Opening the black box of idea Evaluation:
Impact of the presentation during idea pitches.

Guy PARMENTIER*
Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CERAG
guy.parmentier@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

Séverine LE LOARNE – LEMAIRE
Grenoble Ecole de Management
severine.le-loarne@grenoble-em.com

Key words: Idea Selection, Pitch, Creative Idea

* Corresponding Author

I. Introduction

The objective of a creative session is to generate the more ideas as possible. The principle behind such an assumption is the more ideas are generated, the more likely one can obtain strong qualitative ideas. Then, up to the Organization or to the Entrepreneur to select the best ones and to exploit them. However, idea evaluation does not only depend on its intrinsic value (originality, feasibility, relevance, see (Dean *et al.*, 2006) but also on the context in which it is conducted and on the posture of those who present the idea. Recent research reveal that the team composition, in terms of gender, could impact the selection of ideas that have respectively been proposed by team members (Parmentier et Loarne-Lemaire, 2018 ; Parmentier, Szostak et Rüling, 2017). This implies that no creative idea is independent from its genitor and the way it is presented could impact its evaluation. While much research already explored the process of idea generation, little work has been done on the process by which ideas get evaluated, let alone the work on the influence of idea presentation on evaluation. Some research highlights the gender effect of the ideator (Gupta et Turban, 2012), the gender composition of the group (Parmentier, Le Loarne-Lemaire et Belkhouja, 2017), the way to present an idea (Chiaburu, Peng et Van Dyne, 2015), the experience of the ideator (Gupta et Turban, 2012) on idea evaluation. However, the evaluation of ideas still remains a black box for understanding creativity. This article therefore aims at opening this black box to understand, beyond the intrinsic value of an idea, what are the factors that influence the evaluation of this idea.

More precisely, the paper explores the dark sides of the idea evaluation and focuses on the influence of the presentation of ideas on their evaluation: The role that gender and experience of the ideator play, but also the structure of the pitch, the dynamism of the presentation, the nature and the level of language, the outfit of the ideator.

Based on the analysis of 57 idea pitches of Entrepreneurial Ideas during two start-up weekends – analysis that is conducted thanks to the QCA Method –, we show that ideas that receive the best evaluation are the best ideas in terms of newness, feasibility and relevance but the mastery of the basics of pitch presentation also has an impact on idea evaluation. In fact, the dynamism of the ideator and his / her ability to generate a singular presentation of his / her idea seem to have a strong impact on the selection of the idea by the audience. The paper seeks to contribute to identify the most favorable configurations for a good evaluation of an entrepreneurial idea in this type of innovation competition context. The contingency of these results in the analyzed contexts is discussed.

II. Theoretical framework

II.1. Generic considerations on the journey of the creative idea by organizations: the creative process

Creativity is the activity that consists in producing new, appropriate, useful and feasible ideas by an individual or a small group of individuals (Amabile, 1988). Its objective is to find innovative solutions by mobilizing the imagination to rethink the existing system (Ford, 1996). In the creative process, the idea can be considered as the result of an intention to act that leads to a statement integrating a new knowledge network and sometimes involving new networks of knowledge brokers (Parmentier et Loarne-Lemaire, 2018). In its journey, the idea often emerges in organizational interstices (Cohendet et Simon, 2007), is part of multiple collaborative networks (Perry-Smith et Mannucci, 2017), and creates new links between people and knowledge. The form of this idea, however, is closely linked to the context in which it emerges (Amabile, 1996). It will take the form of a pitch in entrepreneurship, a 'high concept' in the film industry, or a 'breakthrough' in video games, and it will be more solution-oriented in the industry.

II.2. The place of Idea Evaluation within the creative process

Different Research acknowledge that idea evaluation is part of the creative process but also reveal ambivalent results: On a hand, idea evaluation is considered as part of the whole phase of idea generation but its request is continuously mobilized during this whole process (Harvey et Kou, 2013 ; Lubart, 2001). On the other hand, Idea evaluation refers to one specific phase of the creative process (Amabile, 1988 ; Wallas, 1926). Nevertheless, in both cases, Idea evaluation is a key activity that contributes to the performance of the creative process.

The attention and amount of resources that are dedicated to the specific phase of idea evaluation strongly influence the transformation of employee creativity into achievable ideas (Van Dijk et Van Den Ende, 2002). Creativity techniques can generate many ideas, but good ideas must also be recognized. Therefore, in the creative process, the evaluation of ideas is therefore as important as the generation of ideas. However, discussions in the literature on creativity converge towards the statement according to which this part of the creative process remains under-explored (Girotra, Terwiesch et Ulrich, 2010): Depending on its form and the context of dissemination, it may be difficult to assess the quality and value of an idea. For example, during creativity sessions, participants find it hard to identify the best ideas (Putman et Paulus, 2009)

and participants do not systematically select the best intrinsic ideas for the organization (Girotra, Terwiesch et Ulrich, 2010).

II.3. Generic Criteria for selecting ideas during the creative process: the quality of the idea

Beyond the debate of its place within the creative process, the definition of the phase of Idea evaluation has been established. Idea evaluation refers to a cognitive process that consists in evaluating the consequences of developing an idea according to explicit or implicit evaluation standards (Lonergan, Scott et Mumford, 2004).

A literature review on 90 articles in which evaluation methods in research laboratories during creative processes are described reveals that selection criteria of creative ideas can be gathered into four (4) categories: novelty, feasibility, relevance, and idea specificity (Dean *et al.*, 2006). The novelty of an idea can be estimated from its degree of originality and its "paradigm relatedness", i.e., to some extends, the degree of disruption of the idea. Selected ideas are more novel when participants are instructed to select the most creative ideas than the instruction to select the best ideas (Rietzschel, Nijstad et Stroebe, 2010). Feasibility can be estimated from its social acceptability and its technical implementability. The relevance of an idea can be estimated from its applicability to a problem and its effectiveness in solving that problem (Ford, 1996). The specificity of an idea can be estimated from its implicational explicitness and the completeness of its description.

Relevant criteria are dependent of the context of creative sessions and strategic objectives of the organization (Cooper, 2006). However, when experts intuitively evaluate ideas, they unconsciously use the criteria of originality, user value and producibility (Magnusson, Netz et Wästlund, 2014). Originality, feasibility and relevance are thus the most used explicit and implicit criteria in creative sessions (Dean *et al.*, 2006 ; Magnusson, Netz et Wästlund, 2014). Despite these criteria, explicit or implicit, participants in a creative session have a strong tendency to choose feasible and desirable ideas, to the detriment of originality (Rietzschel, Nijstad et Stroebe, 2010). Moreover, there would be no constant direct effect between the completeness of the idea presentation the evaluation of its quality, suggesting that the evaluation of ideas is not a rational decision based entirely on the information provided and rational evaluation criteria (Sukhov, 2018).

II.4. Other Criteria for selecting ideas during the creative process: the fluency of the message

The managerial literature, even though not always based on any scientific and established results, proposes other potential characteristics the ideator needs to gather to get his / her creative idea adopted by the organization. The authors of one of the best seller, "Pitch Anything" (Klaff, 2011), claim that a good idea, that can be based on the previously mentioned characteristics, is not enough to get selected. The way the ideator introduce the idea, and moreover, its fluency matters. The authors insist on the positive emotion the ideator has to produce towards jury members. In such an attempt, the phrasing of the message remains a priority: the idea has to be presented in a clear manner and easy to understand. Details need to be avoided. The message has also to be presented in a positive promise.

II.5. Other Criteria for selecting ideas during the creative process: the intrinsic characteristics of the ideator

Other criteria, not explicit, could also influence the evaluation of ideas. Women's Ideas may be less highly rated than men's. Women leaders with narcissistic personalities are perceived as less effective by their subordinates than men of the same profile in the same position (De Hoogh, Den Hartog et Nevicka, 2015). The composition of the group presenting an idea could also influence the evaluation of ideas. So, the ideas supported by mixed teams are perceived as being less creative than ideas supported by teams that are predominantly composed of either males or females (Parmentier, Le Loarne-Lemaire et Belkhouja, 2017). The way the idea is presented would also have a significant impact on the evaluator. Thus, the way an idea are presented (constructive versus complaining form) influences the evaluation of ideas according to the degree of dogmatism of the receiver (Chiaburu, Peng et Van Dyne, 2015).

Apart the gender effect, other characteristics of the ideators might also influence idea selections: The more ideators, as individuals or teams, are recognized by those who are to select best ideas, as to have a strong experience in the domain, the more their ideas will be accepted (Foo, 2010). As evaluation is a cognitive process (Lonergan, Scott et Mumford, 2004) that explicitly results from a note or opinion on the value of an idea, it is likely that this evaluation mobilizes both formal criteria such as novelty, feasibility and relevance but also informal and unconscious criteria related for example to the ideator and the way the idea is presented. A study conducted in the Hollywood context shows that evaluators use a set of physical and behavioural cues to

match each pitcher to archetypes of scriptwriters. Each of these archetypes reflects for them specific levels of creativity that ultimately strongly influence the pitcher's evaluation (Elsbach et Kramer, 2003). In another context, during oral pitch to business angels in UK investor forum, presentational factors (relating to the entrepreneurs' style of delivery) had a strong impact influence on the overall score of the entrepreneurs (Clark, 2008). These two examples highlight that beyond the idea itself, the way the idea is presented has a strong impact on its final evaluation. So, in terms of behaviour, the literature in psycho-sociology of communication points out the importance of the *prestance* in the process of evaluating ideas. The *prestance* is a French Term that has been developed by the infant psychologist, H. Wallon, that refers to the role of the body while communicating (Trevarthen, 1993): the structure of the body – big or small – but also body moves while communication are also signs of communication that those who are to receive the message perceive. Even if we are here referring to a totally different context, we could also argue that the structure of the body and its movement during the pitch, in our case the presence on the stage, could impact the judgment of jury members and, therefore, their selection process. Moreover, the voice pitch can have pervasive effects on social perceptions. For example, an experimental study shows that listeners perceived lower-pitched voices as more trustworthy and attractive in the context of prosocial words than in the context of antisocial words (O'Connor et Barclay, 2018). Thus, during a pitch, the way in which the voice is used to express an idea could have consequences on its evaluation. The proper use of voice (emphasis, tone and pause) is also highlighted as a good practice for making a good entrepreneurial pitch (Klaff, 2011)

To conclude, this literature reveals that the current state of the art in management sciences about how ideas can be selected is still poor and seems to be limited to the judgment of the idea per se. The managerial literature, and, moreover, other literatures that come from the fields of psychosociology and psychology provide more insight and claim that other criteria should play any role in this selection process: the characteristics of the ideators per se but also the fluency of the message he / she diffuses. Therefore, the evaluation of ideas is still today a black box that needs to be opened to better understand the phenomena of evaluation. The ambition of this present research is to explore the dark side of evaluation and to identify the informal and unconscious criteria related to the ideator and how it is presented.

### III.	Research Design

We used qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) method to address our research question. QCA is a set theoretical methods that uses Boolean algebra and algorithms based on case studies (Fiss, 2007 ; Schneider et Wagemann, 2012). The QCA assesses the configurations of conditions that are necessary and sufficient to achieve a result in one case. A condition is a variable which can have only taken two values, i.e. 0 or 1. A null value is coded when the case does not meet the condition. For example, in our research, if a pitcher has a presence during his pitch, it will be assigned a value of 1 for the *presence* condition. A contrario, a pitcher does not impose presence will be coded 0. The QCA compares all cases through assessed conditions and their outcome (high pitch evaluation by the public), this method allows us to determine the most optimal configurations for the outcome of interest. In our research, QCA enables us to find the most optimal configurations of conditions which result in the selection of a pitch by an audience of potential entrepreneurs. We used the software R with R packages, QCA (Adrian Dusa) and Set Method (Ioana-Elena Oana and al.) to analyse data in order to identify necessary and/or sufficient conditions for a high or low score in pitches evaluation.

III.1. Data collection

We collected data during two start-up weekends in Grenoble and Chambéry (France) in November 2018 and February 2019. A start-up weekend is an event that brings together potential entrepreneurs whose objective is to create businesses. In 54 hours, participants learn to create company. They meet mentors, investors, cofounders and sponsors who help them get started. In the first phase of this event, participants have one minute to pitch in front of the group. It is not mandatory to pitch, only those who have an idea to present to the public do so. After, the pitch session, participants can vote for the pitches of their choice. They have €6,000 in virtual currency, a €3,000 bill, a €2,000 bill and a €1,000 bill that they can distribute over one or more projects. The projects that raise the most money are selected to continue their development during the rest of the weekend start-up. Teams are formed on each project. At the end of the event, each project pitch again to a jury of entrepreneurs, investors, sponsors and coaches. The top three projects receive a sum of money to start their businesses. All start-up weekend of the world use the same process with a pitch session in front of the audience at the beginning, a working session for 48 hours and a pitch session in front of the jury at the end. The start-up weekend of Grenoble brings together 89 participants with 37 initial pitches and 15 selected pitches. The start-up weekend of Chambéry brings together 48 participants with 22 initial pitches and 8 selected pitches. All pitches were recorded on video except for the 7th pitch

of Chambéry due to technical problems. However, these pitches have not selected by participants at the end of the first pitch session. The soundtrack of all the pitches has been transcribed into text. We did not include pitches that have been conducted in English during the sessions, in which the very large majority of Pitches and exchanges have been conducted in French, to preserve the consistency of the sample and not to include any bias. Finally, our final sample of cases contains 57 pitches of 1 min duration.

III.2. Measures of variables

The outcome is based on a vote of participants. The conditions are based on academic literature focusing on entrepreneurship and psychology.

Outcome

We use the pitch evaluations by the participants to assign a score from 0 to 100 to each pitch. The 100 scale is based on the highest score reached by a pitch, which is 33 000 € for Grenoble and 39 000 € for Chambéry. After each score is reduced to a percentage of that highest score. Pitches which have a score into the last two thirds of the sample (>32) was coded fully in (1) and pitches which do not have a score in the last two thirds (≤ 33) was coded fully out (0). This level of transformation of the outcome from 0 to 1 corresponds to the level of pitch selection in the project for the weekend start-ups in Grenoble and Chambéry.

Conditions

We have coded all videos with the conditions of *originality, feasibility, relevance, specificity, enunciation, presence* and *physical*. The first three conditions were assessed with a score of 1 to 5. The other conditions have been broken down into sub conditions in order to be as precise as possible in the evaluation. Each condition has been carefully described determining the criteria for justifying its presence (1) or absence (0). Each researcher first coded the videos alone. The notes were compared. If there was a discrepancy, a discussion ensued to find a common assessment. In the event of disagreement, a third researcher assessed the condition in order to obtain additional advice. In the end, there was an evaluation gap on 4.86% of the 1276 codes assigned to videos. Newness, feasibility, relevance and specificity were the four most important criteria for evaluating ideas in creativity literature (Dean *et al.*, 2006 ; Magnusson, Netz et Wästlund, 2014). The newness of an idea can be estimated from its degree of originality and its paradigm relatedness. The feasibility of an idea can be estimated from its social acceptability and its technical implementability (Dean *et al.*, 2006). For a pitch, relevance of an

idea can be estimated from its effectiveness in solving a problem of everyday life, social or environmental. These first three conditions were assessed on a scale of 1 to 5. Beyond the score of 3, the condition was coded at 1.

The specificity of an idea can be estimated from its implicational explicitness and the completeness of its description (Dean *et al.*, 2006). Based on the managerial literature for entrepreneurs (Klaff, 2011), we identified 5 sub conditions, which determine its explicitness and exhaustiveness: the explanation of the need, solution and target, the use of a story to illustrate the need or the solution, the statement of the project name. When there are more than 3 sub conditions at 1 in 5, specificity was coded at 1. We have identified 5 sub conditions for the good enunciation of a pitch based on managerial literature for entrepreneurs (Klaff, 2011): the absence of the use of written notes, the fluency of speech, a low level of hesitation or blockage in the flow of speech (less than 7), the correct use of grammar and respect for the time allocated. When there are more than 3 sub conditions at 1 in 5, enunciation was coded at 1. The presence is the impression that one gives in terms of one's character and manners. For a pitch, we identified 4 sub conditions based on the psycho-sociology and managerial literature : the varied and accentuated flow of the voice, a smiling person, the use of arms and space to highlight salient elements of the speech, interaction with the audience in the form of a question requiring an answer. When there are more than 3 sub conditions at 1 in 4, presence was coded at 1. Finally, we are also coded the physical aspect of the pitchers. As soon as there was a difference in corpulence, geographical origin or age in relation to the majority of participants present, we set this condition to 0.

Table 1: Crisp set membership calibration

Outcome	Fully in (1)	Fully out (0)
High evaluation by participants	• The score of the evaluation by the participants must be higher than 32 out of 100	• The score of the evaluation by the participants must be less than 33 out of 100

Condition	Fully in (1)	Fully out (0)
Newness: its degree of originality and its paradigm relatedness	• The score of the evaluation by the researchers must be higher than 2 out of 5	• The score of the evaluation by the researchers must be less than 3 out of 5
Feasibility: its social acceptability and its technical implementability	• The score of the evaluation by the researchers must be higher than 2 out of 5	• The score of the evaluation by the researchers must be less than 3 out of 5
Relevance: its effectiveness in solving a problem of everyday life (scale of 5) and the social and environmental objective of the project (scale of 5)	• The score of the evaluation by the researchers must be higher than 5 out of 10	• The score of the evaluation by the researchers must be less than 6 out of 10
Specificity: need, solution target, story and project name	• Three of these five criteria are required to be coded 1	• Below 3 required criteria, the condition was coded 0
Enunciation: no written notes, speech fluency, little hesitation or blockage, grammar and time	• Three of these five criteria are required to be coded 1	• Below 3 required criteria, the condition was coded 0
Presence: voice flow, smiling person, body use, interaction	• Three of these five criteria are required to be coded 1	• Below 3 required criteria, the condition was coded 0
Physic: age (above majority), corpulence (above majority), and geographical origin (not originating in the country in which the start-up weekend takes place)	• Only one criterion is required to be coded 1	• None criterion is required to be coded 0

Table 2: Truth table (39 configurations)

Config. number	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	Number of cases	Output value*	Cases
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	Phoenix
3	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	3	1	Willo, Safe Hear, Demeure
4	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	Habitus
5	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	Hogo
6	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	CRMI
7	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	Prollix, Schuss
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	Time to learn

#	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	N	*	
9	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	Refuel, Home Stylist
10	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	Immo Etudiant
11	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	0	Hero Bot, Annophilia
12	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	Agriplan
13	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	Agence Web
14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	AFD Watt
15	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	Conciergerie, Escape Gift
16	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	Randoski
17	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	La Coulisse
18	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	Les Pierres, Solal, Humus
19	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	Gaiac
20	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	0	Simon, Sens, Chanclas
21	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	0	Lokki, By by Fisc, Formation Etudiant, BAO
22	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	Eureka
23	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	Conseil Elus
24	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	Adé
25	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	Bougez Plus, Café All Around
26	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	Tably Power, Improjecteur
27	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	3	0	Mobilier C, Impact, Smart Travel
28	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	Ecolove
29	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	Talentueux, VR School
30	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	Toy
31	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	My Radio
32	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	Together
33	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	PixAI
34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	Gasto
35	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	Tech Po
36	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	Ubyks
37	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	U Trip
38	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	Prêt à lire
39	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	Sauv Me
40	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	Pariez sur vous

* Sufficiency inclusion score greater than 0,832

Conditions : a = newness, b = feasibility, c = relevance, d = specificity, e = enunciation, f = presence and g = physical

Our sample contains 39 configurations out of 128 possible configurations with 7 conditions.

Our overall coverage rate is therefore 30.48%.

IV.   Results

The first phase of the QCA analysis addresses the necessary conditions. The consistency threshold of 0.92 is adopted to select configurations associated with the outcome and the outcome's negation. Our analysis reveals no necessary conditions for a high evaluation of the pitch or a low evaluation of the pitch (see table 3).

Table 3: Analysis of the necessary conditions with positive conditions and positive outcomes

Conditions tested	Consistency	Coverage
Newness	0.561	0.512
Feasibility	0.770	0.448
Relevance	0.560	0.511
Specificity	0.666	0.486
Enunciation	0.861	0.459
Presence	0.320	0.390
Physical	0.584	0.440

The second phase of the QCA analysis addresses sufficient conditions. We find three configurations of sufficient conditions that lead to a good pitch evaluation (see table 4). Configuration 1 shows a pitcher who proposes a good idea in terms of newness, feasibility and relevance with a pitch well structured (specificity condition), and a pitcher that masters enunciation and the presence on the stage. However, in this case, the pitcher has a physical difference differences in comparison with the majority of the other participants.

Configuration 2 shows three pitchers who propose a good idea in terms of newness, feasibility and relevance with a pitch well structured, and a pitcher that masters enunciation. In these cases, there is no mastery of the presence on stage but the pitchers do not present any physical differences in comparison with the majority of the other participants.

Pitcher of the third configuration proposes an idea less creative (not newness), an only feasible and useful idea, and in this case the mastery of stage presence and physical compliance with the majority of other participants are sufficient to obtain a good evaluation.

Table 4: Sufficient conditions for a high evaluation of pitches by participants*

Conditions	Configurations		
	1	2	3
Newness	●	●	○
Feasibility	●	●	●
Relevance	●	●	●
Specificity	●	●	○
Enunciation	●	●	○
Presence	●	○	●
Physical	○	●	●
Raw coverage	0,033	0,098	0,033
Unique coverage	0,033	0,098	0,033
Consistency	0,838	0,835	0,832
Number of cases	1	3	1
	Phoenix	Willo Safe Hear Demeure	Habitus

* Sufficiency inclusion score greater than 0,832

A contrario, we find seven configurations of sufficient conditions that lead to a low pitch evaluation (see table 5). Not surprisingly, configuration 1 shows that the absence of a good idea is not compensated by a good structure of pitch, and a good enunciation and presence on stage of the pitcher. In this configuration, the physical differences in comparison with the majority of the other participants plays no role. In configuration 2, despite a good idea, a good specificity and good enunciation, the physical difference and the absence of presence on stage lead to a low evaluation. The other configurations (from 3 to 7) present either newness and feasible ideas, or ideas that are only feasible, and never more than two positive other conditions (specificity, enunciation, presence or physical). These results are consistent with the configurations that lead to a high pitch evaluation. However, we notice that the configuration 4, with a newness and feasible idea, and with no physical difference and presence on stage of the pitcher, leads to a low evaluation. While the same pitcher conditions but with a feasible and useful idea, this configuration lead to a high evaluation.

Table 5: Sufficient conditions for a low evaluation of pitches by participants*

Conditions	Configurations						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Newness	○	●	●	●	○	○	○
Feasability	○	●	●	●	●	●	●
Relevance	○	●	○	○	○	○	○
Specificity	●	○	○	○	○	○	●
Enunciation	●	●	●	○	○	●	○
Presence	●	●	○	●	○	●	○
Physical	○	●	●	●	○	○	○
Raw coverage	0,057	0,027	0,029	0,03	0,027	0,029	0,029
U coverage	0,057	0,027	0,029	0,03	0,027	0,029	0,029
Consistency	0,901	0,852	0,901	0,95	0,852	0,901	0,923
Number cases	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Sauv me PixAI	Tech Po	Habitus	Pariez sur vous	Gastro	Ubyks	Prêt à lire

* Sufficiency inclusion score greater than 0,852

V.   Discussion

We propose to discuss our results on two main levels, mostly on how the organization or the small group of individuals can retain any creative idea. The first level of discussion, and maybe, the more "classical" is dealing with the quality of the idea per se. Are its intrinsic qualities enough for getting adopted? The second level of discussion refers to the adoption of the idea depending on its newness.

V.1. Is a good idea enough?

Our results tend to show that proposing any good idea, in terms of newness, feasibility and relevance is not enough to get adopted: The quality of the ideator matters, especially his / her capacity to present the idea clearly, to be present. What is also interesting is to note that it such requirements are necessary when the ideator presents a deviant physical appearance to the "norm" of the group. When the ideator has a a physical appearance that matches the group, he has less need to emphasize the idea for it to be well evaluated. In our case, presence on stage is not necessary, but you still need a well-structured pitch (specificity) and a good enunciation of

the idea. Such findings are consistent with the first few results of researches that have already been conducted in management sciences (Parmentier & Le Loarne, 2018): the ideator himself matters. What is interesting here is that we are able to bring one other piece of knowledge to confirm the assumption. But how can we explain such results? One interpretation is the trust the evaluators can have on the ideator. In a Group perspective, Zucker (1986) explains that a group tends to choose to integrate persons who express similar characteristics. Here, the idea is not to select the ideator per se but his / her ideas but we could argue the more similar the ideator is to the group, the more likely his / her idea will get accepted, but, also assuming the idea already have the right criteria.

V.2. Is it more complicated to get a new idea adopted than any other ideas?
Our results also reveal that the more the idea is new, the less likely it is to get chosen. Results here are interesting in the sense that, to our knowledge, little is known on the subject. At least, they are partly consistent with new research results according to which any idea – and all the more innovative ideas – needs to get socialized before getting adopted by the organization (Perry-Smith & Mannucci, 2017). Moreover, they could explain why deviant ideas are often rejected by the group: When they are new, ideas have to be "better" presented than any other ideas and the pitch has to be "perfect" in almost all the criteria.

VI. Contribution, limitation, further research

Since, to our knowledge, very little is known on the criteria that really determines the adoption of any creative idea, we argue that our work brings some first pieces of knowledge to better understand the phenomena.

Of course, this study suffers from many limitations and, therefore, open some call for further research. In this work, we consider the idea as to be new, original, starting a score of 3 out of 5. This study deserves more analytical treatments. Moreover, we have not been able to integrate many criteria to measure the belonging of the ideator to the norm and we wish we would have been able to consider the clothing but also the education of the ideator, compared to the average clothing or average education of the group who got invited to evaluate his / her idea. Last but not least, we have not been able to confirm the results we found in the literature on the gender impact on idea selection.

Bibliography

Amabile T.M. (1988). « A model of creativity and innovation in organizations », *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *10*, p. 123-167.

Amabile T.M. (1996). *Creativity in context: update to « the social psychology of creativity »*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Chiaburu D.S., Peng A.C., Van Dyne L. (2015). « Does it matter how I say it? The effects of constructive and complaining forms of idea presentation on supervisory evaluations », *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, *14*, n° 2, p. 104-108.

Clark C. (2008). « The impact of entrepreneurs' oral "pitch" presentation skills on business angels' initial screening investment decisions », *Venture Capital*, *10*, n° 3, p. 257-279.

Cohendet P., Simon L. (2007). « Playing across the playground: paradoxes of knowledge creation in the videogame firm », *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *28*, n° 5, p. 587.

Cooper R.G. (2006). « Managing technology development projects », *Research Technology Management*, *49*, n° 6, p. 23-31.

De Hoogh A.H.B., Den Hartog D.N., Nevicka B. (2015). « Gender Differences in the Perceived Effectiveness of Narcissistic Leaders », *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *64*, n° 3, p. 473-498.

Dean D.L., Hender J.M., Rodgers T.L., Santanen E.L. (2006). « Identifying Quality, Novel, and Creative Ideas: Constructs and Scales for Idea Evaluation », *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, *7*, n° 10, p. 646-698.

Elsbach K.D., Kramer R.M. (2003). « Assessing Creativity in Hollywood Pitch Meetings: Evidence for a Dual-Process Model of Creativity Judgments », *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*, n° 3, p. 283-301.

Fiss P.C. (2007). « A SET-THEORETIC APPROACH TO ORGANIZATIONAL CONFIGURATIONS », *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, n° 4, p. 1180-1198.

Foo M.-D. (2010). « Member Experience, Use of External Assistance and Evaluation of Business Ideas », *Journal of Small Business Management*, *48*, n° 1, p. 32-43.

Ford C.M. (1996). « A theory of individual creative action in multiple social domains », *Academy of Management Review*, *21*, n° 4, p. 1112-1142.

Girotra K., Terwiesch C., Ulrich K.T. (2010). « Idea Generation and the Quality of the Best Idea », *Management Science*, *56*, n° 4, p. 591-605.

Gupta V.K., Turban D.B. (2012). « Evaluation of New Business Ideas: Do Gender Stereotypes Play a Role? », *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *24*, n° 2, p. 140-156.

Harvey S., Kou C.-Y. (2013). « Collective Engagement in Creative Tasks: The Role of Evaluation in the Creative Process in Groups », *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *58*, n° 3, p. 346-386.

Klaff O. (2011). *Pitch Anything: An Innovative Method for Presenting, Persuading, and Winning the Deal*, McGraw-Hill Professional.

Lonergan D.C., Scott G.M., Mumford M.D. (2004). « Evaluative Aspects of Creative Thought: Effects of Appraisal and Revision Standards », *Creativity Research Journal*, *16*, n° 2/3, p. 231-246.

Lubart T.I. (2001). « Models of the Creative Process: Past, Present and Future », *Creativity*

Research Journal, *13*, n° 3/4, p. 295-308.

Magnusson P.R., Netz J., Wästlund E. (2014). « Exploring holistic intuitive idea screening in the light of formal criteria », *Technovation*, *34*, n° 5/6, p. 315-326.

O'Connor J.J.M., Barclay P. (2018). « High voice pitch mitigates the aversiveness of antisocial cues in men's speech », *British Journal of Psychology, 109*, n° 4, p. 812-829.

Parmentier G., Le Loarne-Lemaire S., Belkhouja M. (2017). « Female Creativity in Organizations: What is the Impact of Team Composition in Terms of Gender during Ideation Processes? », *Management International*, *22*, n° 1, p. 33-43.

Parmentier G., Loarne-Lemaire S.L. (2018). « La créativité sous influence du genre : comment le genre de l'individu influe sur la créativité de groupe dans les organisations », *Innovations*, *N° 57*, n° 3, p. 39-58.

Parmentier G., Szostak B.L., Rüling C.-C. (2017). « Créativité organisationnelle: quels enjeux en management stratégique dans un contexte mondialisé? », *Management International*, *22*, n° 1, p. 12-18.

Perry-Smith J.E., Mannucci P.V. (2017). « From Creativity to Innovation: The Social Network Drivers of the Four Phases of the Idea Journey », *Academy of Management Review*, *42*, n° 1, p. 53-79.

Putman V. L., Paulus P.B. (2009). « Brainstorming, Brainstorming Rules and Decision Making », *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *43*, n° 1, p. 23-45.

Rietzschel E.F., Nijstad B.A., Stroebe W. (2010). « The selection of creative ideas after individual idea generation: Choosing between creativity and impact », *British Journal of Psychology*, *101*, n° 1, p. 47-68.

Schneider C.Q., Wagemann C. (2012). « Set-Theoretic Methods for the Social Sciences: A Guide to Qualitative Comparative Analysis », p. 370.

Sukhov A. (2018). « The role of perceived comprehension in idea evaluation », *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *27*, n° 2, p. 183-195.

Trevarthen C. (1993). « An appreciation of the interpersonal psychology of Henri Wallon », *Enfance*, *46*, n° 1, p. 43-46.

Van Dijk C., Van Den Ende J. (2002). « Suggestion systems: transferring employee creativity into practicable ideas », *R&D Management*, *32*, n° 5, p. 387-395.

Wallas G. (1926). *The art of thought*, Harcourt Brace, New York.

Zucker L.G. (1986). « Production of Trust: Institutional Sources of Economic Structure, 1840-1920 », *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *8*, p. 53.