prevalent measure of "success" that is used in marketing to select "best prac-tices" to study and emulate does not correspond with what managers in the field consider "successful" projects. The marketing measure of success is based on financial criteria like return on investment, while the managers were much more interested in projects that maybe had not been so profitable but had pro-vided a learning experience on which future financial success could be built. They were not very interested in the high-yielding "cash cow" projects that the management scientists had considered to be best practices and encouraged us to emulate.

RISK

Innovation management doesn't shy away from the risk that is part and parcel of innovation, and celebrates the abilities and personal attributes of innova-tion leaders who take risks. Perhaps the high mortality rate among innovative projects gives rise to a culture of admiring these "project champions" and cel-ebrating the innovator who perseveres against all odds—and other such highly charged battle metaphors. In contrast, frame creation is decidedly undramatic: the risk that is inherent in the creation of newness is reduced enormously by the careful analysis and the creative exploration that make up the frame cre-ation process. Yet most of the cases described in this book have been seen as both radical and successful projects by the partner organizations. On reflection, one could posit that the restless jumping toward ideas that is seen as inevi-table in most innovation management literature is what introduces risk into the innovation process—a risk that is then accepted as part of the heroics of innovation leadership. It is worth considering whether some of this risk may be self-inflicted and unnecessary. If I owned shares in a company, I would be more comfortable with a firm that uses the frame creation approach to achiev-ing radical innovation than with a firm that exposes itself to unnecessary risks.

INNOVATION LEADERSHIP

This raises interesting questions on the "culture" of the fields of innovation management and frame creation. We know that professional cultures are closely related to the way we solve problems in our social group ("commu-nity of practice"). Whereas innovation management, which has its roots in U.S. business schools, stresses radical innovation, risk, and leadership, (often expressed in terms of military metaphors), frame creation is more deliberate, a trait that might betray its origin in mainland Europe. The depth of the frame