


# Pedagogy for Hopeful Futures:

## Reimagining Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship Education

### Authors


**Stephanie E. Raible**, EdD, Associate Professor, University of Delaware, USA

 [0000-0003-2249-2993](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2249-2993)

**Juliana Pattermann-Gunsch**, BA MA MSc, Teaching & Research Assistant, MCI | The Entrepreneurial School®

 [0009-0007-6851-762X](https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6851-762X)

**Julia Vögele**, BA MA, Doctoral Researcher, MCI | The Entrepreneurial School®

 [0009-0005-9229-2091](https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9229-2091)

**Desiree Wieser**, PhD, Assistant Professor, MCI | The Entrepreneurial School®

 [0000-0003-4880-8618](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4880-8618)

**The article is peer-reviewed and part of the Special Issue of SITE:  
Future-oriented pedagogies in practice: Innovation and agency**

**Published April 2026**

----

### Abstract

Faced with ecological, economic, and social crises conceptualized as wicked problems and polycrises, students in social innovation and entrepreneurship (SIE) classrooms often adopt analytical orientations that privilege critique over solution-building. This article introduces hopeful futures as a pedagogical orientation that connects futures literacy (FL) with students' agency and capacity to act. Hopeful futures are defined as desirable imaginaries regarded as possible and actionable, integrating plural understandings of futures with hope as agency for intentional change. The article situates hopeful futures within SIE education by examining the roles of hope and FL, reviewing competence frameworks including Catalyst Now, EntreComp, GreenComp, and Ploum and colleagues, and identifying implicit and explicit references to hope and futures-oriented capabilities. It argues that cultivating hopeful dispositions enables students to navigate uncertainty, strengthen resilience, and engage creatively with complexity. Practices such as design-based learning, collective reflection, and the Futures Literacy Lab

foster imaginative agency, empathy, and co-creation, supporting socially responsible innovation. Embedding hopeful futures within SIE pedagogy advances systemic change, strengthens students' capacity to envision and pursue preferable futures, and positions FL as a foundation for cultivating future-oriented social innovation.

**Keywords:** social innovation, social entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship education, futures literacy, hope

----

Faced with the pervasive ecological, economic, and social crises often conceptualized as wicked problems and polycrises in contemporary discourse, students entering social innovation and entrepreneurship (SIE) classrooms frequently adopt analytical orientations that allow them to identify and critique systemic challenges more readily than to envision viable solutions. Such orientations highlight the need for entrepreneurship educators to cultivate students' agency, imaginative capacities, and ethically responsible approaches. Within this pedagogical context, educators serve as critical facilitators in advancing futures literacy (FL): a fundamental competence for the 21<sup>st</sup> century that empowers individuals to imagine multiple and variable futures, reflect on and work with their anticipatory assumptions, and strengthen their capacity to navigate uncertainty and complexity (Mangnus et al., 2021; Miller, 2018c; UNESCO, 2025).

In SIE education, educators require a guiding notion that translates FL into pedagogical practice and connects futures-oriented sense-making with students' agency and capacity to act. To articulate this pedagogical and normative orientation, we introduce the concept of hopeful futures, which encapsulates the stance that what is envisioned as desirable ought, simultaneously, to be regarded as possible and actionable. In what follows, we explicate this terminology by disentangling its main components. First, *futures* are understood in the plural. This pluralization acknowledges that the future is not a single predetermined outcome but a landscape of alternative possibilities (Mangnus et al., 2021; Rowland & Spaniol, 2015). It encompasses varieties such as possible, plausible, preferable, and even preposterous futures (Gall et al., 2022; Voros, 2017), while recognizing that these typologies are illustrative rather than exhaustive.

Second, we clarify the notion of *hope*. While related, optimism is a relatively static disposition, whereas hope represents the agency to achieve a desired outcome (Kelberer et al., 2018). As such, hope foregrounds the possibility of intentional change rather than passive expectation. Hope is a positive orientation that "needs to be cultivated, by showing that another way of being is possible" (Ojala, 2017, p.82). Embedded within hope is also an ability to maintain emotional awareness and cope through difficulties (Ojala, 2017), highlighting hope's connections to the related concept of resilience.

By integrating these two elements, we define *hopeful futures* as desirable future imaginaries that are simultaneously regarded as possible and actionable. This perspective emphasizes that what is envisioned as preferable must be linked to the capacity of individuals and collectives to act upon it. Accordingly, hopeful futures recognize that SIE depends on agentic changemakers, and "there is no change without dreams, as there is no dream without hope" (Freire, 1994, p.81).

Responding to calls that “unknown futures demand new pedagogies, which focus on positive, hopeful transformations” (Dodd et al., 2022, p.687), this article unpacks the notion of hopeful futures and critically reviews pedagogical competence frameworks. By situating the imperative for hopeful futures within the domain of SIE education, we seek to reconfigure hope as a constitutive and critical force in the pedagogy of SIE. While previous work emphasized a societal view of hope and more casual use of hopeful futures (c.f., Dodd et al., 2022), we aim to define this as a critical component of SIE education.

### **The Roles of Hope and Futures Literacy**

In contrast to related constructs such as optimism and self-efficacy, hope emphasizes dynamic motivation in goal pursuit (Snyder, 2002). Hope operates as a motivational force of problem-solving, affective experience, goal-orientation, and the capability to identify and pursue pathways toward desired outcomes (Li & Monroe, 2019). Hope reflects individuals’ self-appraisals of their capacity in pathways thinking (i.e., the belief that individuals can generate multiple routes to their goals), agency (i.e., the determination to pursue those goals with energy and commitment), and goal-directed behavior (Snyder, 2002). Due to the complex nature of hope, it is best understood as a system arising from the dynamic interplay among its constituent elements (Colla et al., 2022).

In times of uncertainty, hope is shaped through connection, agency, community, and individual flourishing (Houlden & Veletsianos, 2022), as well as meaningfulness and aspiration (Salem, 2023). Hope mediates the relationship between resilience and subjective well-being, such that resilience enhances hope, which in turn promotes more positive evaluations of life’s cognitive and affective dimensions (Satici, 2016). The cultivation of hopeful dispositions enables SIE students to effectively navigate complex environments and to engage with uncertainty in a creative and adaptive manner. An increased sense of hope in students is linked to reduced attention to negative emotional stimuli, lower levels of depression and anxiety, and greater support for well-being and future-oriented learning. (Kelberer et al., 2018). Further, the benefits of cultivating hope extend well beyond the domain of SIE education, as cultivating higher levels of hope in students enhances academic and athletic performance, as well as psychological and physical well-being (Snyder, 2002).

While hope plays a critical role in supporting students’ emotional engagement, agency, and well-being, it does not operate in isolation. To become pedagogically productive, hopeful orientations toward the future must be accompanied by the capacity to critically reflect on uncertainty, assumptions, and alternative trajectories: capabilities that are central to FL. FL has emerged as a concept at the intersection of futures studies, sociology, psychology, education, and political science, drawing on diverse but overlapping traditions concerned with anticipation, sense-making, and learning under conditions of uncertainty (Ahvenharju et al., 2018; Mische, 2009; Poli, 2017). Its most influential origin can be traced to the work of Riel Miller, whose early contributions (Miller, 2006, 2007) and later conceptualization of FL as the ability to recognize and reflect on how individuals and societies “use the future” (Miller, 2018b) have become foundational reference points.

Building on this foundation, FL conceptualizes engagement with the future not as prediction, but as a “transversal meta-competence to engage more consciously and effectively with the future” (Vögele, 2025, p.22) centered on exploring plural futures, surfacing anticipatory assumptions, and reflecting on how these assumptions shape present action (Mangnus et al., 2021; Miller, 2018b). While the broader literature on foresight and anticipation has often focused on organizational, policy, or governance contexts (Anderson, 2010; Inayatullah, 2008; Rhisiart et al., 2015; Vervoort & Gupta, 2018), the FL discourse places stronger emphasis on individual and collective learning processes and the development of futures-oriented capabilities.

From an educational perspective, there is a growing but still fragmented body of work that draws on theories of anticipation (Poli, 2017; 2021) and, to some extent, transformative learning (e.g., Häggström & Schmidt, 2021). Empirical studies in higher education illustrate both the potential and the current lack of coherence in learning theories, didactic principles, and assessment approaches underpinning FL education (Bol & Wolf, 2023; Kononiuk et al., 2021; Schmitz, 2022). Recent analyses highlight that FL is an expanding field whose conceptual boundaries are still consolidating, shaped by a small number of pivotal contributions while remaining open to contextual and epistemological variation. Taken together, FL provides the reflective and analytical scaffolding through which hopeful futures can be meaningfully explored, interrogated, and enacted in educational settings.

### **Competence Frameworks for SIE**

Hopeful futures in SIE education are grounded in competencies to engage with futures in reflective, intentional, and agency-oriented ways: an orientation that closely aligns with the notion of FL. Against this backdrop, and acknowledging that no single, comprehensive set of competencies for SIE education exists, we explore four relevant competence frameworks: Catalyst Now (Brock et al., 2025), EntreComp (Bacigalupo et al., 2016), GreenComp (Bianchi et al., 2022), and the framework by Ploum et al. (2017), which builds on earlier contributions to competency development in SIE. For each framework, we review for direct and related references to hope and FL, as the two elements that ground the notion of hopeful futures.

#### ***Futures Literacy in SIE Frameworks***

Although Catalyst Now’s key competencies for social innovation education reflect the need to build students’ inner development and well-being along with their systems thinking for social change, there is no mention of the need for FL development, nor anything related to reflecting on future possibilities. The competencies are primarily framed with being able to act and react in the present. Catalyst Now’s closest mention of FL is *reflective mindset*, referring to students’ ability to “navigate complexity, challenge assumptions, and drive meaningful change” (Brock et al., 2025, p.15), as well as a brief mention of the need for students to “adopt a more open mindset” (Brock et al., 2025, p.25). While complementary to FL, this does not capture the value of FL in SIE education.

GreenComp identifies *envisioning sustainable futures* as one of its four core competence areas, emphasizing learners’ ability to imagine alternative futures, evaluate them critically, and

connect long-term thinking to present action. Within this competence area, futures thinking is described as the capability to anticipate, envision, and plan for multiple possible and desirable sustainability trajectories, drawing on creativity and strategic foresight rather than linear prediction (Bianchi et al., 2022).

On the other hand, EntreComp does not explicitly refer to FL. However, the framework embeds several future-oriented competencies, describing entrepreneurship as a key competence for lifelong learning. EntreComp includes the competence of *vision*, including working towards your vision of the future, which is described as imagining the future, developing a vision to turn ideas into action, and visualizing future scenarios to help guide effort and action (Bacigalupo et al., 2016). Furthermore, it highlights the importance of developing the capacity to act under uncertainty. It also emphasises *ethical and sustainable thinking* with the ability to assess the consequences and impact of ideas, opportunities and actions (Bacigalupo et al., 2016). These elements show that EntreComp incorporates foresight-related skills, even if the term FL is not used in the framework.

Ploum et al.'s (2017) competence framework for SIE emphasizes competencies that allow entrepreneurs to act strategically and ethically within complex systems, integrating economic, social, and environmental concerns. While recognizing the importance of personal values to support action, Ploum et al. (2017) does not mention hope directly or through related concepts. However, alongside systems thinking, action competence, and normative orientation, the framework explicitly introduces *foresighted thinking competence*. This competence highlights anticipatory and futures-oriented capabilities, understood as the collective ability to explore, interpret, and construct images of the future, and to relate present decision-making to long-term and global consequences.

### ***Hope in SIE Frameworks***

Although Catalyst Now, GreenComp, EntreComp, and Ploum et al.'s frameworks do not address hope explicitly, the frameworks implicitly include notions of hope. While not directly mentioning hope, the Catalyst Now framework mentions the need for “educators [to] nurture reflection, resilience, and optimism” as part of *reflective mindset* development (Brock et al., 2025, p.15). Building on this emphasis, the framework's reflective mindset development contributes to students' ability to interpret their own experiences within wider social conditions, strengthening their capacity to advance meaningful change and to work through complexity and underlying assumptions (Brock et al., 2025).

In EntreComp for example, hope is captured within *motivation and perseverance*, described as being determined to turn ideas into action and satisfy a person's need to achieve, being prepared to be patient and persist to achieve long-term individual or group aims, as well as being resilient under pressure, adversity, and temporary failure. A further competence in EntreComp, which implicitly embeds ideas of hope is “taking the initiative” by initiating processes that create value, taking up challenges, acting and working independently to achieve goals, or sticking to intentions and carrying out planned tasks. Last but not least, what Bacigalupo et al. (2016, p.27) describe as self-awareness and self-efficacy (“I can

identify/describe/translate/etc. my needs, wants, interests and goals”) closely links with the goal-directed behavior which Snyder (2002) outlines in the discussion of hope.

While GreenComp does not mention *hope* explicitly, the framework implicitly draws on hope as a foundational premise for understanding sustainability—most notably through its reference to the SDGs, which articulate aspirational goals projected into the future. The competence *systems thinking*, which requires familiarity with the SDGs and sensitivity to the interdependencies and tensions among their targets (Bianchi et al., 2022, p. 43), thus suggests an underlying role for hope that may also mediate the relationship between resilience and subjective well-being (Satici, 2016).

Though *hope* is not explicitly addressed in Ploum et al.’s (2017) framework either, it can be interpreted as an implicit dimension of *foresighted (anticipatory) thinking competence*. By emphasizing the collective exploration and construction of alternative futures, this competence aligns with Snyder’s (2002) conception of hope as the perceived capacity to identify pathways toward desired futures and to exercise agency in pursuing them. In this sense, foresighted thinking embeds hope as a future-oriented, action-enabling disposition rather than an explicit emotional construct.

### Implications for SIE Education

*We may not always have hope as individuals, but as teachers, we should nevertheless spur hope, as a foundation for future imaginings* (Dodd et al., 2022, p.695).

Because hopeful futures and a reflection on one’s role in future building are critical elements within SIE education (Ozgoren & Karatas-Ozkan, 2025), it is important for educators to understand the nature of hope and know how to embed a hopeful futures perspective within their module and degree curricula. Students are likely to be hopeful and work on solutions when they can understand information, see meaningful actions they can take, and believe that both society and everyday people can make a difference (Li & Monroe, 2019). Educators may cultivate hope among students by structuring design-based learning experiences that nurture imaginative agency, facilitate collective reflection, and promote sustained engagement with processes of social transformation.

SIE educators can embed simple practices that cultivate hopeful futures by fostering students’ awareness of societal challenges, deepening their knowledge of these issues, and strengthening their sense of responsibility toward addressing them (Li & Monroe, 2019). From the entrepreneurship perspective, within the established pedagogical practices of entrepreneurship education, the reframing of constraints as opportunities serves to recontextualize foundational entrepreneurial concepts in a manner that emphasizes hope (Ozgoren & Karatas-Ozkan, 2025). From the social perspective, SIE classrooms need to recognize the everyday manifestations of structural challenges, along with the more overt injustices to envision hopeful futures (Eggerman & Panter-Brick, 2010). Moreover, a pedagogy of hopeful futures can be strengthened by carefully selecting classroom role models and cases (Ozgoren & Karatas-Ozkan, 2025), as hope is fostered through the inclusion of positive, relatable examples of SIE that also make entrepreneurial pathways feel attainable (Raible & Williams-Middleton, 2021).

Within SIE education, FL and formats such as the *Futures Literacy Lab* (FLL), a methodology originating in futures studies and promoted by UNESCO to operationalize FL in educational settings (Miller, 2018a), offer a structured yet open learning space for engaging with uncertainty, and systemic challenges in constructive ways. By making underlying assumptions about the future explicit and open to reflection, FL helps learners move beyond deficit-oriented or crisis-driven narratives and instead explore futures as multiple, negotiable, and shapeable. This process supports a hopeful orientation toward social change, as participants experience themselves as active contributors to future-making rather than passive recipients of external developments, often recognizing innovation and entrepreneurship as viable pathways through which they can actively contribute to positive societal change. Through its participatory and dialogical design, the FLL fosters collective agency, empathy, and mutual learning: key conditions for human-centered and socially responsible innovation.

### Conclusion

Building hopeful futures requires advocacy for systemic change that challenges barriers and existing structures (Gallagher et al., 2024). In SIE education, educators and students must collaboratively co-construct future orientations that are simultaneously critical in their appraisal and creative in their exploration of emerging possibilities (Hicks, 2008). Raising students' critical self-awareness and agency can help them to translate the embedded hope within their individual habits towards seeing hopeful futures of collective action (Ojala, 2017). As higher education institutions increasingly assume responsibility for positive societal impact, the integration of FL offers not only a critical competence for navigating complexity, but also a foundation for cultivating hopeful, future-oriented social innovation (Spanjol et al., 2023; Vögele, 2025). FL informs SIE practices by enabling students to engage with futures as open and shapeable rather than predetermined.

By encouraging critical reflection on dominant assumptions, short-term priorities, and long-term consequences, FL guides entrepreneurial agency toward more intentional, responsible, and sustainability-oriented innovation (Hesselbarth & Schaltegger, 2014). Further, this anticipatory orientation supports a hopeful stance toward change, as it reinforces the belief that alternative and more desirable futures can be envisioned and pursued through collective action. By emphasizing empathy, participation, and co-creation, FL supports more human-centered and socially inclusive innovation processes, encouraging individuals and communities to remain hopeful and actively engaged in shaping futures that respond to diverse human needs (Mangnus et al., 2021; Vögele, 2025).

### References

- Ahvenharju, S., Minkkinen, M., & Lalot, F. (2018). The five dimensions of Futures Consciousness. *Futures*, 104, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2018.06.010>
- Anderson, B. (2010). Preemption, precaution, preparedness: Anticipatory action and future geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(6), 777–798. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132510362600>

- Bacigalupo, M., Kampylis, P., Punie, Y., & Van den Brande, G. (2016). *EntreComp: het Entrepreneurship Competence-raamwerk*. Europese Commissie-Joint Research Centre. ISSN 1831-9424
- Bianchi, G., Pisiotis, U., & Cabrera Giraldez, M. (2022). *GreenComp: The European sustainability competence framework* (EUR 30955 EN). Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2760/13286>
- Bol, E., & Wolf, M. de (2023). Developing futures literacy in the classroom. *Futures*, 146, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2022.103082>
- Brock, D. D., Usman, M., & Nguyen, T. (2025). *Key competencies for social innovation education*. Catalyst 2030. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from <https://catalystnow.net/catalyst-now-community-reports/>
- Colla, R., Williams, P., Oades, L. G., & Camacho-Morles, J. (2022). “A New Hope” for Positive Psychology: A Dynamic Systems Reconceptualization of Hope Theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 809053. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.809053>
- Dodd, S., Lage-Arias, S., Berglund, K., Jack, S., Hytti, U., & Verduijn, K. (2022). Transforming enterprise education: sustainable pedagogies of hope and social justice. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 34(7-8), 686–700. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2071999>
- Eggerman, M., & Panter-Brick, C. (2010). Suffering, hope, and entrapment: Resilience and cultural values in Afghanistan. *Social Science & Medicine*, 71(1), 71–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.03.023>
- Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gall, T., Vallet, F., & Yannou, B. (2022). How to visualise futures studies concepts: Revision of the futures cone. *Futures*, 143, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2022.103024>
- Gallagher, M., Nanyunja, S., Akello, M., Mulondo, A., & Miranda, J.-J. (2024). Hopeful futures for refugees in higher education: cultivation, activation, and technology. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(38). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00470-5>
- Hägström, M., & Schmidt, C. (2021). Futures literacy: To belong, participate and act! *Futures*, 132, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102813>
- Hesselbarth, C., & Schaltegger, S. (2014). Educating change agents for sustainability: Learnings from the first sustainability management master of business administration. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 62, 24–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.03.042>
- Hicks, D. (2008). A futures perspective: Lessons from the school room. In M. Bussey, S. Inayatullah and Milojevic (Eds.), *Alternative educational futures: Pedagogies for emergent worlds* (pp.75–90). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Houlden, S., & Veletsianos, G. (2022). Impossible dreaming: On speculative education fiction and hopeful learning futures. *Postdigital Science and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-022-00348-7>
- Inayatullah, S. (2008). Six pillars: Futures thinking for transforming. *Foresight*, 10(1), 4–21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14636680810855991>

- Johnson, N., Seaman, J., & Seaman, J. (2024). A hopeful future? Preparedness and optimism-pessimism about the future of postsecondary education. *Open Praxis*, 16(3), 311-325. <https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.3.603>
- Kelberer, L. J. A., Kraines, M. A., & Wells, T. T. (2018). Optimism, hope, and attention for emotional stimuli. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 124, 84-90, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.12.003>
- Kononiuk, A., Sacio-Szymańska, A., Ollenburg, S., & Trivelli, L. (2021). Teaching foresight and futures literacy and its integration into university curriculum. *Foresight and STI Governance*, 15(3), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.17323/2500-2597.2021.3.105.121>
- Li, C. J., & Monroe, M. C. (2019). Exploring the essential psychological factors in fostering hope concerning climate change. *Environmental Education Research*, 25(6), 936-954, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2017.1367916>
- Mangnus, A. C., Oomen, J., Vervoort, J. M., & Hajer, M. A. (2021). Futures literacy and the diversity of the future. *Futures*, 132, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.Futures.2021.102793>
- Miller, R. (2006). Equity in a twenty-first century learning intensive society: Is schooling part of the solution? *Foresight*, 8(4), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14636680610682003>
- Miller, R. (2007). Futures literacy: A hybrid strategic scenario method. *Futures*, 39(4), 341–362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2006.12.001>
- Miller, R. (2018a). Futures literacy laboratories (FLL) in practice: An overview of key design and implementation issues. In R. Miller (Ed.), *Transforming the future: Anticipation in the 21st century* (pp. 95–109). UNESCO Publishing & Routledge.
- Miller, R. (2018b). Introduction: Futures literacy: Transforming the future. In R. Miller (Ed.), *Transforming the Future: Anticipation in the 21st century* (pp. 1–12). UNESCO Publishing & Routledge.
- Miller, R. (Ed.). (2018c). *Transforming the future: Anticipation in the 21st century*. UNESCO Publishing & Routledge.
- Mische, A. (2009). Projects and possibilities: Researching futures in action. *Sociological Forum*, 24(3), 694–704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1573-7861.2009.01127.x>
- Ojala, M. (2017). Hope and anticipation in education for a sustainable future. *Futures*, 94, 76–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.10.004>
- Ozgoren, C., & Karatas-Ozkan, M. (2025). Social entrepreneurship education through Freire’s philosophy: Engaging curious and passionate minds by growing hope and co-developing wisdom for action (pp.27-51). In B. C. Perker, B. U. Atay, B. Köseoğlu, & E. Okan (Eds.), *Unfolding the layers of social entrepreneurship in Turkey: Discover the transformative power of social entrepreneurship in Turkey*. Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Ploum, L., Blok, V., Lans, T., & Omta, O. (2017). Toward a validated competence framework for sustainable entrepreneurship. *Organization & Environment*, 31(2), 113–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026617697039>
- Poli, R. (2017). *Introduction to Anticipation Studies*. Springer eBook Collection Religion and Philosophy: Vol. 1. Cham: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63023-6>

- Poli, R. (2021). The challenges of futures literacy. *Futures*, 132, 1-9.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102800>
- Raible, S. E., & Williams Middleton, K. (2021). The relatable entrepreneur: Combating stereotypes in entrepreneurship education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 35(4), 293-305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222211017436>
- Rhisiart, M., Miller, R., & Brooks, S. (2015). Learning to use the future: Developing foresight capabilities through scenario processes. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 101, 124–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2014.10.015>
- Rowland, N. J. & Spaniol, M. J. (2015). The future multiple. *Foresight*, 17(6), 556-573.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/FS-02-2015-0014>
- Salem, H. (2023). Education, ontological security, and hope in liminality: learning from the daily strategies exercised by Syrian refugee youth in Jordan. *Journal of Refugee Studies*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fead055>
- Satici, S. A. (2016). Psychological vulnerability, resilience, and subjective well-being: The mediating role of hope. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 102, 68–73.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.057>
- Schmitz, M. (2022). Sustainable futures of business: Future studies meets sustainable management education. In S. Bustamante, E. Saltevo, M. Schmitz, & M. Martinovic (Eds.), *HWR Berlin Forschung* (Vol. 72, *Shaping a sustainable future: Innovative teaching practices for educating responsible leaders*, 1st ed., pp. 87–107). Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.
- Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13, 249–275. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1304\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1304_01)
- Spanjol, J., Rosa, A., Schirrmeister, E., Dahl, P., Domnik, D., Lindner, M., La Cruz, M. de, & Kuhlmann, J.-F. (2023). The potential of futures literacy for impact- oriented business schools. *Futures*, 146, Article 103084. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2022.103084>
- UNESCO. (2025). *Futures literacy & foresight*. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from <https://www.unesco.org/en/futures-literacy>
- Vervoort, J., & Gupta, A. (2018). Anticipating climate futures in a 1.5 °C era: the link between foresight and governance. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 31, 104–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2018.01.004>
- Voros, J. (2017). Big history and anticipation: Using big history as a framework for global foresight. In R. Poli (Ed.), *Handbook of anticipation: Theoretical and applied aspects of the use of the future in decision making*. Springer International Publishing.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31737-3\\_95-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31737-3_95-1)
- Vögele, J. (2025). Shaping futures wisely: Integrating futures literacy with entrepreneurship. *Futures*, 103732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2025.103732>