

# CREATIVITY UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER

How gender affects group creativity in organisations

**Guy PARMENTIER**

*Univ. Grenoble Alpes IAE, CERAG*  
guy.parmenier@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

**S  verine LE LOARNE-LEMAIRE**

*Grenoble School of Management*  
*University of Savoie Mont-Blanc, IREGE*  
severine.le-loarne@grenoble-em.com

Citation: Parmenier, G., Le Loarne-Lemaire, S.L. (2018) La cr  ativit   sous influence du genre : comment le genre de l'individu influe sur la cr  ativit   de groupe dans les organisations. *Innovations*, N   57, 39–58.

## Summary

Creativity literature advocates the positive impact of diversity within the creative group but pays little attention to the place of gender diversity and its impact on the quality of the group's creativity. This article questions the impact of group composition in terms of gender on creative performance and on the judgement that the organisation may have of group creativity. It also examines the effect of the gender of evaluators on the evaluation of ideas. Based on two experimental studies conducted with 99 professionals and 463 students respectively, we confirm that there is no difference in creative performance between men and women. On the other hand, men and women evaluate ideas differently. Finally, while there is no glass ceiling for ideas put forward by women, ideas put forward by mixed groups are less selected by the organisation.

KEYWORDS: Group creativity, Diversity, Gender, Organisations

























### Profiles and choice of the two populations

1) The choice to work on these two populations is a matter of what Girin calls methodical opportunism (1989): the possibility of teaching these people meant that two experiments could be carried out. For all that, the choice of these populations remains consistent with the populations studied in creativity research: the student population (Perry Smith, 2006 for example) or a population of professionals in a well-identified and homogeneous field or profession, Amabile (1988, 2002) for the researcher population and Drazin et al. (1996) for project managers, etc.).

2) It should be remembered that all people are potentially creative. Amabile (1988) establishes that individual creativity is a function of three components: motivation, creativity training and, ultimately, knowledge of the field. Here, the two populations being tested are fairly homogeneous in terms of their capacity for creativity: the ideas they are asked to generate relate to their respective daily lives (life in general and ideas about tourism organisation). Their training in creativity with regard to this subject is practically non-existent. It is practically impossible to guarantee homogeneity in terms of motivation for the exercise. That said, the tourism professionals all volunteered to take part in the exercise. The students, for their part, had all freely chosen their studies and their place of study and were motivated by an external factor.



