 133–156.

Engeström, Y., 2010. Activity theory and learning at work. In: Malloch, M., Cairns, L., Evans, K., O'Connor, B.N. (Eds.), The SAGE Handbook of Workplace Learning. Sage publications, London, pp. 86–104.

Feeny, D., Berkes, F., McCay, B.J., Acheson, J.M., 1990. The tragedy of the commons: twenty-two years later. Hum. Ecol. 18, 1–19.

Feiock, R.C. 2013. The Institutional Collective Action Framework. The Policy Studies Journal. 41, 3, 397 - 425.

Fisher, B.,Kulindwa,K.,Mwanyoka,I.,Turner,R.K.,Burgess, N.D. 2010.Common pool resource management and PES: lessons and constraints for water PES in Tanzania. Ecological Economics.69, 6, 1253–1261.

Garrick, D., Whitten, S.M., Coggan, A. 2013. Understanding the evolution and performance of water markets and allocation policy: A transaction costs analysis framework. Ecological Economics 88, 195–205.

Gerber, J.D., Knoepfel, P.,, Nahratha, S., Varone F. 2009. Institutional Resource Regimes: Towards sustainability through the combination of property-rights theory and policy analysis. Ecological Economics. 68, 798 – 809.

Gislain, J.J. 2002. Causalité institutionnelle: la futurité chez J. R. Commons. Economie et Institutions. 1, 1, 47-66.

Granovetter, M., 1973. The strength of weak ties. American Journal of Sociology. 78, 1360–1380.

Grothmann, T., Grecksch, G., Winges, M., Siebenhüner B. 2013. Assessing institutional capacities to adapt to climate change: integrating psychological dimensions in the Adaptive Capacity Wheel. Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 13, 3369–3384.

Gupta, J., Termeer, K., Klostermann, J., Meijerink, S., van den Brink, M., Jong, P., Nooteboom, S., and Bergsmaa, E. 2010. The Adaptive Capacity Wheel: a method to assess the inherent characteristics of institutions to enable the adaptive capacity of society. Environ. Sci. Policy, 13, 459–471.

Hägerstrand, T., 2001. A look at the political geography of environmental management. In: Buttimer, A. (Ed.), Sustainable Landscapes and Lifeways: Scale and Appropriateness. Cork University Press, Ireland.
Harris, J. 2001. Depoliticizing development: the World Bank and social capital. Anthem, London.

Hodgson G.M. 2010. Darwinian coevolution of organizations and the environment. Ecological Economics. 69, 700 – 706.

Holling, C. S. 2001. Understanding the complexity of economic, ecological, and social systems. Ecosystems. 4, 5, 390-405.

Hiedanpää J., and D.W., Bromley. 2014. Payments for ecosystem services: durable habits, dubious nudges, and doubtful efficacy. Journal of Institutional Economics. 10, 2, 175–195.

IDGEC Scientific Planning Committee. 1999. Institutional Dimensions of Global Environmental Change, IHDP Report No. 9, Bonn.

Ishihara H., Pascual, U. 2009. Social capital in community level environmental governance: A critique. Ecological Economics. 68, 1549-1562.

Janssen, M.A., Anderies, J.M. 2013. A multi-method approach to study robustness of social–ecological systems: the case of small-scale irrigation systems. 9, 4, 427 – 447.

Janssen, M.A. 2006. Historical institutional analysis of social–ecological systems. Journal of Institutional Economics. 2, 2, 127–131

Kapp, K.W. 1969. On the nature and significance of social costs. Kyclos. 22, 2, 334-347.

Kapp, K.W., 1970. Environmental disruption and social costs: a challenge to economics. Kyklos. 23, 4, 833–848.

Kahn, A.E. 1966. The tyranny of small decisions: market failures, imperfections, and the limits of economics. Kyklos. 19, 23–47.

Kauko T. 2012. An Institutional Analysis of Property Development, Good Governance and Urban Sustainability. European Planning Studies, 20, 12, 2053-2071.

Kim S.H., 2007. Evaluation of negative environmental impacts of electricity generation: Neoclassical and institutional approaches. Energy Policy. 35, 413–423.

Kiser, L.L., Ostrom, E. 1982. The three worlds of action: A metatheoretical synthesis of institutional approaches. In Strategies of political enquiry, ed. Elinor Ostrom. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 179-222.

Kolinjivadi, V., Adamowski, J., Kosoy N. 2014. Recasting payments for ecosystem services (PES) in water resource management: A novel institutional approach. Ecosystem Services. 10, 144–154.

Léopolda, M., Thébaudc, O., Charles, A. 2019. The dynamics of institutional innovation: Crafting co-management in small-scale fisheries through action research. Journal of Environmental Management 237, 187–199.

Leontév, A.N. 1978. Activity, Consciousness, Personality. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Lenzen, M., J. Murray, F. Sack, Wiedmann T. 2007. Shared producer and consumer responsibility — Theory and practice. Ecological Economics. 61, 1, 27 - 42.

Levänen, JO, HukkinenJ,I. 2013. A methodology for facilitating the feedback between mental models and institutional change in industrial ecosystem governance: A waste management case-study from northern Finland. Ecological Economics. 87, 15–23.

Luria, A.R. 1976. Cognitive Development. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Mayr, E. 1991. One Long Argument: Charles Darwin and the Genesis of Modern Evolutionary Thought. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Marshall, G.R., 2005. Economics for Collaborative Environmental Management: Renegotiating the Commons. Earthscan, London.

Marshall, G., 2005. Economics for Collaborative Environmental Management: Regenerating the Commons. Earthscan, London.

Marshall G.R., 2013. Transaction costs, collective action and adaptation in managing complex social–ecological systems. Ecological Economics. 88, 185–194.

McCann L. 2013. Transaction costs and environmental policy design. Ecological Economics. 88, 253–262.

McGinnis, M. D., Ostrom, E. 2014. Social-ecological system framework: initial changes and continuing challenges. Ecology and Society. 19, 2, 30.

Mirowski, P. 1987. The Philosophical Bases of Institutionalist Economics. Journal of Economic Issues. 21, 3, 1001-1038.

Mosse, D., 2006. Collective action, common property, and social capital in South India: an anthropological commentary. Economic Development and Cultural Change. 54, 698–724.

Ness, B., Anderberg, S., Olsson L. 2010. Structuring problems in sustainability science: The multi-level DPSIR framework. Geoforum. 41, 479–488.

North, D.C., 1990. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge University Press, New York.

North, D.C., 2005. Understanding the Process of Economic Change. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Ostrom, E. 1990. Governing the commons. The evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge University Press, New York, New York, USA.

Ostrom, E., 1990. Governing the Commons: the Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Ostrom, E. 2000. Understanding social capital: learning from the analysis and experience of participation. In: Dasgupta, P. (Ed.), Social capital: a multifaceted perspective. World Bank, Washington D.C.

Ostrom 2009. A General Framework for Analyzing Sustainability of Social-Ecological Systems. Science. 325, 419-422.

Ostrom, E., Ahn, T.K. 2003. Foundations of social capital. Edward Elgar Publishers, Cheltenham, UK.

Ostrom, E. 2011. Background on the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework. The Policy Studies Journal. 39, 1, 7-27.

Oswald, Y., Owen A., & Steinberger J.K. 2020. Large inequality in international and intranational energy footprints between income groups and across consumption categories. Nature Energy. 5, 231–239.

Paavola J.,, Adger, W.N. 2005. Institutional ecological economics. Ecological Economics 53, 353– 368.

Pennington, M. 2013. Elinor Ostrom and the robust political economy of common-pool resources. Journal of Institutional Economics. 9, 4, 449–468.

Polishchuk, Y.,Rauschmayer,F.,2012. Beyond “benefits”? Looking at ecosystem services through the capability approach. Ecological Economics. 81, 103–111.

Pretty, J., Ward, H., 2001. Social capital and the environment. World Development 29, 209–227.

Prutsch, A., McCallum, S., Grothmann, T., Schauser, I., and Swart, R. 2014. Facing the specific challenges of adaptation, in: Climate Change Adaptation Manual – Lessons Learned from European and Other Industrialized Countries, edited by: Prutsch, A., Grothmann, T., McCallum, S., Schauser, I., and Swart, R., Routledge, London, UK, and New York, USA, 7–13.

Putnam, R. 1993. Making democracy work: civic traditions in modern Italy. Princeton University Press, Princeton N.J.

Putnam, R., 1993. Making democracy work: civic traditions in modern Italy. Princeton University Press, Princeton N.J.

Quiggin, J., 2008. Uncertainty, awareness and the precautionary principle. Presentation to the Symposium on Progress and Problems in Measuring Sustainable Development, 4 April.

Ray, S., Bijarnia, M. 2007. Power relations and institutional outcomes: a case of pastureland development in semi-arid Rajasthan. Ecological Economics. 62, 360–372.

Richards, R.J. 1987. Darwin and the Emergence of Evolutionary Theories of Mind and Behavior. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Roggero M., Thiel A. 2018. Adapting as usual: integrative and segregative institutions shaping adaptation to climate change in local public administrations. Journal of Institutional Economics. 14, 3, 557–578.

Rudd, M.A. 2004. An institutional framework for designing and monitoring ecosystem-based fisheries management policy experiments. Ecological Economics. 48, 109– 124.

Ruhl, J. B. 2011. General design principles for resilience and adaptive capacity in legal systems: applications to climate change adaptation law. North Carolina Law Review. 89, 1374-1401.

Rutherford M. 1994. Institutions in Economics. The Old and the New Institutionalism. Cambridge University Press.

Sarker, A. 2013. The role of state-reinforced self-governance in averting the tragedy of the irrigation commons in Japan. Public Administration. 91, 3, 727-743.

Sarker, A., Blomquist, W. 2019. Addressing misperceptions of Governing the Commons. Journal of Institutional Economics. 15, 2, 281-301.

Sen, A. 2010.The Idea of Justice. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Simon, H.A. (Ed.). 1973. The Organization of Complex Systems. George Braziller, New York.

Söderbaum, P. 1990. Neoclassical and Institutional Approaches to Environmental Economics. Journal of Economic Issues. 24, 2, 481 - 492.

Söderbaum, P. 1992. Neoclassical and institutional approaches to development and the environment. Ecological Economics. 5, 2, 127-144.

Stern, N. 2006. The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stern, P.C., Dietz, T., Dolsak, N., Ostrom, E., Stonich, S. 2002. Knowledge and questions after 15 years of research. In: Ostrom, E., Dietz, T., Dolsak, N., Stern, P.C., Stovich, S., Weber, E.U. (Eds.), The Drama of the Commons. National Academy Press, Washington, pp. 445–489.

Swaney, J.A. 1987. Elements of a neoinstitutional environmental economics. Journal of Economic Issues. 21, 4, 1739–1779.

Teranisi, S., 2001. Social cost approach to environmental problems. In: Sawa, T., Ueta, K. (Eds.), Economic Theory of Environment. Iwanami Shyoten, pp. 65–94 (in Japanese).

Théret, B. 2001. Saisir les faits économiques: La méthode Commons. Cahiers D'Économie Politique. 40-41, 79-13.

Vatn, A., 2005. Rationality, Institutions and Environmental Policy. Ecological Economics. 55, 2, 203-217.

Vatn, A., 2010. An Institutional Analysis of Payments for Environmental Services. Ecological Economics. 69, 1245-1252.

Vatn, A., 2012. Governing the Environment: The Institutional Economics Approach. In Marletto, G., (ed.): Creating a Sustainable Economy. An Institutional and Evolutionary Approach to Environmental Policy. New York: Routledge, pp. 67-91.

Vatn, A., 2015a. Environmental Governance. Institutions, Policies and Actions. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Vatn, A., 2015b. Markets in environmental governance. From theory to practice. Ecological Economics. 117, 225-233.

Vignola, R.,McDaniels,T.L.,Scholz,R.W.,2012. Negotiation analysis for mechanisms to deliver ecosystem services: the case of soil conservation in Costa Rica. Ecological Economics, 75,22–31.

Vygotsky, L.S. 1978. Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Vygotsky, L.S. 1981. The genesis of higher mental functions. In: Wertsch, J.V. (Ed.), The Concept of Activity in Soviet Psychology. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk.

Wiedmann T, Lenzen M, Keyßer LT, Steinberger JK. 2020. Scientists' warning on affluence. Nature Communications. 11, 1.

Williamson, O, E. 2000. The New Institutional Economics: Taking Stock, Looking Ahead. Journal of Economic Literature. 38, 3, 595-613.

World Wildlife Fund. 2020. Living Planet Report 2020: Beyond the curve of biodiversity loss. Available at: https://livingplanet.panda.org/en-gb/ Accessed: 12.02.21

World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987. Our Common Future. Oxford University Press, Oxford, Available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/5987our-common-future.pdf. Accessed: 3.11.20.

Yashiro,M.,Duraiappah,A.,Kosoy,N. 2013.Chapter10:Anestedinstitutional approach for managing bundled ecosystem services: experience from managing Satoyama landscapes in Japan.In:Rival,L.,Muradian,R.(Eds.),Governing the Provision of Ecosystem Services. Springer, London,pp.191–206.