

An Empirical Analysis on Strategic Foresight and Public Policy Making between UAE and Finland

Fatma Ahmed Lari, Juzaimi Bin Nasuredin, Kamilah Binti Ahmad

Abstract— *The main objective of the study ascertain whether there is difference between UAE and Finland strategic foresights. This study employ the use of questionnaires as means for data collection and conducted t-test analysis to ascertain the difference between the means across the strategic foresight dimensions between the two countries. Revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the results UAE and Finland's in the areas of Information use and method sophistication of the two countries' strategic foresights. Specifically, UAE and Finland differs on information use in their strategic foresights. Similarly, the two countries differ on method sophistication in their strategic foresight. However, there is no significant difference between UAE and Finland on people and network, organisation and culture in their strategic foresights.*

Keywords: *Strategic Foresight, Public Policy, UAE and Finland*

I. INTRODUCTION

The UAE faces many challenges at various levels including political, economic and social agenda. At the political level, there are rapid regional changes in addition to the war on terror, at the economic level, there is a drop-in oil prices and increased competition to attract foreign investment, at the social level, there are demographic changes at the population level and an increase in the number of foreign residents from different cultures.

These accelerating challenges are putting pressure on the policy maker because these politicians must take into account what may happen in the near and distant future, which imposes on the policy maker the need to Foresight the future not only for long-term decisions but also for the short-term decisions. Because foresight is defined as a participative approach to creating shared long-term visions to inform short-term decision-making processes. (The European Foresight Monitoring Network) (Calof et al., 2012). All countries must develop a foresight strategy in order to maintain their international standing and prospects for future development.

Starting with the French savant Berger when he begat the expression "la prospect." Since 1955, Berger has contended

about the outcomes of current activities and how these results can be seen in various areas of movement. Identified with human worth "La-Finalite de Prospective." As Berger (2007) recognizes, the connection among forthcoming and vital ideas that stay as particular substances. As such, to get ready for the normal changes (pre-action) and roll out the ideal improvements (star movement). Cagottadaniki conceivable vital choices and the appraisal of the work.

Harper (2013) argues that one can distinguish between two main forms of foresight that are linked to policy. The policy has foresight in terms of its advisory and strategic function, where foresight can be used to inform and develop policy in any area or "join" domains. Second, foresight serves as a policy tool, in relation to its instrumental role, where it is used as a tool to implement budgetary, structural or cultural changes in the domain of research and / or innovation. In a recent study, the researcher examines two forms of foresight in the analysis of its role in public policy design.

Policy design is difficult to define and measure. Many argue that the results of the policy design should be evaluated in order to evaluate the quality of it. Undoubtedly, policies should be judged by their effects rather than their intent, and there are many studies of individual policy failures and (to some extent) success that they seek to do right. When it comes to a comprehensive assessment of policy design outcomes, problems quickly escalate. There are no clear simple steps that capture the range of effects that policies can produce; The timeframe for any sentencing is contested; And there are serious difficulties in establishing causal relationships between policies and outcomes (Halsworth et al., 2011). Researchers therefore focus on the impact of foresight on the policy-making process as long as policy outcomes are present.

In this study, Finland is selected as a reference case to study the impact of strategic foresight on public policy making in UAE government ministries, because of the important similarity between them. Both small in size and population compared to their regional surroundings, but both are distinguished from it by the high level of education and the advanced technological structure, which make both face the same challenges and have the same financial and technological opportunities to implement strategic foresight.

Hence, this study intend to identify the differences between the UAE strategic foresight and Finland strategic foresight. An Empirical Analysis on Strategic Foresight and Public Policy Making between UAE and Finland.

Revised Manuscript Received on February 20, 2020.

Fatma Ahmed Lari, Department of Technology Management, Faculty of Technology Management and Business, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, 86400, Parit Raja, Batu Pahat, Darul Ta'zim, Johor, Malaysia

Dr.Juzaimi Bin Nasuredin, Department of Technology Management, Faculty of Technology Management and Business, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, 86400, Parit Raja, Batu Pahat, Darul Ta'zim, Johor, Malaysia

Dr.Kamilah Binti Ahmad, Department of Technology Management, Faculty of Technology Management and Business, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, 86400, Parit Raja, Batu Pahat, Darul Ta'zim, Johor, Malaysia

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Key prescience is an arrangement based order for fates examines. A significant level arrangement is a methodology to accomplish at least one of the vulnerability conditions. Key foreknowledge happens when examined inputs, conjectures, elective prospects investigation, examination, and criticism are utilized to produce or change the plans and activities of any organizer organization.

Vital arranging consistently includes examination, however it might have genuine premonition in the method for building up an arrangement or making a move. It is critical to think about potential fates (elective prospects) and potential fates (conjectures, projections) to build up a favored tentative arrangement), (just as straightforward mental plans made before making a move. It is the activity of vital foreknowledge specialists to guarantee that fitting differing and pertinent sources of info, gauges and options are considered in the examination, dynamic and arranging forms, that the plans are suitably conveyed, and that move is made. After activity audits to improve the foreknowledge procedure.

Kuosa, (2014) contends that there are as of now three significant adaptations of premonition: participatory foreknowledge: the longing for the fates of things to come, the association and strengthening of more extensive partners during the time spent co-structuring. It energizes representatives, clients, residents, activists, NGOs, and so on to address distinguished issues and advance favored dreams. In a perfect world this should be possible from a grass-root point of view with taking an interest premonition specialists and partners, however it should likewise be possible with chiefs. In participatory premonition, options are constantly made with partners. The participatory foreknowledge component might be a module in work area task premonition and key prescience.

Deskwork foreknowledge: An instructive methodology that coordinates deliberate prospects with a particular dispersed research venture, arranging procedure, or report composing. Consequently, the deskwork premonition, which is especially noticeable in prospects contemplates, alludes to a self-administrative task finished with partners and specialists or with paid customers and leaders, without solid joint effort by specialists. In work area work prescience, choices are made for instructive or open purposes. Deskwork foreknowledge may now and then have a couple of taking part components or modules, and its items can be like those of vital prescience if necessary.

III. FORESIGHT AND POLICY MAKING

Policy design is a challenging process that takes place under extreme stress and stringent limits. Therefore, a strong effort of will power and commitment is requested by policymakers to transform their frame of mind into a long-term and holistic idea without dealing with short-term emergencies. Policymakers deal with complex, multi-dimensional (S&T, cultural & social, political, economic, environmental) issues that are often interconnected and interdependent. Uncertainties are increasing in every sense and at the same time the pace of change is accelerating. The increasing complexity of a system trying to influence a

particular policy makes it impossible to drive directly without risking unintended consequences (da Costa et al., 2008).

There is a differentiation between the two principle types of prescience that are connected to arrangement. The arrangement has foreknowledge as far as its warning and key capacity, where premonition can be utilized to illuminate and create approach in any region or "join" areas. Second, prescience as a strategy device is pertinent to its instrumental job, where it fills in as an apparatus for actualizing budgetary, basic or social changes in the area of research and/or development (Harper, 2013).

IV. PUBLIC POLICY MAKING

As Parsons (1995) points out, policymaking takes place under conditions of uncertainty, flow, unpredictability, and variability, meaning that the analysis of policy design and implementation requires an understanding of the multi-agent complex system. . The policy-making process and the underlying policy process are crucial to the success of any effective policy packaging. In addition, policy packaging means "cherry picking" components, often governed by various public sector entities, which call for negotiation and concentration in the absence of a hierarchy. Therefore, decision-making is also a part of this problem that cannot be ignored.

Despite much knowledge in this domain, as Parsons (2002) has observed in many parts of policymaking, the social or policy sciences are more about "confusion" than an effective process. Part to play. The goal of developing more effective and effective policy packages has the implicit consequences of trying to improve the methods of developing, managing and controlling the policy-making process. Since public policy design is mainly based on decisions made by responsible parties, we will discuss briefly the principles of decision making.

Pure and outline the rationale: Herbert Alexander Simon, by the boundary rationality coined the term, "a disagreement with the empirical evidence, 3 of the invention, util hincina utility maximizing human rationality of the theory of the center of the rapidly diminishing and the theory of boundary rationality, selection processes and products, both embracing, charity Will replace ". A central aspect of Simon's theory is the notion of satisfaction, which umes see that the decision maker has an internal criterion, an aspiration level, which divides all present payments into satisfactory and unsatisfactory (Bender, 2010).

According to Simon (1997), theories of boundary rationality can be derived from Subjective Expected Utility (SEU) theories by selecting one or more of a set of fixed alternatives (SEU) umphs to choose from, generating known probability distributions or maximizing utility function and alternatives Ume the process, assess And satisfactory knowledge of probability and hincani idhanalanu enter or do not represent a strategy to look for strategies to deal with uncertainty (Simon, 1997).

Anderson (2006) defines public policy as "the approach adopted by a government agency to address the problem faced by society or particular groups of people," and more specific ones such as Birklands (2005). A statement of what to do or not to do, such as a combination of these ". He argues that "the absence of such statements may also be an implicit statement of policy" (Birkland, 2005).

Similarly, Stone (2008) defines policy as a rational endeavor to achieve goals, and about communities trying to achieve something as public policy societies. The primary objectives, in her opinion, are trade in equity, capacity, security, freedom and society, among these goals.

V. METHODOLOGY

This study employ the use of a questionnaire as an instrument to collect the data for this study. The main respondents in this research are the management staffs of government organizations in UAE and Finland because of the role they play in strategic foresight implementations. This research is a comparison between UAE and Finland strategic foresight and the process of public policy making.

The statistical approach to this study stands to be structural equation modelling (SEM) with AMOS and factors loading with statistical package for the social sciences. The data collected are analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and SmartPLS versions in testing the structural development of the construct. This study implement a series of confirmatory analysis to assess the reliability and validity of the measurement model before testing the structural model. Prior to the main data analyses, preliminary data screening

and transformation which involved, missing value analysis, descriptive statistics and normality test of the data were conducted in order to ensure that the data meets the requirements for the chosen multivariate data analysis (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010; Pallant, 2014).

VI. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The main objective of the research sought to examine the similarities between UAE and Finland strategic foresights. To achieve this, the study employee t-test to analyses the data. Table 1 shows the descriptive analysis with respect to the strategic foresights across the two countries based on the respondents' opinions.

According to the result, strategic foresight in UAE is mostly characterized by integrating values into future plans (Mean=4.86; SD=.144), early adoption of new trends (Mean=4.80; SD=.139), maintaining control when unrealistic plans appear (Mean=4.67; SD=.152), giving up present benefit for future rewards (Mean=4.65; SD=.148) and starting of project today to address future (Mean=4.86; SD=.144).

On the other hand, strategic foresights in Finland are shown to be more focused on early adoption of new trend (Mean=4.79; SD=.134), maintaining control during the occurrence of unrealistic plans (Mean=4.70; SD=.149), integration of values into future plans (Mean=4.56; SD=.144), seeing possibilities in all situations (Mean=4.54; SD=.148), and understanding what is coming (Mean=4.53; SD=.134).

Table 1: Mean ranking of strategic foresights between UAE and Finland

Country of Residence	Statement	Mean Estimate	Standard Deviation	Rank	
UAE	SF1	Balances issues between past, present and future actions or inactions	4.49	.150	9
	SF2	Gives up benefits today, for future rewards	4.65	.148	4
	SF3	Sees big picture of future with alternatives	4.57	.135	6
	SF4	Starts up projects today to address the future	4.59	.140	5
	SF5	Integrates values into future plans	4.86	.144	1
	SF6	Maintains control when unrealistic plans appears	4.67	.152	3
	SF7	Sees possibilities in all situations	4.54	.153	8
	SF8	Motivates citizens to make needed changes today for the future benefits	4.42	.150	10
	SF9	Considers and respect impacts of today events	4.38	.145	11
	SF1	Early follower and adopter of new trends	4.80	.139	2
Finland	SF1	Don't rush issues, but try to understand what is coming	4.55	.138	7
	SF1	Balances issues between past, present and future actions or inactions	4.28	.140	10
	SF2	Gives up benefits today, for future rewards	4.36	.146	8
	SF3	Sees big picture of future with alternatives	4.43	.131	6
	SF4	Starts up projects today to address the future	4.29	.138	9
	SF5	Integrates values into future plans	4.56	.144	4
SF6	Maintains control when unrealistic plans appears	4.70	.149	2	



An Empirical Analysis on Strategic Foresight and Public Policy Making between UAE and Finland

	SF7	Sees possibilities in all situations	4.54	.148	3
	SF8	Motivates citizens to make needed changes today for the future benefits	4.28	.141	11
	SF9	Considers and respect impacts of today events	4.39	.142	7
0	SF1	Early follower and adopter of new trends	4.79	.134	1
1	SF1	Don't rush issues, but try to understand what is coming	4.53	.134	5

To further test compare the strategic foresight between UAE and Finland, an independent sample t-test was conducted. Table 2 and Table 3 show the results from the t-test. From Table 2 the mean and standard deviations for the

respective dimensions of strategic foresight are presented for the two countries. The mean ranges from 3.80 to 5.00 while the standard deviation ranges from 1.28 to 1.89.

Table 2: Test of difference between UAE and Finland strategic foresights

	Country of Residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
IU_MEAN	UAE	198	4.7997	1.72544	.12262
	Finland	199	4.3769	1.89565	.13438
MS_MEAN	UAE	198	5.0025	1.33481	.09486
	Finland	199	4.6771	1.46477	.10383
PN_MEAN	UAE	198	4.0328	1.43256	.10181
	Finland	199	3.7877	1.43300	.10158
OG_MEAN	UAE	198	4.6843	1.28600	.09139
	Finland	199	4.6399	1.29733	.09197
CT_MEAN	UAE	198	4.0404	1.35811	.09652
	Finland	199	3.8050	1.41413	.10025

To test whether there is difference between the means across the strategic foresight dimensions between the two countries a t-test is conducted. Table 4.8 shows the result of the t-test. The result shows that there is statistically significant difference between UAE and Finland's in the areas of Information use and method sophistication of the two countries' strategic foresights.

Specifically, UAE and Finland differs on information use in their strategic foresights ($t=2.323$, $df=395$, $p=.021$). Similarly, the two countries differ on method sophistication in their strategic foresight ($t=2.313$, $df=395$, $p=.021$). However, there is no significant difference between UAE

and Finland on people and network, organisation and culture in their strategic foresights.

Table 3: Independent Samples Test

	t-test for Equality of Means						
	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Information Use	2.323	395	.021	.42278	.18196	.06505	.7805 1
Method Sophistication	2.313	395	.021	.32539	.14068	.04882	.6019 6
People and Network	1.705	395	.089	.24514	.14382	- .03761	.5278 9
Organisation	.343	395	.732	.04448	.12966	- .21043	.2993 8
Culture	1.691	395	.092	.23538	.13917	- .03823	.5089 9

VII. CONCLUSION

The main aim of the study is to ascertain whether there is difference between UAE and Finland strategic foresights. To achieve this, a t-test was conducted whether there is difference between the means across the strategic foresight dimensions between the two countries. The result shows that there is statistically significant difference between UAE and Finland's in the areas of Information use and method sophistication of the two countries' strategic foresights.

Specifically, UAE and Finland differs on information use in their strategic foresights. Similarly, the two countries differ on method sophistication in their strategic foresight. However, there is no significant difference between UAE and Finland on people and network, organisation and culture in their strategic foresights.

REFERENCES

- Anderson J. (2006). Public Policymaking: An introduction, 6th Edition, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Anderson, J. (2012). The Great Future Debate and the Struggle for the World. American Historical Review.
- Bendor, J.B. (2010). Bounded Rationality and Politics. University of California Press.
- Betts, R. (1997). Should Strategic Studies Survive? World Politics, vol. 50.
- Birkland T.A. (2005), An Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, concepts and Models of Public Policy Making. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY.
- Birkland, T. A. (2014). An introduction to the policy process: Theories, concepts and models of public policy making. Routledge.
- Calof, J. and Smith, J. (2010). Critical success factors for government-led foresight. Science and Public Policy, Vol. 37 1, February, pp.31-40.
- Calof, J., Miller, R., Jackson, M. (2012) "Towards impactful foresight: viewpoints from foresight consultants and academics", Foresight, Vol. 14 Issue: 1, pp.82-97.
- Hallsworth, M., Parker, S., Rutter, J. (2011). Policy Making In the Real World: Evidence and Analysis, Institute for Government, April 2011
- Harper, J. C. (2013). Impact of Technology Foresight, Nesta Working Paper 13/16, November 2013.
- Kuosa, T. (2011). Practicing Strategic Foresight in Government: The Cases of Finland, Singapore and the European Union, S.Rajaratnam School of International Studies.
- Kuosa, T. (2014). Towards Strategic Intelligence — Foresight, Intelligence, and Policy-Making, Dynamic Futures, Print Best, Viljandi, Estonia, 2014.

- Kuosa, T. (2014). Towards Strategic Intelligence — Foresight, Intelligence, and Policy-Making. Dynamic Futures Publications, No. 1, Dynamic Futures.
- Kuosa, T. (2016). The evolution of strategic foresight: navigating public policy making. Routledge.
- Parsons, W. (1995). Public Policy: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Parsons, W. (2002). From Muddling Through to Muddling Up - Evidence Based Policy Making and the Modernisation of British Government. In Public Policy and Administration, Volume 17, Issue 3, pp.43-60.
- Simon H. A. (1947). Administrative Behavior. New York: Macmillan.
- Simon, H.A. (1997), Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision Making Processes
- Stone A. (2008), Institutional reform: A decision-making process view, in Research in Transportation Economics, Vol. 22, Issue 1, pp.164-178.

AUTHORS PROFILE

FATMA AHMED LARI is a phd student at universiti Tun Hussien Onn, Malaysia at Department of Technology Management. Faculty of Technology Management and Business

Dr. JUZAIMI BIN NASUREDIN, is a lecturer at at universiti Tun Hussien Onn, Malaysia at Department of Technology Management. Faculty of Technology Management and Business

Dr. KAMILAH BINTI AHMAD is a lecturer at at universiti Tun Hussien Onn, Malaysia at Department of Technology Management. Faculty of Technology Management and Business

