The Science of Strategic Imagination: Evidence for Narrative-Based Futures Training

A Practical Futures White Paper

Executive Summary

Every organisation has a strategy department. None has an imagination department. Most individuals invest in skills training but never in the capacity to envision what those skills will be worth in five years. This gap — between the rigour applied to analysing the present and the capacity to inhabit possible futures — carries measurable costs.

Research tracking 77 multinationals over five years found that firms with systematic foresight capabilities achieved 33% higher profitability and 200% greater market capitalisation growth than those without (Rohrbeck & Kum, 2018). The World Economic Forum's *Future of Jobs Report 2025* identifies creative thinking as the single most important skill for 2030 — more critical than analytical thinking, technological literacy, or leadership (World Economic Forum, 2025). Yet most organisations treat strategic imagination as individual talent rather than a trainable capability. Most individuals never encounter a structured method for developing it at all.

The neuroscience suggests a different framing. Humans are, at their core, prospecting beings. The brain devotes substantial resources to simulating possible futures — a capacity researchers have termed *Homo Prospectus* (Seligman et al., 2016). Episodic future thinking — the brain's ability to mentally pre-experience possible scenarios — is not a fixed trait but a trainable skill. A 2024 meta-analysis of 45 studies involving over 5,000 participants found that future thinking interventions produce reliable improvements in decision-making

and behavioural outcomes, with an effect size of g = 0.52 (Ye et al., 2024). The mechanism: vivid future simulation shifts neural valuation of distant outcomes, reducing the cognitive discount rate that leads to short-term bias.

Practical Futures is a platform that operationalises this research through a defined system of tools. The system rests on a clear architecture:

- **Business Sci-Fi** is the content format — short fiction that makes the future relatable by grounding technological and social change in everyday situations that already feel familiar: performance reviews, morning commutes, team meetings, family dinners.
- **Narrative Microdosing** is the training method — Business Sci-Fi delivered at regular intervals together with reflection prompts grounded in the episodic future thinking approach. Rather than occasional workshops or abstract scenarios, practitioners engage with brief stories paired with "memory from the future" prompts that connect fictional scenarios to current decisions and contexts.
- **Futures Gradient** is the output — what individuals or organisations build by combining their answers to reflection prompts over time. The Futures Gradient is mineable for patterns and insights grounded in personal or organisational context, creating a cumulative record of evolving strategic intuition.

Three converging evidence streams support this approach. First, positive, plausible future scenarios outperform neutral or negative ones in shifting behaviour (g = 0.64 vs. -0.03 for negative valence). Second, narrative transportation — immersion in story — reduces counterarguing and creates belief change through experiential processing rather than analytical evaluation (Green & Brock, 2000). Third, pattern library development through repeated scenario exposure builds expert-like recognition capabilities, enabling faster and more accurate responses when anticipated conditions materialise (Klein, 1998).

This white paper synthesises evidence across cognitive neuroscience, behavioural economics, narrative psychology, and organisational foresight to explain why narrative-based futures training works and how individuals, organisations, and practitioners can begin building the capacity to thrive in uncertainty.

1. The Strategic Imagination Gap

Organisations invest heavily in prediction. Market research, competitive intelligence, financial modelling, trend analysis — billions flow annually into understanding what *will* happen. Individuals invest in credentials, certifications, and skills training calibrated to the current market. Consultants and facilitators build practices around established methodologies with proven track records. Yet prediction consistently fails precisely when it matters most: at inflection points, during disruption, when the future refuses to resemble the past.

The limitation is not analytical rigour. It is imaginative range.

The Foresight Performance Gap

The business case for strategic imagination is no longer speculative. Rohrbeck and Kum's (2018) longitudinal study of 77 large enterprises found stark performance differences between organisations with mature foresight practices and those without. Firms demonstrating systematic futures capabilities — environmental scanning, scenario thinking, strategic vision alignment — achieved 33% higher profitability and 200% greater market capitalisation growth over the study period.

Yet most organisations lack the infrastructure to develop these capabilities at scale. Strategy remains centralised. Imagination stays personal. Futures thinking operates as executive privilege rather than distributed competence — and for individuals outside organisational structures, the tools are even less accessible.

Why Traditional Approaches Fall Short

Scenario planning, the dominant methodology since Shell's pioneering work in the 1970s, produces valuable outputs but struggles with sustained adoption. Elaborate scenario exercises create intellectual understanding without behavioural change. Leaders nod at plausible futures, then return to quarterly targets. The problem is not the scenarios — it is the mechanism of engagement.

Design fiction and speculative design offer richer experiential qualities but require significant resources: physical prototypes, video productions, immersive installations. These methods work brilliantly for innovation teams with dedicated budgets. They do not scale across organisations, and they

remain largely inaccessible to individual practitioners and independent consultants.

Academic futures studies provides rigorous theoretical foundations but demands substantial training and disciplinary knowledge. The depth is genuine; the accessibility barrier is equally real.

The gap: no lightweight, systematic approach exists for building futures literacy as a distributed capability — whether within an organisation, across a consulting practice, or as an individual discipline.

The Psychological Barrier

Beyond methodology, a deeper obstacle exists. Humans discount the future systematically. Decades of behavioural economics research documents our preference for immediate rewards over larger delayed ones — a tendency that shapes everything from personal savings to corporate strategy (Peters & Büchel, 2010).

This is not a character flaw. It is neural architecture. The brain evolved for immediate environments where distant futures rarely materialised as imagined. Ancestral conditions rewarded present-focus. The cognitive machinery persists.

The consequence is universal: even when individuals and leaders intellectually understand long-term threats and opportunities, the felt urgency of immediate pressures overwhelms distant considerations. Strategic plans gather dust not because they are wrong but because they do not *feel* as real as this quarter's numbers, this week's client deliverable, or today's inbox.

The Emerging Requirement

The World Economic Forum's *Future of Jobs Report 2025* projects that 39% of existing skill sets will be transformed or become obsolete by 2030, identifying creative thinking as the single most important workforce skill — ahead of analytical thinking, technological literacy, and leadership (World Economic Forum, 2025). As AI commoditises routine cognitive work, the capacity to envision alternatives becomes the scarce resource.

Yet organisations continue optimising for productivity while neglecting imagination. Individuals continue optimising for current competencies while the half-life of those competencies accelerates. Consultants and facilitators deliver episodic interventions without continuity infrastructure. The tools exist for

measuring and improving operational efficiency. Equivalent infrastructure for strategic creativity remains undeveloped.

Business Sci-Fi addresses this gap: a content format for training strategic imagination that scales across contexts, requires minimal time investment, and operates through mechanisms the brain already uses to learn about possible futures. Delivered through the Narrative Microdosing method and accumulated in the Futures Gradient, it forms the foundation of a systematic practice accessible to anyone navigating uncertainty.

---

2. The Architecture of the Method

Business Sci-Fi is strategic fiction designed to train imaginative capacity. Unlike science fiction written for entertainment or design fiction created for critique, Business Sci-Fi exists to help individuals and teams mentally rehearse futures before they arrive.

The method operates through **Narrative Microdosing**: systematic exposure to brief, focused scenarios that accumulate into expanded imaginative range over time. Rather than intensive workshops that create momentary insight, Narrative Microdosing builds durable capability through repetition and reflection. The cumulative output — the **Futures Gradient** — becomes a structured record of evolving strategic intuition, mineable for patterns and actionable insights.

The Core Mechanism

Each engagement follows a defined structure:

Scenario. A short narrative — typically five minutes to read — depicting an emerging technology or social shift integrated into a familiar context. Not dystopian speculation or moonshot fantasy, but everyday moments where tomorrow's changes actually matter. A performance review conducted with AI-mediated emotional intelligence. A morning commute where the transit system negotiates your schedule. A family dinner where the kitchen anticipates dietary needs. The mundane is deliberate: it is where the future is actually experienced.

Reflection. "Memory from the future" prompts that connect the fictional scenario to the reader's actual context — professional, organisational, or personal. These prompts operationalise episodic future thinking research by asking readers to mentally simulate their own experience within the scenario's conditions. Not "what do you think about this future?" but "how would you

handle your team's first AI-augmented performance cycle?" or "what would this shift mean for the clients you serve?"

Accumulation. Repeated engagement across scenarios builds pattern libraries — the mental models that enable rapid recognition and response when anticipated conditions begin materialising. Each set of reflection responses feeds the Futures Gradient, creating over time a layered map of how an individual's or organisation's strategic thinking evolves. Strategic intuition develops not through analysis but through simulated experience made visible and reviewable.

What Makes It "Business"

The distinction from general science fiction is deliberate and functional. Business Sci-Fi focuses on:

Second and third-order effects rather than the technology itself. Not "what if we had humanoid robots?" but "what happens to service industry economics when labour costs approach zero?" The strategic implications matter more than the technical specifications.

Organisational, market, and personal dynamics rather than individual adventures. Characters navigate workplace politics, competitive pressures, regulatory shifts, career inflections, and client relationships. The futures depicted are inhabited by people doing jobs, running practices, and making decisions — not heroes saving worlds.

Near-term plausibility rather than distant speculation. Scenarios extrapolate from existing trajectories — technologies already in development, social patterns already emerging, business models already being tested. The horizon is years, not centuries.

Protopian rather than dystopian framing. Research consistently shows that positive future scenarios produce stronger behavioural effects than negative ones (Ye et al., 2024). Business Sci-Fi depicts futures worth building — not utopian perfection, but genuine progress with realistic friction. The goal is motivation and preparation, not warning.

---

3. The Evidence Base

The scientific foundation for narrative-based futures training draws from six converging research streams. Each addresses a different dimension of the

question: how do humans learn to navigate uncertainty, and how can this capacity be cultivated systematically?

3.1 Episodic Future Thinking: How the Brain Constructs Tomorrow

The brain does not store the future — it builds it. Cognitive neuroscience has identified episodic future thinking (EFT) as the constructive process through which humans mentally simulate possible experiences. This capacity relies on the same neural architecture used for episodic memory: the hippocampus, medial prefrontal cortex, and posterior parietal regions work together to assemble elements from past experience into novel future configurations (Benoit & Schacter, 2015).

The construction is literal, not metaphorical. Neuroimaging studies show that imagining a future event activates the same brain regions as remembering a past one. The hippocampus retrieves stored elements — people, places, objects, emotions — while the prefrontal cortex recombines them into coherent scenarios. Patients with hippocampal damage who cannot form new memories also cannot imagine detailed futures.

This architecture sits within a broader reconceptualisation of human cognition. Seligman and colleagues (2016) propose that humans are best understood not as *Homo sapiens* — the knowing species — but as *Homo prospectus* — the prospecting species. Research suggests that roughly three-quarters of future-directed thoughts involve planning and preparation, and that the brain's default network, active during rest and mind-wandering, is substantially occupied with prospective simulation (Baumeister, Vohs & Oettingen, 2016). Prospection is not an occasional cognitive luxury; it is the brain's baseline operation.

Crucially, this prospective capacity is trainable. Affective forecasting research demonstrates that people are often poor at predicting how future events will make them feel — but that structured training in prospection can improve accuracy and reduce systematic biases (Seligman et al., 2016). The implication is direct: the quality of future thinking depends on the quality of the raw material available and the frequency of practice.

Why this matters for methodology. Exposure to diverse, vivid scenarios expands the element library available for future construction. Each Business Sci-Fi story deposits new components — technological possibilities, social configurations, organisational dynamics — that the brain can later retrieve and recombine when constructing its own futures. Narrative Microdosing does not

teach people what to think about the future; it provides building blocks for thinking about futures they could not previously construct.

3.2 Prospection and Decision-Making: Shifting What the Future Is Worth

Humans systematically undervalue future outcomes. This temporal discounting — preferring smaller immediate rewards over larger delayed ones — shapes decisions from personal savings to corporate strategy. The pattern is so robust that behavioural economists model it mathematically: a reward's subjective value decays hyperbolically with delay.

But the discount rate is not fixed. A landmark finding in prospection research demonstrates that episodic future thinking reduces delay discounting. When people vividly imagine themselves in a future scenario, distant outcomes feel more real — and more valuable. Peters and Büchel (2010) demonstrated this mechanism using neuroimaging, showing that EFT engages the brain's valuation circuitry in ways that shift the subjective worth of future rewards. The 2024 meta-analysis by Ye and colleagues quantified this effect across 45 studies: future thinking interventions produce a reliable moderate effect ($g = 0.52$) on reducing impulsive decision-making.

The neural mechanism is increasingly understood. Future simulation engages the ventromedial prefrontal cortex — the brain's valuation centre — in ways that abstract reasoning does not. Thinking analytically about the future informs belief; imagining oneself in the future shifts motivation.

Crucially, valence matters. Positive future scenarios produce substantially larger effects ($g = 0.64$) than neutral scenarios ($g = 0.32$). Negative scenarios produce almost no effect ($g = -0.03$). The brain responds to futures worth wanting.

Why this matters for methodology. Business Sci-Fi's emphasis on protopian scenarios — futures worth building rather than dystopian warnings — aligns directly with this evidence. Positive framing is not naive optimism; it is mechanistic design. Scenarios depicting functional, desirable futures engage the valuation circuitry that shifts behaviour. Apocalyptic speculation may generate intellectual engagement but fails to move the motivational needle.

3.3 Narrative Transportation: How Stories Bypass Resistance

Stories operate differently from arguments. When people read fiction, they enter a state researchers call narrative transportation — a convergent

experience of cognitive attention, emotional engagement, and mental imagery that feels like being absorbed into a narrative world (Green & Brock, 2000). This state has measurable consequences for belief and attitude change.

Transportation reduces counterarguing. The analytical scrutiny people normally apply to persuasive claims diminishes during story immersion. Readers do not evaluate narrative claims the way they evaluate propositional arguments; they experience them. Post-transportation, beliefs often shift without the reader consciously noticing the persuasive mechanism.

Meta-analytic evidence confirms the effect across diverse contexts. Braddock and Dillard's (2016) meta-analysis found that narrative messages produce reliable persuasive effects, with transportation serving as a key mediating mechanism. Van Laer and colleagues' analysis of 76 studies demonstrated that narrative transportation reliably produces changes in cognitive and affective responses. The mechanism appears distinct from analytical persuasion — stories create belief change through experiential processing rather than logical evaluation.

Identification amplifies the effect. When readers connect with characters — seeing themselves in the protagonist's situation — the transportation deepens. Futures scenarios featuring relatable contexts and unnamed characters (allowing readers to self-insert) leverage this dynamic deliberately.

Why this matters for methodology. Resistance to futures thinking — whether in organisations, among individual practitioners, or within consulting engagements — often stems from analytical objections: "that won't happen," "our industry is different," "the timeline is wrong." These objections engage rational critique. Narrative transportation circumvents this resistance by shifting the processing channel. Readers do not argue with a story the way they argue with a forecast. Business Sci-Fi uses fiction's experiential pathway to deposit future possibilities that analytical foresight cannot plant.

3.4 Experience-Taking and the Temporal Dynamics of Fiction

Narrative transportation explains how stories reduce resistance. A complementary line of research explains how they produce lasting change — often in ways that unfold over time rather than immediately.

Kaufman and Libby (2012) identified a phenomenon they term *experience-taking*: when readers become sufficiently absorbed in a narrative, they do not merely observe the protagonist's experience — they simulate it from the inside, adopting the character's perspective, goals, and emotional responses as if they

were their own. This goes beyond empathy or identification. Experience-taking is a first-person cognitive rehearsal triggered by third-person narrative. Crucially, the researchers found that experience-taking produces measurable changes in readers' subsequent attitudes and behaviours, even when the narrative is explicitly fictional.

This finding has direct implications for futures training. Reading about a character navigating an AI-augmented workplace does not merely inform the reader about a possible future — it allows the reader to *rehearse* navigating that future. The third-person format of fiction paradoxically enables first-person learning.

Equally significant is the temporal dimension of fiction's influence. Bal and Veltkamp (2013) demonstrated what researchers call the *sleeper effect* in narrative persuasion: fiction's impact on attitudes and beliefs often increases over days and weeks after reading, rather than diminishing. Immediately after reading, the fictional source may be discounted ("it's just a story"). Over time, the experiential memory persists while the source tag fades, allowing the simulated experience to integrate into the reader's working model of reality.

Mar and Oatley (2008) provide a theoretical framework for these effects, proposing that narrative fiction functions as a form of social simulation — a cognitive workout that exercises the same capacities used in navigating real social complexity. Their research demonstrates that fiction readers develop measurably stronger social cognition, not because stories teach social rules, but because they provide simulated practice in social reasoning.

A further dynamic operates through what might be called the *psychological distance paradox*. Fiction's explicit unreality — the fact that it is clearly not real — paradoxically reduces defensive processing. Readers who would resist a direct argument about how AI will transform their industry engage openly with a story exploring the same territory, precisely because the fictional frame removes the personal threat. The defences come down because nothing is at stake. The learning persists because the brain does not clearly distinguish simulated from actual experience when building its model of possibilities.

Why this matters for methodology. The Narrative Microdosing approach — regular engagement over time rather than single intensive exposure — aligns precisely with these temporal dynamics. Fiction's influence builds rather than decays. Each story session deposits experiential material that integrates gradually into the practitioner's working model of possible futures. The Futures

Gradient captures and makes visible this cumulative development, transforming an invisible cognitive process into a reviewable record.

3.5 Naturalistic Decision-Making: Building the Pattern Library

How do experts make rapid, accurate decisions in complex, time-pressured situations? Research on naturalistic decision-making reveals that expertise operates through pattern recognition rather than analytical deliberation. Experienced firefighters, military commanders, and emergency physicians do not systematically weigh options — they recognise situations as instances of familiar types and retrieve appropriate responses (Klein, 1998).

Klein's recognition-primed decision model describes this process: experts rapidly assess situations, match them to patterns developed through experience, mentally simulate the most plausible response, and act. The quality of decisions depends on the richness of the pattern library — the mental inventory of situations previously encountered or simulated.

This model explains both how expertise develops and how it can be accelerated. Real-world experience builds patterns slowly and haphazardly, constrained by whatever situations actually occur. Simulated experience — through case studies, scenario exercises, or narrative immersion — can systematically expand the pattern library with situations that have not yet occurred but might.

Supporting evidence comes from simulation training research. Cook and colleagues' (2011) meta-analysis of technology-enhanced simulation in health professions education, encompassing 59 randomised controlled trials, found a large overall effect size of 0.80 — indicating that simulated experience produces substantial improvements in clinical performance. The RAND Corporation's research on simulation fidelity adds a crucial nuance: *psychological* fidelity — the degree to which a simulation engages realistic cognitive and emotional processing — matters more than *physical* fidelity (the visual or material realism of the simulation environment). A simple scenario that feels cognitively real outperforms an elaborate simulation that does not engage authentic decision-making.

The premortem technique, developed by Klein and studied empirically by Mitchell, Russo, and Pennington (1989), demonstrates another dimension of simulated future experience. By asking teams to imagine that a project has failed and then work backwards to identify reasons, prospective hindsight increases the ability to identify potential problems by approximately 30%

compared to standard risk assessment. The mechanism is episodic simulation: imagining a concrete future outcome (failure) and then constructing a narrative explanation generates more thorough analysis than abstractly listing what might go wrong.

Why this matters for methodology. Each Business Sci-Fi scenario represents a pattern candidate. Repeated engagement across diverse futures builds an inventory of recognisable situations — the AI-mediated performance review, the algorithm-driven career pivot, the human-machine collaboration dynamic. When these patterns begin materialising in actual experience, practitioners do not encounter them cold. They recognise them. The RAND finding on psychological fidelity validates the text-based approach: Business Sci-Fi does not need virtual reality or elaborate props. It needs scenarios that engage authentic cognitive processing — which vivid, relatable narrative reliably achieves.

3.6 Organisational Foresight: The Performance Evidence

The preceding research streams establish cognitive mechanisms. Does systematic futures practice actually improve organisational performance?

The most rigorous evidence comes from Rohrbeck and Kum's (2018) longitudinal study tracking 77 large enterprises over five years. Companies were assessed on foresight maturity — the presence and sophistication of practices including environmental scanning, scenario development, strategic vision alignment, and organisational integration of futures thinking.

The performance differences were substantial. Firms in the top third of foresight maturity achieved 33% higher profitability and 200% greater market capitalisation growth compared to those in the bottom third. The relationship held after controlling for industry effects and company size.

The study also identified the most valuable foresight capabilities. Peripheral vision — the ability to detect weak signals at the edges of the organisation's attention — distinguished high performers. So did the integration of foresight outputs into actual strategic decision-making, rather than treating futures work as an isolated intellectual exercise.

The World Economic Forum's *Future of Jobs Report 2025* reinforces the urgency. With 39% of current skill sets projected to transform or become obsolete within five years, the report explicitly calls for organisations to invest in anticipatory capabilities and creative thinking at all levels — not merely in executive suites or innovation labs (World Economic Forum, 2025).

Why this matters for methodology. The Rohrbeck findings validate the business case for organisational foresight but do not specify how to build it. Traditional approaches — dedicated foresight units, periodic scenario exercises, executive retreats — concentrate capability in small groups. The Practical Futures system offers a distribution mechanism: futures literacy as a distributed competence rather than a specialised function. The research shows foresight capability matters; Narrative Microdosing provides infrastructure for developing it at scale, while the Futures Gradient makes the resulting organisational learning visible and actionable.

3.7 Synthesis: The Converging Case

These six research streams address different questions but converge on consistent design principles:

Vivid, specific scenarios outperform abstract frameworks. The brain constructs futures from concrete elements, not categorical concepts. Episodic future thinking research demonstrates that detailed mental simulation engages neural architecture that abstract reasoning does not reach. Business Sci-Fi provides the vivid particulars that generic trend analysis cannot.

Positive futures motivate; negative futures warn without moving. The valence asymmetry in prospection research ($g = 0.64$ for positive vs. $g = -0.03$ for negative scenarios) explains why dystopian speculation generates intellectual engagement but behavioural inertia. Protopian framing is not optimism bias — it is evidence-based design for behaviour change.

Stories bypass resistance that analysis triggers. Narrative transportation creates belief change through experiential processing, reducing the counterarguing that meets propositional claims. Fiction's experiential pathway deposits future possibilities that analytical foresight cannot plant.

Fiction produces first-person learning from third-person narrative. Experience-taking research demonstrates that readers do not merely observe fictional scenarios — they rehearse them. The sleeper effect ensures that this rehearsal integrates over time rather than fading.

Repetition builds recognition capability. Pattern library development requires accumulated exposure across diverse scenarios. Single intensive experiences create memorable moments; systematic practice creates durable capability. The microdosing approach — regular engagement across many scenarios rather than deep engagement with few — optimises for pattern acquisition.

Psychological fidelity outweighs physical fidelity. Text-based scenarios that engage authentic cognitive processing produce substantial learning effects. Elaborate production values are unnecessary when the narrative achieves experiential immersion.

Reflection amplifies transfer. Scenario exposure alone is insufficient. Connecting fictional futures to current strategic contexts — through "memory from the future" prompts that feed the Futures Gradient — transforms entertainment into training.

---

4. Operationalising Strategic Imagination: From Evidence to Practice

The evidence establishes that strategic imagination is trainable, that narrative is an effective training medium, and that systematic practice outperforms episodic intervention. The remaining question is practical: how does the method operate across different contexts, needs, and depths of engagement?

The Practical Futures system is designed around a principle derived directly from the research: futures literacy develops through repeated practice, not intensive instruction. A distributed approach that reaches more people more often outperforms a concentrated approach that reaches fewer people more deeply. This principle shapes a natural progression from initial exploration through individual practice to organisational capability — each stage building on the preceding one, each accessible without prerequisites.

Beginning: Expanding the Element Library

The entry point requires nothing beyond curiosity and a willingness to read. The research on episodic future thinking demonstrates that the brain's capacity to construct futures depends on the diversity of elements available for recombination. A library of over 100 Business Sci-Fi stories, freely accessible, provides this raw material — a systematic expansion of the scenarios, technologies, social configurations, and organisational dynamics available for mental simulation.

A weekly newsletter delivers new scenarios at the cadence the research supports: regular, spaced engagement that builds cumulative familiarity rather than momentary intensity. This is Narrative Microdosing at its simplest — each story a five-minute investment that deposits new components into the reader's constructive repertoire.

At this stage, the method is deliberately lightweight. No training required. No facilitator needed. No organisational buy-in necessary. An individual practitioner, a curious consultant, or a team leader sharing a story with colleagues — all begin expanding imaginative range through the same mechanism the neuroscience validates.

Deepening: Building Structured Practice

Exploration creates exposure. Practice creates capability. The transition from reading stories to building a systematic futures practice requires two additional elements: domain focus and structured reflection.

Domain-specific playbooks organise Business Sci-Fi scenarios around particular professional contexts — healthcare, financial services, education, technology, professional services — enabling practitioners to concentrate their pattern library development in areas of strategic relevance. Rather than building broad but shallow familiarity across all possible futures, domain focus creates the depth of pattern recognition that naturalistic decision-making research associates with expert judgment (Klein, 1998).

The personal Futures Gradient operationalises the reflection component. By systematically recording responses to "memory from the future" prompts, practitioners build an accumulating record of their own evolving strategic intuition. Over weeks and months, patterns emerge: recurring concerns, shifting assumptions, evolving mental models. The Futures Gradient transforms an invisible cognitive process — the gradual expansion of imaginative range — into a visible, reviewable, and actionable artefact.

This stage serves individual practitioners and consultants particularly well. An independent strategist can maintain a personal Futures Gradient that informs client engagements. A facilitator can build domain expertise in specific sectors. A career professional can track how their assumptions about their industry's trajectory evolve over time. The practice is individual but the capability is transferable.

Scaling: Building Organisational Capability

The Rohrbeck and Kum (2018) findings demonstrate that organisational foresight capability — not just individual insight — drives performance. Moving from individual practice to organisational capacity requires mechanisms for collective pattern recognition, shared vocabulary, and strategic alignment around possible futures.

The organisational Futures Gradient extends the individual tool to team and enterprise scale. When multiple members of an organisation engage with the same scenarios and record their reflections, the resulting data reveals collective patterns: where the organisation's imagination clusters, where blind spots persist, where strategic assumptions diverge across functions or levels. This collective intelligence is unavailable through any individual practice, however rigorous.

Outcome Sprints — focused, time-bound engagements that apply Business Sci-Fi scenarios to specific strategic questions — provide structured intensity within the framework of ongoing practice. Unlike traditional scenario planning exercises that produce analytical frameworks and then conclude, Outcome Sprints operate within a continuing Narrative Microdosing practice, ensuring that insights generated during intensive work compound through subsequent regular engagement.

Workshop kits enable internal facilitators, learning and development teams, and external consultants to deploy the method without dependence on external experts. The kits operationalise the same evidence base in formats suitable for team meetings, strategy sessions, leadership development programmes, and client engagements. The design principle is distribution: building organisational capability requires reaching more people more often, not concentrating expertise in specialised units.

The Consultant and Facilitator Use Case

For consultants, facilitators, and coaches, a persistent challenge is continuity. Engagements are episodic by nature — a workshop, a strategy session, a training programme — but capability development requires sustained practice. The interval between engagements is where learning either compounds or dissipates.

Practical Futures addresses this gap by providing continuity infrastructure. A consultant delivering a foresight engagement can embed Narrative Microdosing as the ongoing practice that sustains and extends the engagement's impact. Between workshops, participants continue receiving and engaging with Business Sci-Fi scenarios, building their Futures Gradient, and developing pattern recognition capabilities. The consultant's next engagement builds on accumulated practice rather than starting from scratch.

This infrastructure model positions Practical Futures not as a competing methodology but as connective tissue between methodological interventions —

the regular practice that maintains and develops the capacity that deeper methods activate.

Complementary Positioning: Gateway to Deeper Methods

Practical Futures operates at a specific point in the futures practice landscape: it is a gateway that builds foundational capacity, making deeper and more resource-intensive methods more effective when they are deployed.

Scenario planning produces rigorous analytical frameworks but requires participants who can inhabit multiple futures simultaneously. Practitioners with an established Narrative Microdosing practice arrive at scenario exercises with richer imaginative range, more diverse mental models, and greater comfort with uncertainty. The scenario planning is more productive because the participants are better prepared.

Design fiction creates powerful experiential encounters with possible futures but demands significant production resources and works best for focused innovation challenges. Business Sci-Fi provides the ongoing futures engagement that contextualises and extends design fiction's intensive moments. The prototyping session benefits from participants who have been regularly exercising their capacity to inhabit alternative futures.

Formal foresight methodologies — horizon scanning, Delphi processes, causal layered analysis — offer sophisticated analytical tools but require trained practitioners and substantial organisational commitment. Practical Futures builds the foundational futures literacy that makes these methods accessible to broader audiences and more impactful when applied.

Futures studies and academic programmes provide deep theoretical grounding but operate at timescales and commitment levels that limit participation. Business Sci-Fi serves as an entry point — building interest, vocabulary, and basic capability that can lead to deeper methodological engagement for those who choose to pursue it.

The relationship is not competitive but infrastructural. Practical Futures builds and maintains the foundational capacity — comfort with uncertainty, expanded imaginative range, pattern recognition across possible futures — that all deeper methods require and benefit from. It is the regular practice that supports episodic intensity, the distributed capability that complements concentrated expertise.

The Accessibility Principle

Most futures methodologies require expert facilitation, significant time investment, or specialised training. These requirements limit adoption to innovation teams, strategy functions, leadership retreats, and those who can afford specialist consultants. The majority of people — including those closest to customers, operations, and emerging signals — never develop futures literacy.

Narrative Microdosing inverts this pattern. The method requires only reading and reflection. No special training. No coordinated scheduling. No budget approval. Anyone can begin building strategic imagination capacity independently. Organisations can scale the practice without proportional resource increases. Consultants can extend their reach without proportional time investment.

This accessibility is not a compromise — it is a design principle derived directly from the evidence. The simulation training literature demonstrates that psychological fidelity matters more than physical fidelity (Cook et al., 2011). The narrative transportation research confirms that text-based immersion produces measurable cognitive and attitudinal effects (Green & Brock, 2000). The episodic future thinking meta-analyses show that even brief interventions produce reliable results (Ye et al., 2024). Sophisticated futures thinking does not require sophisticated infrastructure. It requires vivid scenarios, structured reflection, and systematic practice.

---

5. Limitations and Research Gaps

Intellectual honesty about the boundaries of evidence strengthens rather than undermines the case for narrative-based futures training. Several important limitations warrant acknowledgement.

Translation from Laboratory to Practice

The meta-analytic evidence for episodic future thinking (Ye et al., 2024) derives primarily from controlled experimental settings with immediate outcome measures. Most studies examine single-session interventions with short follow-up periods. The translation to sustained, real-world futures practice — where the outcomes of interest are strategic decisions made months or years later — remains theoretically supported but not yet empirically verified at scale.

The sleeper effect research (Bal & Veltkamp, 2013) provides encouraging evidence for temporal persistence, and the simulation training literature (Cook

et al., 2011) demonstrates transfer to professional performance. However, dedicated longitudinal studies tracking Business Sci-Fi practitioners' decision quality over extended periods would substantially strengthen the evidence base.

Measurement Challenges

Strategic imagination resists easy quantification. Unlike clinical outcomes or financial metrics, the quality of futures thinking lacks standardised measurement instruments. Current proxies — self-reported confidence, breadth of scenarios considered, speed of pattern recognition — capture important dimensions but fall short of comprehensive assessment.

The Futures Gradient offers a promising approach to measurement, creating a longitudinal record that can be analysed for expanding range, increasing specificity, and evolving sophistication. However, validated scoring rubrics for these dimensions remain in development. The field would benefit from psychometric work establishing reliability and validity of futures literacy measures applicable across individual and organisational contexts.

Individual Variation

Not all readers achieve narrative transportation equally. Factors including reading habits, imaginative disposition, cultural context, and cognitive style likely moderate the method's effectiveness. The narrative persuasion literature acknowledges substantial individual variation in transportation susceptibility (Green & Brock, 2000), and this variation presumably extends to futures fiction.

Practical implications include the need for diverse narrative styles, varying levels of technological specificity, and multiple cultural contexts within the story library. A single narrative approach is unlikely to achieve uniform effects across diverse populations. The current library's breadth across scenarios and styles addresses this concern but does not eliminate it.

Cultural and Contextual Specificity

The evidence base draws predominantly from research conducted in Western, educated, industrialised contexts. The universality of the underlying cognitive mechanisms — episodic future thinking, narrative transportation, pattern recognition — is well-established in the neuroscience literature. However, the specific narrative conventions, temporal orientations, and cultural assumptions

embedded in Business Sci-Fi scenarios may require adaptation for different cultural contexts.

This limitation represents both a research gap and a design opportunity. Cross-cultural validation studies would clarify which elements of the method are universal and which require contextual tailoring.

Interaction Effects with Existing Methods

The positioning of Practical Futures as complementary to established futures methodologies raises empirical questions about interaction effects. Does regular Narrative Microdosing practice actually improve subsequent scenario planning effectiveness, as theoretically predicted? Does the combination of narrative-based preparation with analytical methods produce better outcomes than either approach alone? These interaction effects are architecturally plausible and consistent with the evidence on pattern recognition and expertise development, but they have not been tested directly.

The Protopian Framing Question

The evidence strongly supports positive valence in future scenarios for behavioural change (Ye et al., 2024). However, the preference for protopian framing introduces a potential blind spot: systematic underexposure to genuinely adverse futures. If practitioners primarily rehearse positive scenarios, their pattern libraries may be underdeveloped for crisis conditions.

This limitation is addressable within the method through deliberate inclusion of constructive challenge scenarios — futures that are difficult but navigable, presenting problems that demand creative response rather than despair. The distinction between dystopian (paralysing) and challenging (mobilising) futures matters for both the evidence base and the editorial approach.

Research Programme

These limitations suggest a clear research agenda: longitudinal tracking studies measuring decision quality over time; psychometric validation of futures literacy instruments; cross-cultural effectiveness studies; controlled comparisons of narrative-based preparation combined with established foresight methods; and investigation of optimal dosing parameters (frequency, length, diversity of scenarios). Practical Futures is committed to advancing this programme in collaboration with academic research partners.

6. Conclusion: Building the Capacity to Thrive in Uncertainty

The evidence converges on a conclusion both simple and consequential: the capacity to navigate uncertainty is not a fixed trait but a trainable skill, and narrative is among the most effective training media available.

Episodic future thinking research demonstrates that the brain constructs futures from experiential elements — and that expanding this element library improves the quality of future simulation. Prospection research shows that vivid future scenarios shift the neural valuation of distant outcomes, countering the short-term bias that undermines strategic decision-making. Narrative transportation and experience-taking research reveal that fiction produces first-person learning from third-person narrative, bypassing the analytical resistance that blocks direct persuasion. Naturalistic decision-making research confirms that pattern recognition — built through accumulated simulated experience — underlies expert judgment under uncertainty. And organisational foresight research demonstrates that these capabilities, when systematically developed, produce measurable performance advantages.

Practical Futures operationalises this converging evidence through a system designed for accessibility, scalability, and sustained practice. **Business Sci-Fi** provides the content — vivid, relatable scenarios grounded in everyday situations. **Narrative Microdosing** provides the method — regular engagement paired with structured reflection. The **Futures Gradient** provides the output — a cumulative, mineable record of evolving strategic intuition.

The system serves three distinct communities through a unified approach. Decision-makers within organisations gain infrastructure for building distributed futures capability — moving strategic imagination from executive privilege to organisational competence. Individual practitioners gain a structured method for developing the anticipatory capacity that the World Economic Forum identifies as the defining skill of the coming decade. Consultants and facilitators gain continuity infrastructure that sustains and extends the impact of their engagements, providing the regular practice between interventions that transforms episodic insight into durable capability.

The future will not be predicted. It will be navigated by those who have practised inhabiting it.

Practical Futures provides the tools for that practice.

About Practical Futures

Practical Futures is a system of tools designed to train strategic imagination through science fiction grounded in everyday situations. The platform delivers Business Sci-Fi — short fiction that makes the future relatable — through the Narrative Microdosing method, enabling individuals, organisations, and practitioners to build the Futures Gradient: a cumulative record of evolving strategic intuition mineable for patterns and insights.

The approach is grounded in cognitive neuroscience, behavioural economics, and narrative psychology. It is designed to complement and strengthen established futures methodologies — scenario planning, design fiction, formal foresight — by building and maintaining the foundational imaginative capacity these methods require.

Practical Futures is accessible at every level of engagement: from a free library of over 100 Business Sci-Fi stories and a weekly newsletter, through domain-specific playbooks and personal Futures Gradient tools, to organisational Futures Gradient platforms, Outcome Sprints, and workshop kits for teams and enterprises.

Learn more at practicalfutures.com

References

Bal, P. M., & Veltkamp, M. (2013). How does fiction reading influence empathy? An experimental investigation on the role of emotional transportation. *PLoS ONE*, 8(1), e55341. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0055341

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Oettingen, G. (2016). Pragmatic prospection: How and why people think about the future. *Review of General Psychology*, 20(1), 3–16. https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000060

Benoit, R. G., & Schacter, D. L. (2015). Specifying the core network supporting episodic simulation and episodic memory by activation likelihood estimation. *Neuropsychologia*, 75, 450–457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.06.034

Braddock, K., & Dillard, J. P. (2016). Meta-analytic evidence for the persuasive effect of narratives on beliefs, attitudes, intentions, and behaviors. *Communication Monographs*, 83(4), 446–467. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2015.1128555

Cook, D. A., Hatala, R., Brydges, R., Zendejas, B., Szostek, J. H., Wang, A. T., Erwin, P. J., & Hamstra, S. J. (2011). Technology-enhanced simulation for health professions education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*, 306(9), 978–988. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2011.1234

Green, M. C., & Brock, T. C. (2000). The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 701–721. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.701

Kaufman, G. F., & Libby, L. K. (2012). Changing beliefs and behavior through experience-taking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027525

Klein, G. (1998). *Sources of Power: How People Make Decisions*. MIT Press.

Mar, R. A., & Oatley, K. (2008). The function of fiction is the abstraction and simulation of social experience. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(3), 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00073.x

Mitchell, D. J., Russo, J. E., & Pennington, N. (1989). Back to the future: Temporal perspective in the explanation of events. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 2(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.3960020103

Peters, J., & Büchel, C. (2010). Episodic future thinking reduces reward delay discounting through an enhancement of prefrontal-mediotemporal interactions. *Neuron*, 66(1), 138–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2010.03.026

Rohrbeck, R., & Kum, M. E. (2018). Corporate foresight and its impact on firm performance: A longitudinal analysis. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 129, 105–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.12.013

Seligman, M. E. P., Railton, P., Baumeister, R. F., & Sripada, C. (2016). *Homo Prospectus*. Oxford University Press.

Van Laer, T., De Ruyter, K., Visconti, L. M., & Wetzels, M. (2014). The Extended Transportation-Imagery Model: A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of consumers' narrative transportation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(5), 797–817. https://doi.org/10.1086/673383

World Economic Forum. (2025). *Future of Jobs Report 2025*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Ye, Z., et al. (2024). Episodic future thinking and delay discounting: A meta-analysis. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 159, 105607. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2024.105607