Policy Decision Support Through Social Simulation

Luis Antunes
GUESS/LabMAg/Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

Ana Respício
Operations Research Center/GUESS/Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

João Balsa
GUESS/LabMAg/Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

Helder Coelho
GUESS/LabMAg/Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

INTRODUCTION

Public policies are concerned with the definition of guidelines that promote the achievement of specific goals by a society/community of citizens. Citizens share a common geographic space under a set of political governance rules and, at the same time, are subject to common cultural influences. On the other hand, citizens have differentiated behaviours due to social, economical, and educational aspects as well as due to their individual personalities. Public interest relates with individual interests held in common—the result of joining the individual goals for the community. However, community goals may conflict with individuals' self-interests.

The outcome of public policies is emergent from this very complex set of rules and social and individual behaviours. Decision support in such a context is a hard endeavour that should be founded in comprehensive exploration of the set of available designs for the individual actors and the collective mechanisms of the society. Social simulation is a field that can be useful in such a complex problem, since it draws from heterogeneous rationality theory into sociology, economics, and politics, having computational tools as aid to perform analysis of the conjectures and hypotheses put forward, allowing the direct observation of the consequences of the design options made. Through social simulation it is possible to gain insights about the constraints and rules that effectively allow for the design and deployment of policies. The exploration of this set of possible models for individual actors, their relationships, and collective outcome of their individual actions is crucial for effective and efficient decision support.

Ever since the work of Simon (1955), it has been known that perfect rationality is not attainable in a useful and timely fashion. Social simulation provides an alternative approach to limited rationality, since it encompasses both observer and phenomenon in the experimentation cycle. Decision support systems can be enhanced with these exploratory components, which allow for the rehearsal of alternative scenarios, and to observe in silica the outcomes of different policy designs before deploying them in real settings.

BACKGROUND

The notion of agent and computational simulation are the master beams of the new complexity science (Conte et al, 1997; Kauffman, 2000). Computational simulation is methodologically appropriate when a social phenomenon is not directly accessible (Gilbert & Doran, 1994). One of the reasons for this inaccessibility is that the target phenomenon is so complex that the researcher cannot grasp its relevant elements. Simulation is based in a more observable phenomenon than the target one. Often the study of the model is as interesting as the study of the phenomenon itself, and the model becomes a legitimate object of research (Conte & Gilbert, 1995). There is a shift from the focus of research of natural societies (the behaviour of a society model can be observed "in vitro" to test the underlying theory) to the artificial societies themselves (study of

possible societies). The questions to be answered cease to be "what happened?" and "what may have happened?" and become "what are the necessary conditions for a given result to be obtained?" and cease to have a purely descriptive character to acquire a prescriptive one. A new methodology can be synthesised and designated "exploratory simulation" (Conte & Gilbert, 1995). The prescriptive character (exploration) cannot be simplistically resumed to optimisation, such as the descriptive character is not a simple reproduction of the real social phenomena.

In social sciences, an appropriate methodology for computational simulation could be the one outlined by Nigel Gilbert (2000): (1) identify a "puzzle," a question whose answer is unknown; (2) definition of the target of modelling; (3) normally, some observations of the target are necessary to provide the parameters and initial conditions of the model; (4) after developing the model (probably in the form of a computer program), the simulation is executed and its results are registered; (5) verification assures the model is correctly developed; (6) validation ensures that the behaviour of the model corresponds to the behaviour of the target; and (7) finally, the sensitivity analysis tells how sensitive the model is to small changes in the parameters and initial conditions.

We are not far from the traditional computer science experimental methodology, but there are fundamental differences: in Gilbert's (2000) methodology there is a return to the original phenomenon, and not only to the specification. The emphasis is still on the system, and the confrontation of the model with reality is done once and for all, and represented by causal relations. All the validation is done at the level of the model and the journey back to reality is done already in generalisation. In some way, that difference is acceptable, since the object of the disciplines is also different.

But, is it possible to do better? Is the validation step in Gilbert's (2000) methodology a realist one? Or can we only compare models with other models and never with reality? If our computational model produces results that are adequate to what is known about the real phenomenon, can we say that our model is validated, or does that depend on the source of knowledge about that phenomenon? Is that knowledge not obtained also from models? For instance, from results of question-

naires filled by a representative sample of the population—where is the real phenomenon here? Which of the models is then the correct one?

The answer could be in Troitzsch (1997): social sciences have an exploratory purpose, but also a predictive and even prescriptive one. Before we conduct simulations that allow predictions and prescriptions, it is necessary to understand the phenomena, and for that one uses exploratory simulation, the exploration of simulated (small) worlds. But when we do prediction, the real world gives the answer about the validity of the model.

Once collected the results of simulations, they have to be confronted with the phenomenon, for validation. But this confrontation is no more than analysis. With the model of the phenomenon to address and the model of the data to collect, we have again a simplification of the problem, and the question of interpretation returns, which we have already found in localised experimentation. It certainly is not possible to suppress the role of the researcher, ultimate interpreter of all experiments, be it classical or simulation. The bottom-up approach which forms the basis of computational simulation forces us to consider the concept of emergence.

When conducting experiments and simulations, it is a constant worry of the designer to verify if the so-called emergent behaviours would not be preprogrammed, in the sense of being an inevitable consequence of the way the agents were built. Gilbert (1995) provides a criterion to distinguish emergent behaviour, in Gestalt sense, according to Castelfranchi's (2001) account from behaviour predictable from the individual characteristics of the agents: it should not be possible to analytically derive the global emergent behaviour solely from the consideration of the agents' properties. That is, the analysis has to fail, and the simulation has to be inevitable to discover those properties. But emergence may not even be a stable or interesting property of systems: what is interesting is to study the system macroproperties and their relations with its microproperties (Gilbert, 1995). The exploration of the micro-macro link involved the study of how the global vision of society determines or guides individual behaviours, and how individual behaviours determine global behaviour (Conte & Castelfranchi, 1995).

Related Content

The Quality Amplification Challenge: Throughput Time's Effect on Quality Variability and Quality Loss

Zhen Li, Pamela Rogersand Wai Kwan Lau (2020). *International Journal of Strategic Decision Sciences (pp. 25-45).*

www.irma-international.org/article/the-quality-amplification-challenge/261800

Decision Making in the Petroleum Industry in Africa: Criteria, Time, and Relationships

Mariano Carrera (2021). *International Journal of Strategic Decision Sciences (pp. 1-13).*

www.irma-international.org/article/decision-making-petroleum-industry-africa/298590

Export-Led Recovery in Portugal: Can It Also Sustain Growth?

Gonçalo Carvalho, Marta Simõesand António Portugal Duarte (2017). *Tools and Techniques for Economic Decision Analysis (pp. 129-150).*

www.irma-international.org/chapter/export-led-recovery-in-portugal/170898

Integrating Knowledge-Driven and Data-Driven Methodologies for an Efficient Clinical Decision Support System

Okure Udo Obot, Kingsley Friday Attaiand Gregory O. Onwodi (2023). *Diverse Perspectives and State-of-the-Art Approaches to the Utilization of Data-Driven Clinical Decision Support Systems (pp. 1-28).*

www.irma-international.org/chapter/integrating-knowledge-driven-and-data-driven-methodologies-for-an-efficient-clinical-decision-support-system/313778

Optimal Thresholds of an Infinite Buffer Discrete-Time Two-Server System with Triadic Policy

Veena Goswamiand G. B. Mund (2011). *International Journal of Strategic Decision Sciences (pp. 75-88).*

www.irma-international.org/article/optimal-thresholds-infinite-buffer-discrete/60532