Often, several issues are intertwined in a problem situation, but to keep the frame creation process on track, it is important to take some time to identify the core paradox or deadlock that keeps the problem owner from moving forward. Within our experimental frame creation projects, it has proven practical to express the paradox as a clash of rationalities in a series of "because" statements. Please see the case studies below for examples.

CONTEXT

The next step in this analytical phase of the frame creation process completely surprised me when I first encountered it in the protocol studies of experienced designers: after all the hard work they do to establish and accurately formulate the core paradox, they put the paradox statement aside and do not look at it again until much later in the process. In retrospect, this makes sense: we need to deliberately turn away from the core paradox if we are to shift the problem situation. The designers shelve the original problem to begin the next step of the frame creation process with a sense of freshness and energy. What follows is an exploration of the practices of the inner circle of key stakeholders who have been involved in the problem situation before, or those who are clearly going to be necessary participants in any possible solution. By carefully examining them, we seek out significant influences on their behavior and what strategies they currently employ. In this way, we gain a sense of practices and scenarios that could become part of the solution.

FIELD

Once a reasonably complete overview is achieved (when there is saturation), we leave the inner circle of stakeholders alone and begin to radically widen the context, creating an intellectual, cultural, and social space we will here call a "field" after Bourdieu. Like many key concepts in Bourdieu's work, the concept of "field" can be approached from many different angles (Grenfell 2012) and requires some explanation. After all, we could take "field" as a meadow (not what we mean here), a "playing field" (close), or a "force field," as in science or science fiction (also really close). Bourdieu describes the notion of field as a space where assets (cultural, economic, social, and symbolic) are the "currency" that is exchanged between players. We will use the term "field" in this book in the sense of a very wide social and intellectual space. By creating a field, we consider all (potential) players, including anyone who might be connected to the problem or the solution at some point in time—actively or passively, just