

Foresight Methods × Evaluation Questions Matrix Generator

1. Search parameters

Search for a set of 10 foresight methods fitting this definition:

***Foresight** is the structured, evidence-based, and participatory exploration of possible, plausible, and desirable future developments, undertaken to inform present-day decisions and strategies.*

And more specifically,

Well-documented and widely used methods, as described in both academic and practitioner oriented literature

2. Matrix construction

Construct a matrix where:

- the rows list the foresight methods found by the search. These are named in the left most column
- the columns five types of evaluation questions, as described here
 - **Descriptive:** about what happened , when, where when, who.
 - **Valuative:** about peoples' assessments of the value, merit and significance of what happened.
 - **Explanatory:** about the causes of what happened or what happened as a result of a cause
 - **Predictive:** about likely consequences of what happened, about what will or might happen
 - **Prescriptive:** about what could or should be done about what happened, or what is expected to happen
- The cells will display a fitness rating, describing how well the row method will help address the column question. The rating scale is described below
- The right most column will describe a four category "Method Status" based on the cell values of each row. The categories are described below.

3. Method assessment

Method fitness

Use the fitness rating scale as described here:

HIGH: Rate HIGH when the method meets these criteria:

1. Primary Design Purpose: Is addressing this question type the method's primary design purpose according to academic literature or foundational practitioner sources? OR
2. Unique Structural Features: Does the method have distinctive structural features specifically designed or appropriate to this question type?

MEDIUM: Rate MEDIUM when the method demonstrates genuine utility:

- Literature documents application to this question type, OR
 - Method's analytical structure provides relevant capability as a secondary feature, OR
- AND the method provides:

- General utility for this question type, without distinctive advantages for this question type

LOW: Rate LOW when:

- No documented application or clear theoretical fit exists
- Method is not designed for this question type
- Adaptation would require fundamental redesign of the method
- Better methods are available for equivalent effort
- Minimal insights relative to effort required

Method status

Use these categories, as named and defined

CHAMPION: >1 HIGH ratings | Excels across multiple question types | Need excellence in 2+ areas;

SPECIALIST: 1 HIGH & <3 MEDIUM | Excels in one area, limited elsewhere

GENERALIST A: >2 MEDIUM | Broadly adequate

GENERALIST B: 1 HIGH & >2 MEDIUM

MARGINAL: 0 HIGH & <3 MEDIUM | Limited utility anywhere

Borderline case tie-breaker rules:

When uncertain between HIGH and MEDIUM:

- Default to MEDIUM unless the method is cited in evaluation literature as an exemplar for this specific question type
- Ask: Does this method appear in evaluation frameworks or guidance specifically for this question type?
- If the method provides only ancillary benefits through secondary features → MEDIUM

When uncertain between MEDIUM and LOW:

- Default to MEDIUM if any documented application exists in foresight or evaluation literature
- Default to LOW if application requires analogical reasoning without precedent or documented use
- If adaptation is theoretically possible but not documented → LOW

Rating Process

Step 1: Initial Rating

For each method-question combination:

- Apply the HIGH criteria (check if criteria are met)
- If HIGH criteria not met, apply MEDIUM criteria
- If MEDIUM criteria not met, assign LOW
- Apply tie-breaker rules for borderline cases

Step 2: Consistency Verification (MANDATORY - perform before finalizing)

Review all ratings to ensure logical coherence:

A. Horizontal Consistency (across methods for same question type):

- If Method X rated HIGH for question type A, verify that similar methods aren't rated MEDIUM for the same type without a clear, documented differentiator
- Ensure HIGH ratings for a question type represent genuinely superior capabilities, not arbitrary distinctions

B. Vertical Consistency (across question types for same method):

- If Method Y rated LOW for question type B, confirm it lacks the specific capabilities that earned other methods MEDIUM/HIGH for that type
- Ensure a method's ratings reflect its documented capabilities consistently

C. Documentation:

- Document any borderline cases where ratings were difficult to assign

4. Matrix analysis

A. Vertical (Method Specialization)

- Report actual distribution across method status types (counts and percentages)
- Explain what this distribution reveals about the foresight methods landscape
- Discuss implications (e.g., "The preponderance of Specialists suggests foresight methods tend toward targeted excellence rather than broad applicability")
- Note any Champions and what makes them exceptional

B. Horizontal (Question Coverage)

- Identify which question types have richest/weakest coverage
- Note HIGH rating distribution across question types
- Explain what this reveals about foresight methods' strengths and evaluation gaps

5. Method descriptions

For each method:

- Description (100-150 words)
- Full bibliographic reference
- Method Status rationale with explicit counts

Example: "Status Rationale: Specialist (1 HIGH) - HIGH for Predictive reflects core design for futures exploration.

6. Output format requirements

Use these headings as the basis structure

- Summary
- Search parameters
- The evaluation matrix
- The rating scale
- Matrix analysis
- Method descriptions
- Customisation options

7. Customisation options

Users should be informed they can request:

- Detailed method information

- Rating explanations
- Variant analysis (e.g., Classical vs. Policy Delphi)
- Changes to the search parameters
- Changes to the
- Variations to the fitness ratings and Status categories and definitions

8. Before proceeding

Request any clarifications you need to implement this prompt