

beyond the rational high ground, but thoughtful and logical approaches can be developed to help us traverse that terrain. This does, however, require the problem solver to embrace the open, complex, dynamic, and networked nature of the problem instead of denying it.

DOING DIFFERENTLY

In chapter 6 we saw that the originality of the frame creation approach extends beyond “seeing” and “thinking” to also sparking a new approach to achieving novelty in organizations, “frame innovation.” To understand the ways in which the frame creation approach is new, and the extent to which it differs from conventional ways of dealing with innovation, we first have to delve into the domain of the management sciences, and particularly into the field of innovation management.

The core paradox of innovation management lies in the fact that the ideal image of an organization still is that of a well-oiled machine where efficiency reigns supreme. The need to create novelty is at odds with this model, as novelty inevitably disturbs existing processes and might be accompanied by “creative destruction.” How do we find a balance between routine operation and the need for novelty and change in an organization? To answer this question, the field of innovation management has had to become a hybrid: it combines a rich mix of subjects in policy-making, strategy formulation, organizational structures, and management styles with elements of design theory (notably, creative problem-solving; see van der Lugt 2001) and fundamental analyses of the notion of innovation itself. Combined, these create a context for thinking about innovation within organizations. Lately, design has come to be seen as a potential driver of strategic innovation in the organization (Verganti 2009). In pursuing these goals, the field of innovation management has developed ways to stimulate innovation while maintaining a strong connection with the “planning and control” paradigm that is so dominant in management science, in many business schools, and within organizations. Most thinkers in innovation management have found a way around the fundamental paradox of stability versus dynamism by concentrating innovation and encapsulating it in analytical steps. The achievement of novelty in a “creative phase” (“idea generation”) is restricted by the determination of goals and criteria in the step before it, and