A Review of Strategic Governance Foresight Policies in Human Geographies In Iran

Ahmad Hajarian* 🄳
Geography and Rural Planning, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. A.hajarian@ltr.ui.ac.ir

Abstract

Purpose: Human activity is necessarily limited to time and the future. This includes all levels of policy and policy-making, regardless of the level or type of governance. In principle, policymakers do not pay enough attention to the long-term consequences of their policy choices or lack the ability to reflect on the various possible future states of the world and how to achieve or avoid them. Government decisions with poor foresight will cause harm to society. On the other hand, it should be noted that strategic foresight has nothing to do with predicting the future. The growing need to deal with the pressures of short-term policy on long-term decisions and issues related to long-term decision-making and wide-ranging intergovernmental justice has necessitated such futuristic research. The aim of this study is to design and institutionalize foresight in governance systems to provide the logic of intervention and the basic hypotheses of the risks associated with it and possible solutions.

Method: This research is practical from the point of view of the goal and is considered as mixed research and it uses the methods of library studies, expert panel.

Findings: Research has shown that while strategic foresight provides a useful tool for navigating unexpected realms, it alone cannot guarantee wise decision-making for policies and other human skills and characteristics.

Conclusion: This study argues that futurism activities face three important, interconnected, and enduring challenges, including paying attention to the value of futurism, ensuring that policy-making processes are properly integrated with futurism activities, and maintaining They are attracting the attention of policymakers and their senior advisers.

Keywords: Institutionalization, Strategic Foresight, Governance, Policy Making, Intervention Logic

Introduction

Strategic foresight as a concept, is fairly new and puts emphasis on bringing these forward-looking techniques into strategic decision making. Strategic foresight provides insights into organizations' operating environment of challenges and opportunities and identification of innovations and opens up the competitive space. The existing literature is nevertheless fragmented and not properly integrated. The academic field is weakly organized. In this context, it is argued that foresight activities face three important, interconnected and enduring challenges, including paying attention to the value of foresight, ensuring the proper integration of policy-making processes with foresight activities, and Maintain the attention of policymakers and their senior advisers. With this introduction, the purpose of this research is to describe the nature, history of futuristic activities and the methods used to examine the reason for these activities in the next step. In doing so, four interventional logics of drawing and basic hypotheses, associated risks, and possible solutions are listed. Therefore, the main question of this research is organized in this direction that: What kind of foresight do governments need? What principles should guide the location and organization of such capabilities? And how can more incentives be created for government decision-makers to pay proper attention to the results of foresight?

Methodology

The data analysis method of Brown and Clark (2006) was used to analyze the data, and all interviews were analyzed line by line. It can be said that Brown and Clark consider the data analysis process to have three general stages: text description, text explanation and interpretation, and text integration and reintegration. Therefore, the data analysis of this study was carried out in three stages: 1) identification of topics, features, and contexts (basic concepts), 2) classification of themes (organized themes), and 3) overarching themes. There are various ways to assess the quality and validity of the findings of the content analysis, such as using independent coders, receiving feedback from interviewees, and applying consistency and coherence with research literature and valid studies in the field of research.

The research data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with fourteen specialists in futures studies with different research fields and in different regions of Iran. In fact, the main research tool was the interview. Half of the interviews were conducted online due to COVID-19 pandemic conditions.

Results and Discussion

First, in terms of methods, the set of future tools, albeit in part, is still evolving; Providing a set of useful tools for examining long-term threats and opportunities and examining alternative futures should be considered as a complement to comprehensive analytical tools in the hands of professional policy advisers. Properly applied forecasting methods can provide rational basis hypotheses, a common framework for scenario planning, and common reference points for long-term planning. This means that they do not end at all. They can identify "weak signals" and magnify the issues needed, but they can't provide ethical advice on what policymakers should do in response. They can identify challenges, but they cannot solve difficult political choices. Wisdom in such cases must come from other sources.

Second, if foresight is to be done, it must be done well (King and Thomas, 2007). False and critical thinking about the future will not add value. Accurate thinking requires expertise, logic and strong evidence. This requires the close collaboration of highly skilled scientists with subject matter experts with appropriate public resource investments (eg, training in foresight, database development, modeling and future capability). Blogging, conducting surveys and supporting consulting processes). Foresight reports should be subject to proper external scrutiny and make available to the public.

Third, while there are benefits to creating a dedicated central foresight unit with good resources in all government agencies, foresight activities should also be widely distributed and properly distributed in government offices and agencies. Be networked. In addition, those with visionary responsibilities must be in the organizational (not just physical) vicinity of those who provide policy advice to decision-makers, whether ministers or presidents. In other words, futuristic activities must be done in a "dominant society" and "interconnected" way: they must be organized and correct (ongoing and not merely episodic) in planning. Normalities should be integrated and preferably integrated into routine programs and decisions, executive branches and legislatures. Efforts should also be made to engage people regularly in special foresight activities through open, transparent, consultative processes.

Fourth, to the extent that cross-sectional prejudice leads to insufficient demand for policy-making in future thinking, there are conflicting mechanisms that apply at both the policy-making level and the administrative system. In short, heroes must be at the heart of the government sector and at the heart of the policy-making system for the future. Only in this way can we be very sure that long-term strategies and horizontal dynamics are properly prepared from serious sources and taken seriously. But not all political leaders and policymakers value foresight, and not everyone welcomes the political challenges posed by such processes.

Conclusions

Finally, while foresight measures can provide greater insight and improve decision-making capabilities, the future does not necessarily always remain uncertain; There will be many unpredictable, sudden and destructive events. Unexpected events are inevitable. Governments cannot prepare for all events, and not all risks can be identified or reduced. While strategic foresight provides a useful tool for navigating unexpected realms, it cannot guarantee wise policymaking, let alone flexibility or greater social adjustment. These require other human skills and characteristics.

References

Boston, J. (2017). Governing for the Future: Designing Democratic Institution for a Better Tomorrow, Howard House, wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Conway, M. (2006). Applying an integral framework to government foresight projects. Journal of Futures Studies, 11(1), 57-74.

Day, N. (2013). The Politics Of Posterity: Expertise And Long-Range Decision-Making. Future Directions For Scientific Advice In, 106.

Dryer, I., & Stang, G. (2013). Foresight in governments _ Practices and trends around the world. In Yearbook of European security 2013. Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies.

European Environment Agency. (2013). Late lessons from early warnings: Science, precaution, innovation. Copenhagen: European Environment Agency.

Eriksson, E. A., and Weber, K. M., (2008). Adaptive Foresight: Navigating the Complex Landscape of Policy Strategies, Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 75(4), 462-482.

Fuerth, L., & Faber, E. (2012). Anticipatory governance: Practical upgrades _ Equipping the executive branch to cope with increasing speed and complexity of major challenges. Elliott School of International Affairs. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Goodarzi, G., Azar, A, Azizi, F., & Babaei Meybodi, H.(2016). Presenting a Proposed Framework for Regional Futurism as an Interdisciplinary Research Field: Case Study, Yazd Plan Development Document, Interdisciplinary Studies Quarterly in Humanities, Volume VIII, (2).

House of Commons Science and Technology Committee. (2014). Government horizon scanning, ninth report of session 2013_14. London, May 4.

Havas, A. (2003). Socio-Economic and Developmental Needs: Focus of Foresight Programmes. Paper presented at the UNIDO workshop on Implementation of the Regional Programme on Technology Foresight for CEE/NIS, Ankara, Turkey .

Jones, B., & Baumgartner, F. (2005). The politics of attention; How governments prioritize problems. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Jacobs, A., & Matthews, J. (2012). Why do citizens discount the future? Public opinion and the timing of policy consequences. British Journal of Political Science, 42(3), 903_935.

Lawrence, P. (2014). Justice for future generations: Climate change and international law. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Olson, R. (2016). Missing the slow train: How gradual change undermines public policy and collective action. Washington, DC: Wilson Centre.