

that there is an inner logic to the frame creation process, but we have also seen that in applying this process, the assumptions of the different stakeholders form the basis of their own “rationality.” There is no a priori dominant or overarching logic for looking at the problem situation—the core of the frame creation process is the creation of such a logic through theme analysis and framing. Where rational thought and frame creation are largely in line is in the aim (3) *to make thoughts conscious*. But from the outset, frame creation accepts the fact that many stakeholders will not be conscious of their own standpoints, assumptions, and preconceptions. This is where frame creation seeks to make thoughts and assumptions explicit to trigger inspiration and reflection. There is a significant difference in that the theory of rational action sees (4) *rational thought as disembodied*, while one of the core processes in frame creation, the phenomenological analysis that produces themes, is largely based on empathy and the ability to understand the lived experience of the parties in the broader problem arena. That is how deep understanding is achieved, and deeper layers of meaning are brought to the surface. While (5) *rational thought is dispassionate*, frame creation is engaged, is guided by empathy, and employs personal experience in the sense-making and creative phases. Yet another difference is that whereas in rational action (6) *theory leads practice*, in frame creation every premise about how the world might work is suspended, and the practices of the stakeholders and parties in the field are what lead to the formation of a “theory,” a frame hypothesis, which is then critically examined. (7) *Rational action takes place in a closed world*, while frame creation extends beyond the problem owner and the inner ring of stakeholders, opening up to be informed by the multiple sources in the broader field. In the later stages, the information generated in the frame creation process (like proposed themes and frames, business plans, and the like) becomes a dominant force steering the process.

We can conclude that the differences between the frame creation approach and the conventional theory of rational action are huge. Yet there is nothing irrational or random about the careful sequence of steps that make up the frame creation approach, and in many ways it shares the values that underlie the rationalist approach. Frame creation is as concerned with clarity and inner consistency as conventional problem-solving, for the frame creation approach contains extensive checks and balances to verify the realism and validity of the frames proposed. But frame creation (and other design-based approaches that may be developed as its siblings) could be seen as a first step toward creating more fluent approaches to rationality. There may be quicksand and chaos