Innovation Is Not a Department. It Is a Pattern.

02.08.2026 14:45:35 | Management Insights, Lukas Michel | 0 Comments | Innovation

And how you know and develop it.

Many organizations say they want innovation.

They launch initiatives.
They create labs.
They appoint heads of innovation.
They run workshops.
They set innovation targets.
They celebrate ideas.
They talk about disruption.

And yet, in many of these same organizations, innovation remains sporadic, fragile, or performative.

Ideas are generated, but not carried forward.
Teams brainstorm, but do not implement.
Creativity is praised, but risk is still punished.
Collaboration is encouraged, but systems continue to reward local optimization.
People are asked to innovate inside operating environments that were built for caution, efficiency, and compliance.

That is why one of the most important insights in *Patterns of Mastery* is this:

Innovation is not a department. It is a pattern.

The manuscript’s chapter on innovation organizations makes this unmistakably clear. Innovation-type organizations thrive because they have built an environment where highly engaged people can fully apply their unique knowledge and skills. They operate in a

dynamic environment with capabilities-based management and people-centric principles, and their results come from a pattern of trust, choice, awareness, collaboration, leadership, and culture that supports knowledge sharing and creative execution.

That changes the leadership question completely.

The question is not whether the organization has an innovation unit.

The question is whether the organization has an innovation pattern.

Why innovation is so often misunderstood

Innovation is frequently treated as a discrete activity.

Something to be assigned.
Something to be sponsored.
Something to be measured separately.
Something that happens “over there” while the rest of the organization continues as usual.

That way of thinking is tempting because it makes innovation manageable.

But it also makes innovation superficial.

The manuscript describes innovation organizations very differently. It shows that innovation emerges in environments where people can share knowledge, trust one another, collaborate across boundaries, and act with a degree of freedom that allows ideas to be explored and implemented. Innovation is not isolated from the operating model. It is produced by it.

This is the critical shift.

Innovation is not what one team does on behalf of everyone else.

It is what becomes more likely when the whole organization creates the conditions for insight, experimentation, and execution to reinforce each other.

The pattern behind innovative organizations

The manuscript’s innovation cluster offers a remarkably coherent picture.

Innovation organizations typically operate at
the performers maturity level. They are often small to medium-sized creative businesses, though some large firms preserve innovative characteristics at scale. They tend to function
as professional assemblies, organize around specialized knowledge, and pursue an exploration-type business model with close customer relationships and solution-oriented work.

That matters, because it shows that innovation is not random.

It has recognizable ingredients.

People are highly engaged.
Trust is high.
Choice is high.
Awareness is high.
Purpose, relationships, and collaboration are strong.
Leadership supports knowledge sharing.
Culture strengthens curiosity rather than suppressing it.
Systems are supportive enough to scale what emerges.

This is what makes innovation a pattern.

Not one practice.
Not one ritual.
Not one department.

A whole configuration.

Why knowledge sharing sits at the center

One of the strongest themes in the innovation chapter is the role of knowledge sharing.

The manuscript states that innovative companies are designed

for superior understanding, thinking, engagement, and adherence, and that superior leadership has cultivated a culture that facilitates knowledge sharing, which in turn generates innovative ideas. It also links innovation to the creation of environments where people share what they know and where leaders proactively demonstrate trust and choice.

This is a decisive point.

Innovation does not begin with idea generation techniques.

It begins with whether people can bring forward what they know.

Can they connect expertise?
Can they speak openly?
Can they build on one another’s insight?
Can they test possibilities without immediate defensiveness?
Can they combine customer understanding with technical depth and organizational support?

If the answer is no, innovation remains theatrical.

If the answer is yes, innovation becomes much more natural.

That is why knowledge sharing is not a cultural extra.

It is operational infrastructure for innovation.

Why creativity needs structure, but not the wrong kind

The manuscript makes an important distinction: creative organizations still need implementation discipline. Creative ideas matter only if they can be implemented quickly and efficiently; knowledge sharing and innovative working methods need complementary ways of scaling implementation.

This is where many organizations go wrong.

Some suppress innovation with too much structure.
Others celebrate creativity without building the means to execute it.

The innovation pattern avoids both errors.

It does not confuse freedom with disorder.

It does not confuse control with coherence.

Instead, it builds the right kind of structure:

enough support for implementation,
enough clarity for coordination,
enough freedom for exploration,
and enough discipline to move ideas into practice.

That is what makes innovation sustainable instead of episodic.

Why innovative organizations are more than “creative places”

Innovative organizations are often described casually as creative places.

That description is too weak.

The manuscript presents something much more specific. It shows that these organizations combine high-end leadership and culture with strong purpose, relationships, and collaboration. Success and outcomes are high because leaders inspire rather than manage through rules and command-and-control, and because the organization creates a fertile environment for people to share what they know.

In other words, innovation does not come from mood alone.

It comes from a system of conditions.

A healthy culture by itself is not enough.
Bright people by themselves are not enough.
A customer orientation by itself is not enough.
Even strong leadership by itself is not enough.

Innovation becomes repeatable when these elements interact.

That is why the pattern matters more than the label.

The leadership role: not directing

ideas, but creating fertile conditions

The manuscript describes the dominant leadership style in innovation organizations as outbound. Managers form self-responsible teams with minimal structuring, stay highly involved, and act more as champions than directors. Their role is to facilitate knowledge sharing, support, motivation, and roadblock removal rather than specify every step.

This is a very different view of innovation leadership.

Leaders do not create innovation by demanding it.

They create the conditions in which it becomes more likely.

They bring people together.
They protect trust.
They encourage learning.
They support cross-boundary collaboration.
They hold the balance between freedom and direction.
They help teams move from exploration to execution.

That is why innovation leadership is less about genius and more about environment.

The role is not to own every idea.

It is to make the organization more capable of generating, testing, and implementing good ones.

Why control still matters — but differently

The manuscript is careful not to romanticize innovation. It notes that innovation organizations still face a challenge: continued growth depends on improving control systems without stifling creativity and innovation. The leadership toolbox often remains the weakest of the six competitive-advantage criteria, especially where systems need to be more closely aligned with the demographics and dynamic features of the organization.

This is an important nuance.

Innovation does not eliminate the need for control.

It changes what effective control looks like.

The challenge is not whether the organization should control.

The challenge is whether control supports experimentation, learning, and implementation—or quietly pushes the organization back into caution, fragmentation, and delay.

That is why innovation organizations must keep refining their operating systems as they grow.

Not to become more bureaucratic.

But to remain more precise.

Why innovation often disappears during growth

This is where Blog 9 and Blog 10 connect.

Many companies innovate in earlier phases, then lose that capability as they scale. The manuscript frames this as a crisis of control: innovation-type organizations often grow through delegation and accountability in self-organizing teams, but as complexity increases, leaders feel pressure to regain control. If the toolbox is not aligned, control starts to crowd out creativity.

This is one of the great organizational turning points.

Growth increases complexity.
Complexity creates anxiety.
Anxiety invites heavier systems.
Heavier systems weaken knowledge sharing.
And once knowledge sharing weakens, innovation becomes harder to sustain.

That is why innovation is not something an organization “has.”

It is something an organization must keep designing for.

What leaders should look for

Leaders who want innovation should not begin by asking for more ideas.

They should begin by asking whether the organization actually supports the pattern innovation needs.

Where does trust support experimentation, and where does fear still narrow contribution?
Where do people have enough choice to explore real options?
Where does knowledge move well, and where is it trapped in silos, hierarchy, or function?
Where do teams collaborate meaningfully across boundaries?
Where are leaders acting as champions rather than controllers?
Where do systems help scale implementation, and where do they still slow it down?
Where is culture releasing energy, and where is it still protecting caution?

These are not secondary questions.

They are the operating questions of innovation.

The development path: strengthen the pattern, not just the innovation agenda

The manuscript’s action agenda for innovation organizations is concise and strong: align the systems components of the Leadership Scorecard with a toolbox that supports the people-centric program, and prepare for the next stage by further enhancing dynamic capabilities for superior coordination.

That means the development path is not mainly about launching new innovation efforts.

It is about strengthening the pattern that already makes innovation possible.

Protect knowledge sharing.
Refine systems so they scale ideas without bureaucratizing them.
Improve coordination as the organization grows.
Keep leadership involved, but not over-directive.
Maintain the balance between exploration and sustainable delivery.

That is how innovation becomes part of the organization’s way of

operating rather than an isolated effort.

The first step: create your own Organization Twin

The most practical first step is not to assume innovation is missing because people are not creative enough.

It is to create your own Organization Twin.

Through a Structured Reflection—a standardized online questionnaire that takes about 15 minutes—you create a first evidence-based representation of how your organization currently works.

This produces two practical views:

The Capability Profile, which makes visible the broader organizational pattern: strategy, business model, organizational form, management context, growth stage, operating capabilities, and competitive barriers.

The Leadership Scorecard, which reveals how systems, leadership, culture, and success interact, and whether the organization supports understanding, thinking, delivery, engagement, and meaningful boundaries.

Together, they help leaders see whether innovation in their organization is being treated as a side activity—or whether the deeper pattern actually supports it.

Not as a judgment.
Not as a ranking.
Not as a label to defend.

But as preparation for a Guided Clarity Session.

Innovation becomes real when the whole system supports it

Innovation is not a department because innovation is not a discrete event.

It is a property of an organization that has learned how to combine human capability, trust, collaboration, leadership, and workable systems into a pattern that generates both ideas and execution.

That is what the manuscript makes visible.

Innovative organizations do not merely talk differently.

They are built differently.

And that is the real leadership challenge.

Not to ask one part of the company to “be innovative.”

But to shape an operating environment in which innovation becomes a natural, repeatable, and scalable outcome of how the organization works.

- Version zum Drucken
- Per E-Mail versenden
- Newsletter abonnieren

- Twittern

No comments yet.