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Part One

What is complexity theory?
Complexity theory provides:

- An understanding of how systems change over time
- Guidance on policy research methodology
- Ideas on intervention design
- Guidance on evaluation methodology
- Particularly useful for ‘wicked’ problems?
### Wicked vs Tame Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Wicked’ Problem</th>
<th>‘Tame’ Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No definite formulation of problem</td>
<td>Well-defined and stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continually evolves</td>
<td>Know when a solution is reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions are better or worse</td>
<td>Solutions clearly right or wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many causal levels</td>
<td>Causes are evident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complex systems:

• Are made up of multiple interacting agents
• Include other complex systems (nested systems)
• Are historically determined, exhibit patterns of behaviour
• Develop through non-linear interactions
• Develop ‘emergent’ properties
Restricted vs General Complexity

Restricted Complexity:
- The search for a few simple rules that govern self-organisation within a system
- Structure as micro-emergent, little causal power

General Complexity:
- Understanding the whole and parts of a system, and their interaction (mechanism-context configurations).
- Structure has power, so do agents.

Part Two
Examples of use in policy work
How to achieve target of electric cars (Querini & Benetto. (2014) *Transportation Research Part A. 70(1)*)

- Use of Agent-Based Model to test scenarios of achieving Luxembourg’s aim of 40,000 electric cars by 2020.
- Requires sympathetic policies in Belgium and Germany
- Aided by widespread public charging points
- Identifies household characteristics most likely to respond to policy incentives
To inform investment in smoking cessation services in NZ (Tobias, Cavana, Bloomfield. (2010). *American J. Public Health*. 100(7))

- Compared simulation of business-as-usual with enhanced service scenario on smoking rates over 50 yrs
- Enhanced services showed 11% greater decline
- Analysis led directly to increase in funding by $42 million over 4 years
Health Inequalities in England (Blackman et al 2011, Social Science and Medicine. 72(12))

• Use of Qualitative Comparative Analysis to identify factors associated with narrowing of inequalities in cancer and cardiovascular disease across local authority areas in England
Framing Considerations (less coherence in literature):

- Explicit use of complexity concepts (e.g. emergence)
- Defining appropriate level of analysis
- Timing of evaluation

Method considerations (more coherence in literature):

- Developing a view of the system over time
- Mixed methods
- Participatory methods
- Case study design

Policy Trends

Broad trends in policy work consistent with (but not limited to) complexity

• Understanding trajectory through systems
• Considering interactions between programmes and institutions
• Understanding what works, for whom and why
• Increased stakeholder engagement and participation
Part Three

Research Findings
Results discussed:
1. Key informant interviews – use of complexity in policy and evaluation
2. Case study – Evaluation use
3. Q Methodology study – what is useful evidence and what do policymakers want?
Key informant interviews

- 41 participants
- Mixture of policy and evaluation professionals and academics
- All had direct experience of applying systems thinking and/or complexity theory
- Most from NZ
Complex Interventions

- Complexity feature of intervention
- Narrower scope for applying complexity

Complex Systems

- Complexity feature of systems
- Wider scope for applying complexity
Barriers to Application

• Resource constraints
• Dominance of existing approaches
  – Views of “legitimate” evidence
  – Expectations of stakeholders
• Purpose of evaluation – accountability vs learning
• Limited practitioner knowledge of complexity
• Limits to current complexity methods and tools
Opportunities for Application

• Organisational Environment
  – Willingness to try new approaches, increasing focus on collaborative policy and programmes
  – Supportive managers
  – Budget surplus vs austerity

• Political Environment
  – Expectation for cross-agency action
  – Desire to show what worked despite complexity

• Social Science Environment
  – Growing expectation of mixed methods
  – 20 years of sympathetic evaluation methodologies
Case Study – Evaluation Use Fruit in Schools Programme

Findings:
Part A had good impacts with combined with part C in the context of coordinated action and external supports.

Context:
Change of government

Decisions:
- Part A is effective
- Continue part A
- Discontinue part C
- Discontinue supports
- Stop tracking impacts

Findings:
- Biggest impact for agency x
- Smaller impact for agency y

Decisions all made by agency y

Methods

Step 1
Exploring experience of using complexity theory

41 Key informant interviews

Step 2
Themes regarding use of evaluation and “good” evidence

Thematic analysis

Step 3
Exploring policymaker understanding of evaluation evidence and uses

Q Methodology
Q Methodology … helps quantify human subjectivity in a way that allows for statistical interpretation while leaving the scope for in-depth, qualitative interpretation.

Q Methodology Relationship with Complexity Theory

- Based on abductive reasoning
- Starts from quite open boundaries of an issue and allows participants to construct boundaries and interactions from their perspective
- By ranking one statement compared to others, it begins to capture interaction
- Provides holistic understanding of perspectives
### Q Methodology Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme from interviews</th>
<th>Theme summary – sources (references)</th>
<th>Q-sort Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is valid evidence</td>
<td>Certainty vs uncertainty</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Evaluations need to consider how programmes interact and consider holistic outcomes.</td>
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Q Methodology Study

- Concourse – defined by interview themes
- S sample – 35 statements
- P sample – 15 participants
  - From 8 government agencies – social, natural, economic areas
  - 4 were also key informant interview participants
  - 7 had experience in applying systems approaches
  - 10 primarily in evaluation roles, 5 in policy roles
Two factors identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Sorts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Factors 1 and 2 intersect in a concept of consensus.
“Traditional analysts learning new tricks”

The analysts role is to provide a balanced perspective of stakes involved, but ultimately politicians who represent constituents make the value judgements.
What constitutes good evidence?

- Numbers are important but not paramount
- Stories are useful, but not always persuasive
- Understand what works and why for programme learning
- More focus on learning for system improvement than narrow accountability
- Communicating complex and uncertain evidence is key task
“Analysts as process facilitators”

Policy decisions are not an endpoint but a process. Analysts actively draw boundaries around an issue and strive to communicate to decision makers a multi-perspective view. Promoting consensus decision making.
What constitutes good evidence?

- Promoting understanding of diversity of perspectives around an issue
- Mixed methods – stories and numbers
- More critical focus on boundaries and range of outcomes
- Views accountability as learning to improve outcomes for stakeholders
Factor 1

- Complexity theory offers some new tools for policy
- Tools applied within constrained political process that favours simplicity of findings

Factor 2

- Complexity theory informs more participatory policy processes
- Analysis tools/process to be inclusive and move towards consensus
Network Governance

Complexity literature

‘Wicked’ problems

Participatory methods

Network Governance literature
Public policy making and implementation through a web of relationships between government, business and civil society actors


- Developed to create or manage solutions for ‘wicked’ problems
- Can be closed set of experts, or open network of participants
- Can be mandated by government or generated from grass roots
Implementing Complexity through Network Governance:

- Network governance consistent with complexity design principles
- Policy and implementation through a web of relationships
- Multiple perspectives within deliberative decision-making
- Space and ability to consider complex findings
- Require delegated authority and political trust
Part Four

Implications for policy work
Implications of complexity theory for policy practice

Eppel, Matheson & Walton (2011):

• Surprises will happen – well articulated vision is useful, hard targets less so

• Policy processes are continuous. Design and implementation and evaluation go hand in hand

• Local flexibility in intervention design required

• Complexity implies there is no one solution to any problem, nor than one solution will work across systems

Implications of research findings

- Application of complexity tools within a factor 1 perspective represents a relatively minor advance to policy analysis.
- Even when complexity lens asked for, the policy process that the results of analysis are applied within may not embrace complexity.
- Lack of familiarity with complexity tools a barrier to implementation.
Implications of research findings

- A more radical approach is factor 2 combined with a wider application of network governance

- Direct engagement and empowerment of actors across a system to make ongoing reflective use of data for programme improvement

- Acknowledge uncertainty in outcome, develop certainty in process
A revolution?

- Factor 1 is not a revolution
- Factor 2 could be – but – complexity theory is providing additional lens to this approach. Participatory policy methodologies have been around for a while informed from multiple theoretical perspectives.
- Complexity theory can *and should* be more than a shiny new model for analysis. But it is less than an entire revolution for policy work.
CAS as policy theory scaffold

- Critical examination of problem definitions
- Critical Systems
- Complex Adaptive Systems
- Network Governance
- Policy Theory
- Post-positivist policy theory: Multiple Streams; Deliberative
- Agency-structure interaction
- Devolved–real-time evaluation - reaction
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