

FORESIGHT FRONTLINES: GLOBAL INSIGHTS ON STRATEGIC FORESIGHT IN POLICY-MAKING

Marina ANDEVA

Professor, University American College Skopje
marina.andeva@uacs.edu.mk

Abstract:

In an era marked by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA) (Bennis and Nanus, 1985), governments worldwide are increasingly turning to strategic foresight to anticipate and shape future challenges and opportunities. This paper presents a secondary research analysis of the institutionalization and application of strategic foresight in policy-making across diverse geopolitical contexts. By examining governmental foresight frameworks, national foresight programs, and policy innovation labs from countries including Finland (Heo and Seo, 2021) (OECD, 2022), Singapore (CSF, n/a), Canada (Government of Canada, 2022), and the European Union (European Commission, 2020), the study identifies common patterns, enabling conditions, and obstacles in embedding foresight into governance structures. The research also explores the varied cultural, political, and administrative lenses through which foresight is interpreted and operationalized, offering a comparative perspective on its effectiveness and impact. Ultimately, the paper proposes a typology of foresight adoption in policy-making and offers reflections on how global practices can inform more anticipatory and resilient governance. This contribution aims to enrich the discourse on strategic foresight as a critical competency for future-ready policy development.

Keywords: *strategic foresight; policy-making; comparative governance; anticipatory governance; foresight typology*

Introduction

Modern human existence is embedded within a landscape of profound uncertainty, encompassing both immediate concerns and long-term horizons extending several decades into the future. Individuals respond to this pervasive uncertainty by adopting varying temporal philosophies: some prioritize present-centered living, emphasizing immediate experiences, while others engage in strategic planning aimed at shaping future outcomes. These differing approaches are not purely matters of individual disposition but are also significantly influenced by underlying personality traits and the cultural frameworks of the societies in which individuals are embedded. Together, these factors critically shape perceptions of the future and strategies for managing uncertainty.

The cultural framework of a society significantly shapes state policies and the ways in which policymaking processes are structured, particularly in determining whether governance adopts a future-oriented perspective. Societal values regarding time—whether emphasizing immediate concerns or long-term outcomes—profoundly influence the extent to which governments engage in anticipatory, strategic planning. This paper aims to explore the psychological foundations of time perspective and future orientation, building on key contributions from the psychological literature that explain individual and collective differences in how the future is perceived, valued, and acted upon. Drawing on this theoretical basis, the paper further proposes a typology of foresight adoption in policymaking, offering reflections on how global practices can inform the development of more anticipatory and resilient governance systems. To illustrate these dynamics, the analysis examines governmental foresight frameworks, national foresight programs, and policy innovation initiatives across several

leading examples, including Finland, Singapore, Canada and the European Union. Through this dual approach—linking psychological understandings of future thinking with concrete practices in public governance—the paper seeks to demonstrate how embedding future-oriented cognition within institutional structures can strengthen strategic capacities to address complex, long-term societal challenges. By synthesizing insights from psychology, policy science, and international case studies, the paper advocates for a more systematic integration of foresight into public decision-making processes, moving beyond ad hoc innovation toward resilient, future-ready governance.

Time Perspective and Future Thinking: Psychological Foundations for Strategic Foresight

A large number of studies have investigated the psychological construct of time perspective to gain insight into how people perceive and relate to the future in terms of cognition, behavior, and decision-making. The literature is reviewed critically in this part.

Time perspective (TP) is a basic and integral psychological phenomenon, that determines how people mentally divide their experiences into past, people process information in individuals with long past TP and future frames (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999). Zimbardo and Boyd's landmark theory depicts TP as a stable dispositional factor and suggests that people have dominant TP, such as Past-Negative, Present-Hedonistic, and Future-Oriented that influence their daily functioning. They note that, while a balanced time perspective is optimum, the overemphasis on any temporal frame can have enormous implications for judgment and choice.

Basing themselves on this groundwork, Stolarski, Fieulaine, and van Beek (2015) presented further with TP's refinement as well as with its applications in a developmental, cognitive, emotional, and cultural context. They emphasize that TP does not only point to particular individual behaviors, like those in health and consumption, but also provides a basis from which to make sense of wider patterns in society and culture. Their study emphasizes the importance of incorporating TP into cross-disciplinary psychological research to better understand its impact on human behavior.

The concept of future time perspective (FTP) is further elaborated by Kooij et al. (2018) through a systemic review and meta-analysis. Their results indicate that FTP and significant correlates of achievement (well-being, health behavior, and retirement planning) are predicted by FTP, even after accounting for broad personality. They construe FTP as a mutable cognitive-motivational precursor, that changes throughout one's lifespan, and is subject to situational influences, thereby providing robust empirical evidence that increases future orientation can lead to positive individual and organizational consequences.

At the level of decision making, Kogut, Eyal, and Sharon (2017) demonstrate that the link between psychological distance and choices is moderated by FTP. They learned that when people make decisions about the distant future they're thinking in more idealistic, visionary terms, but when they make decisions about the near future, they tend toward the pragmatism. More interestingly, high-future oriented individuals exhibit less inconsistency between near-term and long-term decision and the practical implication of this association is that motivating future orientation is crucial in alleviating temporal biases on important choices.

Other temporal systems are also culturally influenced, as Hofstede (2011) notes. Long-term oriented cultures in his model are those that value persistence and future returns, while short-term oriented cultures focus on short-term gains. This cultural level dimension is consistent with individual level results indicating that societal values strongly support or restrict the temporal perspectives of individuals.

Summing up these contributions, it is evident that TP, particularly FTP, is affected by a combination of cognitive, personality, and cultural dimensions. Temporal biases were first described by Zimbardo and Boyd (1999), and a theoretical explanation comes from the work of Stolarski et al. (2015) and Kooij et al. (2018) also support TP's potential to predict a wide range of life domains. Kogut et al. (2017) provide applied perspectives on decision-making, while Hofstede (2011) situates TP within larger cultural systems. Taken together, the results suggest that cultivating a balanced and future-oriented time perspective can help improve decision quality, strategic planning, and adaptability in a complex and uncertain world.

The insights yielded by these studies not only emphasize the psychological and cultural substrates to future time orientation, they also have important implications for strategic foresight work. A better grasp of how people and organizations perceive and deal with potential changes will strengthen the ability to prepare for the future, develop and manage flexible strategies and strategies with longer-term resilience in a more complex world.

The Role of Strategic Foresight in Future-Ready Policymaking

Strategic foresight and anticipatory governance have become increasingly important frameworks to build the abilities of governments and organizations to anticipate change, manage uncertainty and develop more agile and resilient policies in the future.

Foresight now constitutes a key field in the context of ambiguity about the future allowing organizations and governments to delve into, anticipate, and influence future developments, rather than reacting simply to change (European Commission, 2020; World Economic Forum, 2024). Unlike classic forecasting – which is backward looking and tries to predict the future based on some linear extrapolation of past trends – strategic foresight is concerned with exploring a number of credible futures, recognizing discontinuities and emerging trends. It increases immunity, flexibility and wise choice in a more complicated world. While future talks are embedded into strategic documents and visions, there is often an understanding that the unfolding of future dynamics is of secondary concern. During decision-making for the implementation of plans some of these uncertainties and prospective changes are forcefully brought their way by the use of strategic foresight and it has become a must of the specific planning process (IFRC Solferino Academy, 2023).

Foresight researchers and practitioners emphasize its role in addressing the uncertainties of the drivers of change (Courtney, 2001; Wayland, 2015). Strategic foresight fulfils a number of crucial roles, including for: strategy development (to envision different futures), crisis management (in responding to crises but also imagining long-term implications), strategy stress-testing (to ensure robustness), innovation and stimulation (opening up a range of views and embracing the need for new solutions); and participatory processes (in order to bring the ideas, views and knowledge of marginalized voices to bear on defining desired futures) (IFRC Solferino Academy, 2023). Moreover, it is crucial to differentiate between prediction and anticipation. For the first, predicting project outcomes is based by the past, and generally for short timeframes, whereas foresight takes an exploratory, scenario building pathway, which enable an adaptive and visionary planning over a period (Insight & Foresight, n.d.; TFSX, 2022).

The Framework Foresight by Hines and Bishop (2013) presents a structured way to design future projects. This approach combines domain scanning, trend analysis, scenario generation and implications analysis to inform strategic response. It serves as a modular structure that can be populated with different instruments and methods, providing a flexible and yet structured approach to the foresight process. The progression from “Framework Forecasting” to “Framework Foresight” suggests transition from merely describing the map of futures to shifting it with agency (Hines, 2020).

Meanwhile, the contribution of foresight to decision-making processes at the level of governments is still partial. Based on past patterns policy frameworks that have been developed are usually built on the basis of historical justifications that do not extend to new ways of thinking generated by foresight practices (OECD, n.d). Hence, the potential role of foresight in strengthening anticipatory capabilities in public systems is still underexplored. A large divide is observed between the doing of foresight exercises and the performing of a systematic integration of foresight outcomes into ongoing policy planning and adaptation. As a source of information to help guide experimentation and innovation, strategic foresight is valuable, but it needs to be complemented by wider structural changes to underpin anticipatory governance.

Anticipatory governance, an approach, not a framework, and somewhat closely related to strategic foresight, is a steering system that combines fore sight, prediction and pre-emption actions to effectively manage risks and seize opportunities, whilst still in primis (Fuerth, 2011; Guston, 2014; Heo & Seo, 2021; Ramos, Tönurist & Hanson, 2020). That means embedding foresight in policymaking over policy cycles, giving policymakers the license to test out solutions within lived reality and adjust policies on the basis of increasingly robust evidence. But today, governments are confronted with a

variety of issues – from technological change to uncertainty, multi-causality, short termism and risk aversion – which make it hard to roll out anticipatory approaches (Marchant, 2011; OPSI, 2021).

In the context of fast-paced technological developments and socio-economic changes, the need for foresight-based frameworks has become imperative. Digitalization and disruptive technologies are reconfiguring production systems as well as the nature of skilled work, and social systems, frequently increasing inequality and generating regulatory “pacing problems” in which law falls behind invention. What is difficult for politicians is that they need to balance between system stability and risk-taking and be adaptable to new risks and opportunities. In the context of these dynamics, classical reactive policy making becomes progressively inadequate, requiring more experimental and adaptive primitives based on futures thinking.

In addition, traditional sustainability initiatives to reduce harm are insufficient to address complex societal and environmental change (Camrass, 2020). Both futures thinking and regenerative approaches propose a vision of the future where humans are active and embedded in social and natural systems in a much more transformative manner. In this regard, foresight is critical to give the possibility for politicians and societies to go beyond “business as usual” agendas towards more innovative and sustainable approaches for governing and developing their futures.

Though the importance of foresight and anticipation is increasingly acknowledged, the level of systematic application differs greatly between national contexts. Institutional foresight has been institutionalized in countries like Finland with the adoption of futures thinking in the legislative process such as the Parliamentary Committee for the Future (Heo & Seo, 2021; OECD, 2022). The Centre for Strategic Futures in Singapore has prioritized futuring and long-range strategic analysis for their national planning (CSF, n.d.). Policy Horizons Canada has also integrated foresight in federal policy processes to envision changes to society. The EU has further stepped up its strategic foresight activities with plans, led by the European Commission, to prepare across several sectors for resilience and preparedness (OECD, 2022).

These cases illustrate that strategic foresight, while essential for dealing with complex futures, delivers its ultimate value only when situated inside more comprehensive anticipatory governance frameworks. A framing of this challenge is the nature of governance: If foresight-informed governance is to be effective, it cannot simply be to answer the question of what might the future look like; it should be about creating knowledge on the future and structures, processes, and mindsets powerful enough to adapt on the go. Realizing this transformation demands not only technical foresight and expertise in methods, but also cultural and organizational change toward proactive, inclusive, and resilient policy making.

Based on this rationale, this paper considers the extent to which strategic foresight and anticipatory capacities have been institutionalized within national systems of governance, providing an illustrative overview of the multiple trajectories towards more resilient, future-oriented forms of policy-making.

Global Practices: Case Studies

Finland: Legislative Foresight and Systemic Integration

Finland have developed a holistic foresight system. The fulcrum of this system is the Government Report on the Future, brought to Parliament one every election period since 1993. The aim of this report is to explore those questions that merit attention in policy-making, to create public awareness for further discussion, and stimulate debate on future challenges. The report, a massive collective collaboration led by the Prime Minister’s Office, pulls together contributions from the National Foresight Network and the EU-wide Foresight Network. These are initiatives where those who produce foresight data and experts meet together to co-build a shared understanding about possible futures. The forward-looking activities are designed to open up alternative varieties of future rather than to predict any one outcome, so that government sectors can plan strategically and make decisions. By pursuing an anticipatory model, Finland can more readily anticipate and respond to future societal shifts (Finnish Government, n.d.).

The Committee for the Future (Tulevaisuusvaliokunta) is a standing, non-partisan committee within the Finnish Parliament, which was established in 1993 to improve future-oriented, long-term policy making. The Committee, with 17 members from different political groups, acts as a kind of

parliamentary think - tank on futures issues and, in particular, on technology assessment and the impact on the society of evolving trends. Its main duties are preparing parliament documents on futures issues, giving opinions to others committees on long-term matters, and analyzing futures studies of interests to decisionmakers (Committee for the Future, n.d.). An important task of the Committee is to discuss the Government's Future Report, produced every electoral period. This report highlights matters relevant to future decision-making and is intended to initiate public discussion. The Committee's reaction to the report may result in rules with binding effects to integrate long-term perspectives to government for example (Committee for the Future, n.d.).

Sitra – the Finnish Innovation Fund is an independent public foundation that operates directly under the Finnish Parliament. At its heart is a quest to enable Finland to predict, ensure its adaptability to, and provide for, its future by fostering systemic solutions to sustainable well-being. Sitra's work focuses on democracy, economic well-being and the environment, and building a better future for Finnish society (Sitra, n.d.-a). One of the key strategic pillars is to foster a fair, competitive and carbon neutral circular economy. Sitra has been the torchbearer for national and global related initiatives, such as publishing the circular economy roadmaps of Finland and organizing the World Circular Economy Forum, which brings together global experts to promote scalable sustainable economic models. In 2023, Sitra, launched more than 100 experiments to test practical responses to new challenges. These involved testing pilots for digital product passports and data driven port traffic management to enhance sustainability and improve efficiency (Sitra, 2024). The Foundation also directly involves citizens in deliberative democracy, through digital platforms such as Polis, which brings together thousands of Finns to talk about the future of their nation (Sitra, 2023b).

A further anchor in Sitra's foresight material, Megatrends 2023, outlines five interconnected drivers of change that are shaping Finland and the world: diminishing ecological resilience, deepening well-being disparities, heightening pressure on democracies, escalating competition for digital power, and the emergence of structural frictions in the global economy (Sitra, 2023a). This knowledge is aimed to assist policy makers, academics and civil society by making sense of the difficult transitions.

After a major strategic update in 2025, Sitra concentrated more strongly on producing knowledge, experimenting and solving problems. It aims to be an agent of change and an enabler — bringing together instruments drawn from the public, private and civil society domains to collectively develop breakthroughs addressing a fair future (Sitra, n.d.-b). By engaging through this whole-systemic, experimental and participatory approach, Sitra is helping to create the environment believed to be necessary for others to act and push for systemic change in Finland.

Singapore: Scenario Planning and Strategic Capacity

Founded in 2009, the Centre for Strategic Futures (CSF) is a think-tank within the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) in the Singapore government dedicated to promoting and strengthening the Singapore government's capability for forward looking policy development. Its objective is to help enhance the foresight competences of the public sector, developing the mindsets, tools and skills to deal with emerging risks and opportunities (Centre for Strategic Futures, n.d.-a). CSF goes beyond traditional scenario planning in creating the Scenario Planning Plus (SP+) methodology, which takes a structured approach to addressing both incremental and transformational discontinuities. SP+ consists of six stages, namely: defining focus areas, undertaking environmental scanning, engaging in sense-making processes, generating possible futures, crafting strategic responses, and tracking key indicators (Centre for Strategic Futures, n.d.-b). This holistic system further allows policymakers to incorporate foresight-backcast insights into long range planning.

In addition to the methodological innovation, CSF is also about growing networks and sharing knowledge. The Centre organizes the Strategic Futures Network and holds Sandbox meetings, to bring the Public Service, academia and leaders together to challenge assumptions, pinpoint blind spots and co-create strategic ideas that will benefit Singapore in its constantly changing operating landscape (Centre for Strategic Futures, n.d.-c). Through the mainstreaming of foresight in the various layers of governance, CSF makes an important contribution to reinforce robustness of governance institutions and to build a culture of proactive and adaptive governance. Its efforts serve as an example of how the integration of foresight can link the continuum of future strategy explorations and concrete policy development requirements in a dynamic world context.

The Strategy Group, under the Prime Minister's Office of Singapore, also acts as the central agency that coordinates the whole-of-government planning and formulating of policies. This is done in order to coordinate national goals across ministries and agencies to achieve a more coherent and proactive governance (Strategy Group, n.d). The Group serves a critical function in steering whole-of-government efforts into emerging cross-cutting areas, enabling agencies to work together, and shaping long-term strategies in response to Singapore's ever-changing challenges and opportunities.

A vital function of the Strategy Group will be to embed foresight and horizon scanning in policy development. Using data analytics, scenario planning and strategic foresight approaches, the Group predicts trends and potential disruptions to enable government departments to adapt policies and initiatives in advance. This approach will help keep Singapore strong and competitive in an ever-changing world (Strategy Group, n.d.).

And the Strategy Group works closely with other government agencies, including the Centre for Strategic Futures, to build up a practice of anticipatory governance. Together, they increase the public sector's ability to deal with complexity and uncertainty, encouraging new strategies for national problems. The rationale for the Group's focus on 'strategic alignment' and 'looking forward' reflects a concern to position Singapore's long-term competitiveness and resilience in the future (Strategy Group, n.d.).

Singapore is showcased as an exceptionally developed example where strategic foresight is institutionally embedded and centrally managed (Kuosa, 2011). Singapore's development of foresight can be traced back to the formation of the Risk Detection and Scenario Planning Office in 1991 and has been amplified with the formation of several major units, the Strategic Policy Office (2003), the Risk Assessment and Horizon Scanning Programme (2004), Horizon Scanning Centre (2008), and Centre for Strategic Futures (2010) (Kuosa, 2011).

Canada: Embedding Foresight through Policy Horizons

Policy Horizons Canada is the Government of Canada's foresight institution located within the Department of Employment and Social Development. Its responsibility is to instill a future focus in the federal government and to enhance policy development in an environment of uncertainty and complexity (Policy Horizons Canada, n.d.-a). The organization's areas of focus are: Economic Futures, Social Futures, and Governance Futures and they scan trends, disruptions and possible futures to support policy formulation and development (Policy Horizons Canada n.d.-b).

To support the development of foresight capacity in the Public Service of Canada, Policy Horizons Canada (2024) has created a competencies framework that identifies key skills for good foresight such as systems thinking, storytelling, and understanding the workings of government. The programs are part of the organization's commitment to building a sustainable and adaptive public sector ready to face future challenges.

Policy Horizons Canada recently tackled important themes like erosion of social mobility. Those scenarios depict how areas and sectors that are now gateways to social mobility—education and home ownership, for example—could in the future be closed or more tightly regulated to control movement and the flow of knowledge, leading to deeper societal divisions and even civil unrest (Policy Horizons Canada, 2025). Additionally, the "Future Lives: Uncertainty" report examines how technological, environmental, and economic transformations are reshaping life courses, influencing decisions on living arrangements, insurance, and youth expectations (Policy Horizons Canada, 2024).

Competencies Framework for Foresight Practice offers a systematization of the skills needed for conducting foresight in the Canadian public service. It defines ten key skill sets across five categories: Research (collection and synthesis of information), Communication (design and storytelling), Engagement (facilitation and collaboration), Thinking (systems thinking, meta-cognition and futures thinking), and Government Acumen (how the public sector works). These skills underpin two roles of foresight practitioners — that of user (applying foresight to inform policy in government and business) and producer (running foresight activities in dedicated studies). The framework specifies four levels of competence – novice, apprentice, practitioner, and expert – and allows self-assessment and performance improvement over time. This work seeks to enhance public sector flexibility and decision-making in complex and uncertain environments (Policy Horizons Canada, 2024).

European Union: Foresight for Resilience and Preparedness

The European Commission produces Strategic Foresight Reports as annual publications that guide the Commission's Work Programmes and multi-annual planning through a participative foresight process involving Member States, ESPAS partners, and external stakeholders (European Commission, n.d.). As an example, the 2023 report, titled "Sustainability and wellbeing at the heart of Europe's Open Strategic Autonomy," (European Commission, 2023) identifies significant social and economic challenges the EU faces in achieving sustainability and outlines ten action areas essential for enhancing Europe's strategic autonomy and global competitiveness in the transition to a net-zero economy.

In previous years, the reports have addressed various themes. The 2022 report, "Twinning the green and digital transitions in the new geopolitical context," (European Commission, 2022) examined the interrelationship between Europe's green and digital transitions amidst a shifting geopolitical landscape. It emphasized the critical role of digital technologies in five high-emission sectors: energy, transport, industry, construction, and agriculture, proposing ten key action areas to harmonize these transitions by 2050.

The 2021 report, "The EU's capacity and freedom to act," (European Commission, 2021) offered a multidisciplinary perspective on trends impacting the EU towards 2050, such as climate change, technological advancements, democratic pressures, and global shifts. It highlighted ten areas where the EU could enhance its operational capacity.

The 2020 report, "Charting the course towards a more resilient Europe," (European Commission, 2020) reflected on lessons learned from the COVID-19 crisis and explored how foresight can bolster long-term resilience across social, economic, geopolitical, green, and digital dimensions. It introduced resilience dashboards as tools for policymakers to monitor progress.

An EU-wide Foresight Network was established following the 2020 report to enhance foresight capabilities across Member States and the European Commission. This network includes "Ministers for the Future," who convene annually to discuss pressing issues, supported by senior officials from national administrations who meet biannually to prepare for these discussions (European Commission, n.d.).

Strategic foresight plays a vital role in EU policy-making by improving policy design and ensuring alignment between short-term actions and long-term objectives. Various techniques are employed, such as:

Horizon Scanning: Systematic identification of emerging trends to create a visual mapping of future changes.

Megatrends Analysis: Examination of significant shifts and trends to formulate a narrative of the future and actionable strategies.

Scenario Planning: An interactive process that generates plausible future scenarios through interviews and analysis.

Visioning: Establishing a shared understanding of a preferred future and creating a roadmap for achieving it.

Strategic foresight informs the Commission's strategic priorities by conducting foresight exercises that explore ways to meet political aspirations, identify key trends, and define critical issues for the EU. This includes the publication of annual reports and the development of foresight scenarios to guide initiatives under the Better Regulation Agenda, ensuring that major policy initiatives are grounded in a comprehensive understanding of future trends and challenges (European Commission, n.d.).

Comparative Typology of Foresight Adoption in Public Policy

Foresight adoption in public policy varies across the presented case-studies based on institutional design, depth of integration, and strategic purpose. A comparative typology reveals four broad modes of integration: institutionalized anticipatory governance, centralized scenario-led planning, capacity-building foresight services, and networked strategic coordination.

Institutionalized Anticipatory Governance – Finland

Finland represents well-entrenched foresight within government by organisational and legislative requirements. The Government Report on the Future, introduced at every electoral term, constitutes the cornerstone of national foresight work. Mirrored by the parliamentary Committee for the Future, Finland's model combines executive horizon scanning production with legislative oversight. And organisations such as Sitra, the Finnish Innovation Fund, make foresight a reality through experiments, engaging citizens, and spreading the megatrend message. This whole-of-society approach to futures literacy is enshrined in long-term planning and discussion, making Finland a vanguard for anticipatory, deliberative governance.

Centralized Scenario-Led Planning – Singapore

Singapore adopts a centralized, state-led foresight model through the *Centre for Strategic Futures* (CSF) and *Strategy Group*, both under the Prime Minister's Office. In Singapore such a model is conspicuous with an institutional setup led by the state and centralized in nature. Through structured approaches such as Scenario Planning Plus, CSA strengthens capacity in the public sector and provides the opportunity to take strategic bets (e.g., Sand box meetings). The Strategy Group integrates foresight-oriented insights with long-term national objectives in a context of cross-governmental cooperation. The buzzwords are resiliency, agility and alignment — features of a modern, high-control governance style adapted to a more fluid global landscape.

Utilizing structured methodologies like *Scenario Planning Plus*, CSF builds public sector capacity and creates space for strategic experimentation (e.g., Sandbox meetings). The Strategy Group aligns foresight insights with long-term national goals, emphasizing cross-agency coordination. The emphasis is on resilience, agility, and alignment—hallmarks of a forward-looking, high-control governance style tailored to a dynamic geopolitical context.

Capacity-Building Foresight Services – Canada

Canada institutionalizes foresight in the form of Policy Horizons Canada, a federal foresight unit, part of whose mission is to assist decisionmakers confronted by complexity and uncertainty. It is primarily aimed to capacity building and provides methods, scenario analysis, as well as a national Foresight Competencies Framework. This framework structures levels of foresight skills and proficiency, enabling organizations to train from novices to experts in the ways of thinking about systems, storytelling, and government acumen. The Canadian model is consistent with a decentralized, user-driven paradigm in which foresight informs rather than prescribes policy.

Networked Strategic Coordination – European Union

The strategy of the European Commission is that of multi-level governance, using strategic foresight to coordinate the interests and aims across Member States. Annual Strategic Foresight Reports influence long term EU strategy with tools such as scenario planning, megatrend analysis and visioning. The EU Foresight Network and the ministerial coordination give momentum to the foresight in the legislative and regulatory framework. When combined with Regulatory Impact Analysis and the Better Regulation Agenda, foresighting contributes to the resilience, coherence, and future proofing of supranational policy in the EU.

These four models represent a range of governance cultures and policy circumstances. Finland represents forward-looking as a part of democratic and participatory procedures; Singapore is a case of elite led, agile scenario using; Canada reflects on generating skills and service provision; and the EU identifies system-wide coordinating of multi-level actors. They comprise a typology which can be used to make sense of how foresight can be taken up and reconfigured to service the different requirements of governments in today's complex and uncertain world.

Conclusion

In summary, the psychological concept of TP, especially FTP has important theoretical and practical implications about how people and organizations cognitively and affectively experience the

future. Studies find that a future-focused outlook is linked to desirable outcomes such as good health, success and well-being. A psychological literacy that cultivates strategic foresight is essential to shape the ways in which to make the most out of uncertainty and complexity. By examining several future options, it provides proactive planning compared with reactive responses and is different from conventional forecasting based on historical trends.

Building a stronger base of governance through foresight, evident in nations such as Finland, Singapore, Canada, and at the European level, illustrates the potential of foresight to generate more nimble, flexible, and intelligence-driven decision-making processes. These countries have institutionalized foresight in policy making, providing them with a steel gaze that protects against future shocks and ensures strategic agility. But the global institutionalization of foresight is still uneven. If it is to work, foresight needs to become embedded in the institutions of government as part of 'anticipatory governance'.

Foresight's function is not solely to take on technology, environment and socio-economic challenges. It is key to forming public policies that go beyond "tomorrow-ist" policy-making and adopt an innovative approach to sustainable development. The situation has improved, but more fundamental cultural and organizational change is still necessary to get foresight fully embedded into governance. This transformation process will allow decision-makers to choose society-protecting measures, while accelerating resilience and long-term prosperity.

REFERENCES:

- Camrass, K. (2020). Regenerative futures. *Foresight*. Vol. 22 No. 4 2020, pp. 401-415, © Emerald Publishing Limited, ISSN 1463-6689
- Centre for Strategic Futures. (n.d.-a). *Who we are*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://www.csf.gov.sg/who-we-are/>
- Centre for Strategic Futures. (n.d.-b). *Our approach*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://www.csf.gov.sg/our-work/our-approach/>
- Centre for Strategic Futures. (n.d.-c). *Networks*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://www.csf.gov.sg/our-work/networks/>
- Committee for the Future. (n.d.). *Committee for the Future*. Parliament of Finland. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://www.parliament.fi/EN/valiokunnat/tulevaisuusvaliokunta/Pages/default.aspx>
- Courtney, H. (2001). *20/20 Foresight*, Harvard Business School Press: Boston. MA.
- CSF. (n/a). Centre for Strategic Futures. Retrieved from <https://www.csf.gov.sg/>
- European Commission. (2020, September 9). *2020 Strategic Foresight Report: Strategic foresight – Charting the course towards a more resilient Europe* (COM(2020) 493 final). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52020DC0493>
- European Commission. (2021, September 8). *2021 Strategic Foresight Report: The EU's capacity and freedom to act* (COM(2021) 750 final). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=COM%3A2021%3A750%3AFIN>
- European Commission. (2022, June 29). *2022 Strategic Foresight Report: Twinning the green and digital transitions in the new geopolitical context* (COM(2022) 289 final). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52022DC0289>
- European Commission. (2023, July 6). *2023 Strategic Foresight Report: Sustainability and people's wellbeing at the heart of Europe's open strategic autonomy* (COM(2023) 376 final). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2023%3A376%3AFIN>
- European Commission. (n.d.). *Strategic foresight*. https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/strategic-foresight_en
- Finnish Government. (n.d.). *Foresight activities and work on the future*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://valtioneuvosto.fi/en/foresight-activities-and-work-on-the-future>
- Fuerth, L. (2011). Operationalizing Anticipatory Governance. *FEATURES. PRISM* 2, no. 4. Retrieved from https://ciaotest.cc.columbia.edu/journals/prism%20/v2i4/f_0024154_19699.pdf

- Guston, D. H. (2014). Understanding 'anticipatory governance'. *Social Studies of Science*, 44(2), 218-242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312713508669>
- Heo, K., Seo, Y. (2021). Anticipatory governance for newcomers: lessons learned from the UK, the Netherlands, Finland, and Korea. *Eur J Futures Res* 9, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-021-00179-y>
- Hines, A. (2020). "Evolution of framework foresight", *Foresight*, Published online 26 June 2020.
- Hines, Andy & Bishop, Peter. (2013). Framework foresight: Exploring futures the Houston way. *Futures*. 51. 31-49. 10.1016/j.futures.2013.05.002.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). *Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context*. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- IFRC Solferino Academy. (2023). The Strategic Foresight Book. Retrieved from <https://solferinoacademy.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/The-Strategic-Foresight-Book-EN.pdf>
- Insight & Foresight. (n/a). What's the difference between forecasting and foresight?. Blog post. Retrieved from <https://www.insightandforesight.com.au/blog-foresights/forecast-to-foresight>
- Kogut, T., Eyal, T., & Sharon, I. (2017). Seeing into the future: Future time orientation as a moderator of temporal distance effects on educators' decisions. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 30(1), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1930>
- Kooij, D. T. A. M., Kanfer, R., Betts, M., & Rudolph, C. W. (2018). Future time perspective: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(8), 867–893. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000306>
- Kuosa, T. (2011). *Strategic foresight in public policy: The cases of Finland, Singapore and the European Union*. S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.com/stable/resrep05909.13>
- Marchant, G.E. (2011). Addressing the pacing problem. In *The Growing Gap Between Emerging Technologies and Legal-Ethical Oversight* (pp.199-205). Springer, Dordrecht.
- OECD. (2022). *Anticipatory Innovation Governance Model in Finland: Towards a New Way of Governing*, OECD Public Governance Reviews, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/a31e7a9a-en>
- OECD. (n/a). Strategic Foresight. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/strategic-foresight/>
- OPSI. (2020). Anticipatory Innovation Governance: What is is, How it works, and Why we need it more than ever before. Retrieved from <https://oecd-opsi.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/AnticipatoryInnovationGovernance-Note-Nov2020.pdf>
- Policy Horizons Canada. (2024). *Future Lives: Uncertainty*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://horizons.service.canada.ca/en/2024/future-lives-uncertainty/index.shtml>
- Policy Horizons Canada. (2024). *Policy Horizons Canada Competencies Framework for Foresight Practice*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://horizons.service.canada.ca/en/2024/11/21/competencies-framework/index.shtml>
- Policy Horizons Canada. (2025). *Future Lives: Social Mobility in Question*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://horizons.service.canada.ca/en/2025/01/10/future-lives-social-mobility/index.shtml>
- Policy Horizons Canada. (n.d.-a). *About Us*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://horizons.service.canada.ca/en/about-us/>
- Policy Horizons Canada. (n.d.-b). *Our Work*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://horizons.service.canada.ca/en/our-work/index.shtml>
- Ramos, J., Uusikyla, I. and Luong, T. (2020). Anticipatory Governance — A Primer. UNDP. Retrieved from <https://www.undp.org/vietnam/blog/anticipatory-governance-primer>
- Sitra. (2023a). *Megatrends 2023*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://www.sitra.fi/en/publications/megatrends-2023/>
- Sitra. (2023b). *Sitra in 2023: Megatrends, experiments in Finland and the start of strategy renewal*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://www.sitra.fi/en/news/sitra-in-2023-megatrends-experiments-in-finland-and-the-start-of-strategy-renewal/>
- Sitra. (2024). *Projects and experiments*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://www.sitra.fi/en/projects/>
- Sitra. (n.d.-a). *About Sitra*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://www.sitra.fi/en/themes/about-sitra/>

- Sitra. (n.d.-b). *Finnish Innovation Fund Sitra undergoes renewal – focus on promoting economic growth and innovation*. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://www.sitra.fi/en/news/finnish-innovation-fund-sitra-undergoes-renewal-focus-on-promoting-economic-growth-and-innovation/>
- Stolarski, M., Fieulaine, N., & van Beek, W. (2015). Time perspective theory: The introduction. In M. Stolarski, N. Fieulaine, & W. van Beek (Eds.), *Time perspective theory: Review, research and application: Essays in honor of Philip G. Zimbardo* (pp. 1–13). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-07368-2_1
- Strategy Group. (n.d.). *Who we are*. Prime Minister's Office Singapore. Retrieved April 29, 2025, from <https://www.strategygroup.gov.sg/who-we-are/>
- TFSX. (2022). Don't confuse forecasting with foresight. November 1, 2022. Retrieved from <https://tfsx.com/2022/11/dont-confuse-forecasting-with-foresight/>
- Tönurist, Piret and Hanson, A. (2020). Anticipatory Innovation Governance: Shaping the future through proactive policy making. OECD Working Papers on Public Governance No. 44. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/cce14d80-en.pdf?expires=1710851796&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=F900056C70D3E60B3FBC0201FA73BFF7>
- Wayland, R. (2015). "Strategic foresight in a changing world". *Foresight*. Vol. 17 No. 5 2015, pp. 444-459, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, ISSN 1463-6689
- World Economic Forum (2024). How true strategic foresight can help companies survive and thrive. January 31, 2024. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2024/01/strategic-foresight-help-companies-survive-thrive/>
- Zimbardo, P. G., & Boyd, J. N. (1999). Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-differences metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(6), 1271–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1271>