Abstract. *The issue of developing an effective idea generation model has preoccupied business leaders more and more in modern businesses. The literature shows that there are many models that are in use and that differ substantially in both style and application. The idea generation methods can be divided into three groups: group work, individual approach and schematic techniques. After analyzing all the methods belonging to each group, a total of nine methods were selected (three for each category).This study tries to identify whether or not there is a connection between the number of ongoing projects from a company and the three groups of methods. In order to perform this analysis, the banking sector was chosen, using a sample of nine banks.*

Keywords: *idea, idea generation, banking sector, entrepreneurship, innovation.*

MODERN BUSINESS METHODS OF IDEA GENERATION IN THE BANKING SECTOR

Adrian Dumitru TANȚĂU
Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest
6 Romană Square, 1st district, Bucharest, Romania
Email: ad_tantau@yahoo.com

Silviu MATEEŞESCU
Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest
6 Romană Square, 1st district, Bucharest, Romania
Email: matesilviu@yahoo.com

Management & Marketing
Challenges for the Knowledge Society
(2012) Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 57-72

1. Introduction

Businesses today are very different from the ones that existed several decades ago. This is due not only to the environmental changes or to the technology improvements. To a large extent, the difference emerges from the way businesses are started and developed. For many years until the industrial revolution, business simply emerged to meet some objective of the founder. The main characteristic about these businesses is that they assumed as long as the founder had something to offer, the market would be there. This model of product driven businesses, however, had a fatal flaw. If the market changed after some time, the founder was left with only production facilities and a broken heart. This trend started breeding a new type of businesses, businesses that focused on a need of the society that was expected to be durable. These businesses also suffered a fatal mistake. The market always changed and what appeared to be a durable business model, after some time, would wither away. After the collapse or disappearance of many businesses, a new type of business emerged, which is said to be the modern business. This is a business based on a flexible model, a business that always anticipates the market behavior and changes in accordingly (McAdam, 2004). One characteristic of this type of business is that at any given time it can take a totally new model that has nothing in common with the original business idea. Some theorists have argued that modern businesses change so frequently and so significantly that it is possible to think of them as many businesses operating serially.

Although the modern business have identified the trick of lasting longer, maybe even forever, by constantly changing the business model, the problems do not end there. For the businesses to change, they must be able to continuously generate new business ideas that are viable in the changing environment (Smith, 1998). This is the main task for modern businesses and the focus of this study. Modern businesses have been described as entrepreneurial businesses to reflect this nature of constantly searching for new ideas and adopting them to continue operating profitably. Idea generation is generally a process and business have tried many models that have been adopted in many disciplines.

2. Business evolution over time

The evolution of business is quite similar to the evolution of the human race. In today's world, the business holds a key component in the society, since it offers a means of livelihood to almost everybody. Today's business is far much different from the way it used to be several years ago. It has changed through various aspects and this change is attributed to the various innovations that occur with the human race. In real sense, the term 'business', can mean the aggregate economic activities which human beings choose to engage in. These economic activities are categorized by production of goods or services and trade of those goods and services (Burnes 2004). Modern business, thus, means using the latest innovations and technologies to engage in economic activities in the best way possible (Burnes, 2004; Pettigrew, 1973; Penrose, 1959). Just like other

economic activities, the evolution of business has been in three stages, which are the pre-industrialized period, the industrialization period and the modern internet period (Burnes, 2004; Miller, 2010; Miller, 1992).

2.1 Business in Pre-Industrialized World

During this time, the agriculture was the dominant economic activity. Other minor economic activities in this period included various forms of trade in non-agricultural activities, like handiworks and other rural based industries. Barter trade existed in the market and later on was developed into an advanced and organized form, that broadened beyond countries and continents. Barter remained common, even in the eighteen century, although transactions were still documented in financial terms. The pre-industrial society tended to be fairly local, even though barter trade resulted to local markets that were small and regionally focused businesses. The ancient civilizations confirm that both local and international trade existed during this period, and the items for trade included precious metals, fruits, and jewels (Galbraith, 1952; McGrath, 1993).

During this age, the production of goods took place at diverse levels in the society. In the rural set up, production of goods composed of handicrafts like weaving, metal work or wood work. Hence, this period relied on the skilled craftsmen, artisans, and individuals with farming skills. On the other hand, production in the urban centers included efficient trading activities as the most dominant feature. As time went by, trading began to take another dimension as it was now more centered toward specialization. Business personalities started to form various classes of trading, for instance, in India, the trading business class was known as Vaishya, who were one of the four castes in the society (Galbraith, 1952; Langbert, 2005; Kuchinke, 2001). International trade began taking shape during the third century B.C. and at this time international trade was dominant in many parts of Europe and Asia. The traders travelled widely across various countries with the common goal of exchanging their goods for a proper fee. As a result of this, trading empires started to build up in various parts of Europe and Asia (Galbraith, 1952; Krefting and Nord, 2003; Knight, 1921). The empires became so powerful such that they influenced the direction of trade in the whole region.

Hence, the pre-industrialized period was a trial and error mode for the individual inventor or industrialist and his ‘dream’. Business ideas during this period were quite low as the innovation model was highly risky. Since the business approach was not very systematic, the business environment was static in nature, hence little scope for innovation. During this period, businesses were infringed of resources (Verloop and Wissema, 2004). Hence, innovation could not be stimulated in order to come up with solutions that would be able to propel the businesses forward, so as to position it to achieve its goals and objectives. The lack of access to resources in this period contributed in affecting the growth prospects of the businesses (Krefting and Nord, 2003).

2.2 Business in the Industrialization Period

The shift from pre-industrialization to an industrialized society did not change within a short span of time, it took hundreds of years, from around the 1200s to the 1800s. The period of industrialization was characterized by major rise of machines. In this period, human labour gave way to the adoption of machines in the production process (McGrath, 1993; Kimberly, 1981; Jackson, 1992). Until the industrialization period, the dominant factors of production were land, labour, and capital. The other factor of production, which is management, came up as a result of the expanding nature of the business world. The latest development in technologies of production was mainly viewed to be as a result of the introduction of machines. The existence of machines made it possible for labour to be more efficient. As a result, a lot of goods were produced within a very short time, thus, trade developed and took a central position within the society. This contributed to the emergence of modern markets or business systems. As trade continued to expand, there was an urgent need to further study the market progress, thus, necessitating the research to find out new directions for trading to take place (McGrath, 1993; Johnson and Scholes, 2001). As a result of the research to find out the new trading routes, Christopher Columbus bumped into a new land, which was later to be known as America. America later transformed to be the centre of world's business. As a result, many inventions and innovations have originated from that land.

Money was introduced in the 17th century and it replaced barter trade system of exchanging goods in the market. Paper money quickly replaced the precious metals that were previously used for trade. Another major development during this period was the emergence of big industries in America. Robber Barons became the first American industrialists (Nelson and Winter, 1982; Geert, 1991; Gronn 2002; DiMaggio 2001). Towards the end of the 19th century, several other industrialists came into play, most notably were the Carnegie Steel Company and Central Pacific railroad (Nelson and Winter, 1982). These industries created competition in the business world and as a result of this, many more innovations took place. At the start of the 20th century, the leading industries in the world were mainly from Europe and they were followed by American industries and Asian industries, in that order. Other parts of the world, including the Latin America region and Africa, still lagged behind with regard to the establishment of industries within their soil (Nelson and Winter, 1982; Cameron, Sutton, and Whetten, 1988). The emergence of these industries contributed to the development of energy market, mainly oil and petrol, as they were the common source of energy in these set ups. The introduction of petrodollar gave rise to rich and powerful oil business empires, mostly in the oil rich gulf countries.

The Industrial Revolution technology innovations soon surpassed the traditional management skills employed in rural settings. This was attributable to the fact that machine power was the major source of production. Innovation in this period was facilitated by emerging markets that were arising from systematic use of science and technology. Since money economies substituted barter economies, managers who were accountable for operating the factories and assembly lines were scheduling, coordinating, and rewarding the employees in wages. Disorganized and random management practices

proved to be unsatisfactory for large-scale factory operations. Businesses during this period required clear management direction so as to be efficient. As a result, they adopted multiple sites that necessitated coordination and control by means of speedily delivered information and structure. For instance, the first multinational corporation, Standard Oil, refined, distributed, and marketed almost 90% of America's oil in the early part of the 20th century, hence depicting the start of innovation management with regards to discovering and delivering a product. In this industrial economy, the distinction of small and large business became vital, this period brought gave way to large companies. This period shifted business operations from highlighting on independent, skilled workers who concentrated in building products one by one, to a factory system that mass-produced items by gathering together huge numbers of semiskilled workers. The businesses during this period gained from the savings they generated from the large-scale productions, reinforced by rising support from machines across time. The growth of businesses enabled them to buy raw materials more reasonably compared to the previous times. Due to this rapid change, the businesses in the United States and England experienced a revolutionary period (Gronn, 2002).

From 1815 and 1875, the industrial period changed the United States from an agrarian economy into an industrial giant. Agriculture in the U.S. was very profitable and hence resulted the increase in farm incomes and a huge demand for standardized consumer products. The system led to merging of mass production, raw materials, machinery, and labour into one volume on the same location, with the aim of purchasing in bulk and at a reduced cost. The innovation of machines enabled business during this period to produce goods quickly, cheaply, of high quality, and more uniformly compared to those produced by hand. Across the world, entrepreneurs developed new production methods and created a virtually continual array of commercially useful products (Boone and Kurtz, 2010).

During the Industrial Revolution, Grantiterock, a company based in the United States, adopted the business opportunities and responded to technological, competitive, and marketplace demands. Currently, it has evolved to be a modern business and provides consumer products produced from recycled materials. Scientific discoveries were translated into inventions in the technology domain and a certain number of the inventions expanded further in the business sphere. As a result, they passed to the market innovations that scattered through society. This period later shifted to the post industrial era where multinationals, the conglomerate firms and the corporate giants operated across national boundaries, hence developing an interconnected, interdependent world economy. Businesses achieved strategic objectives by running business processes and optimizing their capabilities. Small businesses gained new opportunities by strengthening the emerging industrial economy in ways that cannot be statistically accessed. They became a crucial link by engaging in mass production and creating massive amount of innovations with regards to the technology of products and business methods. Innovation also greatly expanded in the managerial techniques that were adopted. They have currently expanded the current business units in boosting the resource base and reorganizing the factors of production in an objective manner (Boone and Kurtz, 2010).

2.3 Business in the Modern Internet Period

Initially, business was perceived to be either involving the trade of goods, manufacture of goods or exchange of goods. However, in the modern internet period, that perception has hugely changed as a result of internet technological advancements (Nunnally, 1978; Capelli, 2000). The development of the World Wide Web made the ease of transfer of goods and services from one area to another. During this period, it was not mandatory for a person to be physically present in order to provide labour services, instead, the person can provide labour services to an organization while he/she is far away, by use of internet.

As the internet era began to take shape, many businesses started to use customized business softwares, in order to streamline their operations. As a result, several software companies came into being, in order to meet the growing and changing demands with regard to the business world (Vesper, 1990). This course of action streamlined the business world forever. Research was made easier as a result of designed softwares and other computer applications. Up to now, the evolution of business is a process that still goes on and on, as a result of the ever growing needs of many organizations. It is important to note that the business evolution process is much similar to the history of human beings, since both processes are connected and interlinked with each other.

The internet era has resulted to a competitive environment where businesses are being compelled to generate internal processes, structures and methods. To exemplify, more than 50 percent of large businesses are utilizing internet regularly. The evolution of the internet is still a continuous process and the recent technological upgrades play a major role towards the shaping of the future business world. The innovations in the 20th century have proved to be a result of dynamic processes from the web, that focus systematically on adding value to business strategies. The internet era has resulted to a revolutionary change by reducing business boundaries and endowed them a way to easily and speedily access the interest of the maximum number of customers. Large businesses have become the most favorable place for the majority of high-tech innovations. The way how modern businesses will become accustomed to the current and future technology is now a challenge, thus the importance of unlearning the current programs and learning new sets of capabilities (Bratianu and Orzea, 2010). Companies are reducing constraints that are likely to stifle them from adopting innovations. One of the flourishing companies to gain a competitive advantage as a result of adopting the new communications technology is Amazon (Metrick and Yasuda, 2009). Nevertheless, successful adoption will enable modern business to reuse the existing business regulations, that maintain the current business processes (Vesper, 1990).

3. Literature Review

The issue of creativity and idea generation in businesses is not new. In the 18th century, economists started analyzing the purpose of new businesses in the economy. It was immediately realized by Adam Smith (1981), who supported the idea of free

enterprise, that businesses are usually based on idea generation and improvement. Other economists, like Milton Friedman (1962), have also contributed to the idea of free enterprise, which is the base of creativity and entrepreneurship. Apart form the economic point of view, the issue of creativity and idea generation has been tackled in other disciplines, such as business management, notably by Peter Drucker (1954) who argued that the purpose of business is innovation and marketing. Innovation, according to Drucker, involved the constant search for better ways of producing and for products that can meet the needs of the customers better.

The literature of idea generation techniques can be analyzed in three headings: those techniques that prefer group work, those techniques that prefer individual approach and those techniques that apply a schema to develop an idea. These are reviewed below.

3.1. Group Approach systems

The most common of the group approaches techniques is the brain *storming method*. This method was developed in the early 1960s by Osborn. The method is also perhaps the first attempt to develop a formal model that can be used for idea generation. The method involves the participation of many individuals who are concerned with the main problem or issue. All the individuals produce ideas and these are then vouched by the whole group (Mumford et al., 2001). The method has been applied in many organizations to generate ideas. However, the model has a particular weakness. The major weakness with the model is that it assumes people in a group can be able to generate good ideas. Research by Amabile (1988) showed that in groups people may lower their level of risk appetitive and therefore generate ideas that are not optimal. The key strength with this model, however, that has made it endure for a long time, is that it facilitates the generation of many diverse ideas (Mumford et al., 2001).

The other popular group method of idea generation is the Team Process. This process has been very popular with large organizations where the process of idea generation is seen as a collective process (Taylor and Greve, 2006). It requires the assignment of the job of idea generation to a team that handles no other role. The team then engages in intensive debate, similar to what would be expected in brainstorming (Payne, 1990). This model has been applied in various forms in different businesses. In many technologically involving businesses, the team comprises of technical experts. In other businesses, the team may comprise of a managerial group. This process, although successful, has a major limitation. The team does not have very good access to externals ideas. Charlan and Ormiston (2007) demonstrated that although a closed group in harmony is capable of generating quality ideas, a group that is stimulated by constant changes, that brought in new perspectives, had better ides. The critical element learned from this model therefore is that diversity is critical.

Problem mapping is a technique that involves a group of people working in a room with a board. The technique involves the establishment of the main problem (McAdam, 2004). Ideas and the way they connect to the main problem are then raised building the map into a bigger and more complex model. When all the relevant issues

and their relationships with the main problem are mapped out, the process then focuses on developing a method to solve them systematically. This method was developed by T. Buzan in the early 1970s to be applied as an individual technique. However, the complexity that arises when the relevant factors are mapped out together with their relationships, made it be more applicable in groups. The main success with this model is that it helps in focusing the idea generation on the main problem by identifying all the relevant factors and their relationships. The method stimulates thinking of solutions and reinforces memory. However, the main problem is that there are usually no real boundaries between problems and it might therefore take a very long time to map out the whole problem (Weisberg, 1999). The model has two critical factors, which are the focus on the main problem and the establishment of a way to harvest ideas without the need to engage in endless analysis.

3.2. Individual Approaches

The most popular model of the individual approaches is the *Delphi Method*. The Delphi method is symbolically named after the Apollo's temple in Greece. In line with the ancient Greece philosophers method of analysis, it involves individual critical thinking, that is supposed to follow the logical way of thought of the individual. The method is expected to produce pure and complete ideas on how to confront the problem. The method appreciates that individual analysis may result in more concrete ideas than group thinking (McAdam, 2004). It however assumes the problem may be possible to be comprehended by an individual in its completeness. This is usually the major flaw and when the problem is big enough or when the variables involved are too many, the individual may take a very long time to figure out a new idea to solve the problem (Weisberg, 1999). The critical element in the method is the emphasis on critical analysis of the problem. Due to the focus of the effort on a critical and logical method, the technique is capable of producing unique ideas that are complete.

Lateral thinking is another very popular technique of idea generation that can be applied by an individual. The process was developed and popularized by de Bono (1970). The main feature of the method is that it involves the application of common solutions to different problems or introducing new problems to common scenarios (Terwiesch and Ulrich, 2009). The method emphasizes on the ability to recast the existing knowledge in different scenarios that have little resemblance to the scenarios in which the knowledge is commonly used in. The critical elements of this method are therefore the emphasis on transcending the existing boundaries of thought and critical thinking by the individual as in the Delphi method. Fleming and Singh (2007) demonstrated that when the boundaries of knowledge are assumed away, the generation of ideas becomes stimulated and the result is usually a multiplicity of many new ways of doing the same thing.

Revolutionary Idea Generation is best applicable at an individual level although it has also been applied in groups. The method involves discarding all the existing knowledge about a problem and coming up with a new and original way of doing things or a new and original product. This idea is supported by many theorists like Goldenberg,

Lehmann, and Mazursky (2001) who argue that an idea that is really helpful must not be limited by existing systems and knowledge. Kavadias and Sommer (2007) demonstrated that ideas that are built on existing systems or evolutionary ideas rarely bring in radical improvements in products or systems. But ideas that were developed without the limitation of existing systems and ideas always brought about radical improvements. The critical idea in the method is therefore the lack of imitation from the existing knowledge and systems. The method therefore encourages unbounded imagination.

3.3. Schematic Approaches

One of the most popular schematic approaches is the *1H5W method*. The method focuses on answering the questions How, When, Where, Who, What, and Why. By focusing on these questions, the method seeks to identify all the elements of the problem and as a consequence, to make the solution show up (Finke et al, 1992). The focus on questions offers a comprehensive approach to understanding problems, which makes the approach very popular in businesses. However, by asking the questions endlessly, the method suffers from the same problems as the mapping technique. Since there are no real boundaries between problems, the questions may be asked endlessly unless there is a limiting mechanism. The key element in the technique is the emphasis on comprehensiveness and also ,like the mapping technique, on the importance of having a way to utilize ideas without being paralyzed by endless analysis.

The Five Why Method is similar in many ways to the 1H5W method. The method involves asking the question Why for five times. By developing answers to the questions, the method hopes to develop a credible solution to the main problem. This method works by deconstructing the problem into its fundamental elements and then building a solution from the fundamentals. The model has been used successfully in businesses as it simplifies the idea generation problem. The main flaw with this method is that it assumes there is a limit to the fundamental factors of a problem. This is not always so. Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta and Kramer (2004) argue that the nature of business problems is that they are interrelated and therefore an attempt to create a boundary in itself introduces a weakness to the model. The critical element in this model is the focus on the main problem and the establishment of a way to limit analysis.

The Checklist Method is another schematic method that is very popular in businesses today. The method has three aspects, which are attribute listing, wishful thinking and demerit listing (Ford, 2000). Attribute listing endeavors on identifying all the important characteristics of the systems and the people involved in the problem. This is expected to produce a comprehensive list of all the relevant attributes that can be integrated in problem solving or in the development of the new idea. Wishful thinking involves the unlimited imagination that focuses on ideals that can be achieved in resolving the current problem. The ideals are to be compared with the available attributes and with the best way to combine the attributes outlined (Estes and Ward, 2002). Demerit listing endeavors to identify all the possible ways in which the current situation can be altered to achieve better results. This method is the most strategic of all the schematic methods. The method not only ensures the focus on the main problem, but

also helps map out all the available resources in form of attributes and does not limit the way the attributes can be combined. However, by focusing on improving the existing situation, the method suffers from the flaw of evolutionary approaches (Smith, 1998). The key element of this model is the emphasis on comprehensiveness and free imagination.

4. A case study of idea generation in the banking sector

Three groups of banks were selected, each one using different methods of idea generation. Group one uses individual methods, the second one uses group methods and group three schematic methods. After applying these methods, certain projects are initiated. The research problem is to identify whether or not there is a significant relationship between the type of method used and the number of new projects. The data was collected by interviewing the project managers of each one of the banks. The nine banks are ALPHA, RZB, BT, Citi, RBS, BCR, ING, BP, Credit Europe and the product taken into consideration is the credit card. The reason why we chose it is that the number of users is bigger and bigger and that it is an instrument of payment with a continuous development. My sample is composed of the most competitive banks at this moment in the Romanian market, as far as the credit cards are concerned. If we go back to 2003, when the credit card was launched in our country, we must say that it only represented a limit given by the bank. Nowadays, this payment instrument offers a multitude of benefits, such as instalments without interest at the partner merchants (except for Citi and ING) and period of grace for cash retreat.

The method used for the development of this study is ANOVA (analysis of variance). ANOVA tests the difference between the means of more than two means, obtained in independent samples. It is computed as the ratio between intergroup and interagroup variances. This is called the Fischer ratio (F). A significant value of F makes us believe that the difference between the means of the compared groups is big enough in order not to be by chance. (Popa, 2008)

The research hypothesis is that the number of projects depends on the groups of methods of idea generation used.

The null hypothesis is that there is no significant connection between the groups of methods and the number of projects.

The statistical criteria are presented below.

Table 1

Degrees of freedom

$df_{intergroup}$= number of groups – 1
$df_{intergroup}$= 3 –1 = 2
$df_{intragroup}$= total population – number of groups
$df_{intragroup}$= 9 – 3 = 6
$F_{critical}(F_{0.05,2,6})$ = 5,1433 from F table for α = 0,05

Table 2

The distribution of values belonging to the three groups

	Metode individuale		Metode de grup		Metode schematice	
	X_1	X_1^2	X_2	X_2^2	X_3	X_3^2
	2	4	4	16	3	9
	4	16	5	25	1	1
	3	9	4	16	2	4
Σ X	**9**	**29**	**13**	**57**	**6**	**14**
M=Σ X/N	**3**	**...**	**4.33**	**...**	**2**	**M=(m1+m2+m3)/3= 3.11**
s^2	**1**	**...**	**0.33**	**...**	**1**	
(m-M)	-0.11	...	1.22	...	-1.11	
$(m-M)^2$	0.01	...	1.49	...	1.23	**Σ$(m-M)^2$= 2.74**

After the calculation of the parameters of the three groups, we are able to compute the F ratio. First, we calculate the dispersion of the means of the three groups and after that the denominator of the F ratio (intragroup dispersion), by substituting the values calculated for the dispersions of the groups. Finally, we will compute the value of F ratio.

Table 3

Fischer ratio

$s^2_{intergrup}=\frac{n_1*(m_1-M)^2+n_2*(m_2-M)^2+n_3*(m_3-M)^2}{df_{intergroup}}$ m_1, m_2,m_3 are the means of the groups

n_1, n_2, n_3 are the sizes of the samples

$s^2_{intergrup}=3*\frac{0.01234567?+1.49382716+1.234567901}{2}=3*1.37=4.11$

$s^2_{intragrup}=\frac{s_1^2+s_2^2+s_3^2}{Ngroups}$ s_1, s_2, s_3 are the dispersions of the three groups

$F=\frac{s^2_{intergroup}}{s^2_{intragroup}}=\frac{4.111}{0.78}=5.28$

The value of F from the table is lower than the value computed for F. This means that the value of F calculated is statistically significant, so there are differences between the means of the three groups. The statistical decision is that the null hypothesis is rejected. The research decision is the hypothesis of the research is accepted. So, the research conclusion is that the number of projects varies according to the type of idea generation method applied.

Until now, we have analyzed the influence each group of methods has on the number of internal ongoing projects from the banking system (in our example, we took into consideration nine banks). Next, we will apply the same method, but inside each group.

Table 4

Group methods

	Brain storming		**Team Process**		**Problem Mapping**	
	X_1	X_1^2	X_2	X_2^2	X_3	X_3^2
	2	4	2	4	0	0
	1	1	3	9	1	1
	1	1	2	4	1	1
Σ X	**4**	**6**	**7**	**17**	**2**	**2**
M=Σ X/N	**1.33**	**…**	**2.33**	**…**	**0.66**	**M=(m1+m2+m3)/3=** 1.44
s^2	**0.33**	**…**	**0.33**	**…**	**0.33**	
(m-M)	-0.11	…	0.88	…	-0.77	
$(m-M)^2$	0.01	…	0.79	…	0.60	

Dispersion	SS	df	MS	F
Intergroup	4.22	2	2.11	6.33
Intragroup	2.00	6	0.33	
Total	6.22	8		

The research hypothesis is the number of projects depends on the type of *group method of idea generation* used.

The null hypothesis is there is no significant connection between the type of group method and the number of projects.

Since F calculated is bigger than F table, the null hypothesis is rejected, meaning that the number of projects depends on the type of group method of idea generation used.

Table 5

Individual methods

	Delphi		**Lateral Thinking**		**Revolutionary Idea Generation**		
	X_1	X_1^2	X_2	X_2^2	X_3	X_3^2	
	1	1	0	0	1	1	
	1	1	1	1	2	4	
	1	1	0	0	2	4	
Σ X	**3**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**5**	9	
M=Σ X/N	**1.00**	…	**0.33**	…	**1.66**	**M=(m1+m2+m3)3=1**	
s^2	**0**	…	**0.33**	…	**0.33**		
(m-M)	0	…	-0.66	…	0.66		

	Delphi		**Lateral Thinking**		**Revolutionary Idea Generation**		
	X_1	X_1^2	X_2	X_2^2	X_3	X_3^2	
	1	1	0	0	1	1	
	1	1	1	1	2	4	
	1	1	0	0	2	4	
Σ X	**3**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**5**	9	
$(m-M)^2$	0	…	0.44	…	0.44		

Dispersion	SS	df	MS	F
Intergroup	2.66	2	1	6
Intragroup	1.33	6	0	
Total	4	8		

The research hypothesis is the number of projects depends on the type of *individual method of idea generation* used.

The null hypothesis is there is no significant connection between the type of individual method and the number of projects.

Since F calculated is bigger than F table, the null hypothesis is rejected, meaning that the number of projects depends on the type of individual method of idea generation used.

Table 6

Schematic methods

	1H5W		**Five Why**		**Checklist**	
	X_1	X_1^2	X_2	X_2^2	X_3	X_3^2
	1	1	0	0	2	4
	0	0	0	0	1	1
	1	1	0	0	1	1
Σ X	**2**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**6**
M=Σ X/N	**0.66**	…	**0**	…	**1.33**	**M=(m1+m2+m3)/3=** 0.66
s^2	**0.33**	…	**0**	…	**0.33**	
(m-M)	0.00	…	-0.66	…	0.66	
$(m-M)^2$	0	…	0.44	…	0.44	

Dispersion	SS	df	MS	F
Intergroup	2.66	2	1.33	6
Intragroup	1.33	6	0.22	
Total	4	8		

The research hypothesis is the number of projects depends on the type of *schematic method of idea generation* used.

The null hypothesis is there is no significant connection between the type of schematic method and the number of projects.

Since F calculated is bigger than F table, the null hypothesis is rejected, meaning that the number of projects depends on the type of schematic method of idea generation used.

5. Conclusions

In all three cases, the research hypothesis was accepted, since the value computed for F was bigger than the critical value of F from the table. This means that the number of ongoing projects in the banking system depends not only on the group of methods (which was demonstrated in the second table) but also on each type of method belonging to each group. We can say that the group methods are the most effective because they are responsible for the biggest number of projects. This group also has the biggest computed value for F. Among the most important projects generated by group methods, we can mention Cosmote Alpha MasterCard and Citi Vodafone. Both of them are partnerships between the bank and another company. They are about some bonuses you get by using your credit card under different conditions. Cosmote Alpha MasterCard offers you a welcome present(18 Euros discount for every purchase of mobile phones from Cosmote and Germanos stores), 3% bonus for every transaction in Cosmote stores, 3% bonus for the payment of Cosmote bill in Cosmote stores, 1% bonus for every transaction made in Romania or overseas using the credit card. With Citi Vodafone you get a bonus of 500 fidelity points after the first transaction using the card and also 8 fidelity points for every 10 Ron you spend. These two projects are very profitable since a lot of new customers use their credit cards more in order to get these bonuses and the bank cashes in many commissions.

References

Amabile, T.M. (1988), "A model of creativity and innovation in organization", *Research in Organizational Behavior,* Vol. 10, pp. 123-167

Amabile, T.M., Schatzel, E.A., Moneta, G.B. and Kramer, S.J. (2004), "Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support", *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, pp. 5-32

de Bono, E. (1970), *Lateral thinking: creativity step by step,* Harper Colophon Books, New York

Boone, L.E. and Kurtz, D.L. (2010), *Contemporary Business*. Hoboken, John Wiley and Sons, NJ

Brătianu, C. and Orzea, I. (2010), "Organizational knowledge creation", *Management & Marketing*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 41-62

Burnes, B., (2004), "Kurt Lewin and complexity theories: back to the future?", *Journal of Change Management,* 4(4), pp. 309-325

Cameron, K.B., Sutton R. I. and Whetten D.A. (1988), "Issues in organizational decline", in K.S. Cameron, R.I. Sutton and D.A. Whetten (eds.), *Readings in organizational decline: frameworks, research and prescriptions,* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co, p. 3 19

Cappelli, P. (2000), "A market-driven approach to retaining talent", *Harvard Business Review,* Vol. 78, No. 1, pp. 103-111

DiMaggio, P. (2001), *The Twenty First-Century firm: changing economic organization in international perspective*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Drucker, P. (1954), *The Practice of Management,* Harper Business, New York

Estes, Z. and Ward, J.B. (2002), "The emergence of novel attributes in concept modification", *Creativity Research Journal*, 14, pp. 149-156

Finke, R.A., Ward, T.B. and Smith, S.M. (1992), *Creative cognition: Theory, research, and applications*. Cambridge, MIT Press, MA

Fleming, L. and Singh, J. (2007), *The Lone Inventor as the Source of Technological Breakthroughs: Myth or Reality?,* Harvard Business School, Boston

Ford, C.M. (2000), "Creative development in creativity theory", *Academy of Management Review, 25*(2), pp. 284-285

Friedman, M. (1962), *Capitalism and Freedom,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Galbraith, J.K. (1952), *American capitalism,* Houghton Mifflin, Boston

Goldenberg, J., Lehmann, D.R. and Mazursky, D. (2001), "The Idea Itself and the Circumstances of Its Emergence as Predictors of New Product Success", *Management Science*, 47, pp. 69-84

Gronn, P. (2002), "Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), pp. 423-451

Jackson, S.E. (1992), "Consequences of group composition for the interpersonal dynamics of strategic issue processing", *Advances in Strategic Management*, 8, pp. 345-382

Johnson, G. and Scholes, K. (2001), *Exploring corporate strategy text and cases,* 6th edition, Prentice Hall, London

Kavadias, S., Sommer, S. (2007), "The Effects of Problem Structure and Team Expertise on Brainstorming Effectiveness", Georgia Institute of Technology

Kimberly, J.R. (1981), *Managing Innovation,* Oxford University Press, Oxford

Knight, F.H. (1921), *Risk, uncertainty and profit*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Krefting, L.A. and Nord, W.R. (2003), "Ethics and HRD: a new approach to leading responsible organizations", *Academy of Management Review*, 28, pp. 512-513

Kuchinke, K.P. (2001), "Why HRD is not an academic discipline", *Human Resource Development International*, 4, pp. 291-294

Langbert, M. (2005), "The master's degree in HRM: midwife to a new profession?", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(4), pp. 434–450

McAdam, R. (2004), "Knowledge creative and idea generation: A critical quality perspective", *Technovation,* Vol. 24, pp. 597-705

McGrath, R.G. (1993), *The development of new competence in established organizations: an empirical investigation*, Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Pennsylvania

Metrick, A., Yasuda, A. (2009), *Venture capital and the finance of innovation*. 2nd edition, Hoboken, John Wiley and Sons, NJ

Miller, J. A. (1992), "Book reviews: whose team are you on?", *Human Resource Planning*, 15, pp. 83-95

Miller, N. (2010), "Brave new role: leading workplace innovation and change", *T+D,* 64(6), pp. 54-58

Mumford, M.D., Feldmen, J.M., Hein, M.B. and Nagao, D.J. (2001), "Tradeoffs between ideas and structure: Individual versus group performance in creative problem solving", *Journal of Creative Behavior,* 35, pp. 1-23

Nelson, R.R. and Winter, S.J. (1982), *An evolutionary theory of economic change,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Nemeth, C. and Ormiston, M. (2007), "Creative idea generation: Harmony versus stimulation", *European Journal of Social Psychology* Eur. J. Soc. Psychol, 37, pp. 524-535

Nunnally, J.C. (1978), *Psychometric theory,* 2nd edition, McGraw-Hill, New York

Payne, R. (1990), "The effectiveness of research teams: A review", in M.S. West and J.L. Farr (eds.), *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies,* pp. 101-122, NY Wiley

Penrose, E. (1959), *The theory of the growth of the firm,* John Wiley & Sons, New York, p. 17

Pettigrew, A.M. (1973), *The politics of organizational decision making*, Pettigrew, London, p. 23

Popa, M. (2008), *Statistica pentru psihologie. Teorie şi aplicaţii SPSS,* Polirom, Iaşi, pp. 143-144

Smith, A. (1981), *The Wealth of Nations*, Oxford University Press, UK

Smith, G.J. (1998), "Idea-generation technique: A formulary of active ingredients", *Journal of Creative Behavior,* 32, pp. 107-133

Taylor, A. and Greve, H.R. (2006), "Superman or the Fantastic Four? Knowledge Combination and Experience in Innovative Teams", *The Academy of Management Journal*, 49, pp. 723-740

Terwiesch, U. (2009), *Innovation Tournaments: Creating and Selecting Exceptional Opportunities*, Harvard Business School Press

Verloop, J. and Wissema, J.G. (2004), *Insight in innovation: managing innovation by understanding the laws of innovation,* Elsevier San Diego, CA

Vesper, K.H. (1990), *New venture strategies*, Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey

Weisberg, J. (1999), "Creativity and knowledge: A challenge to theories", in R.J. Sternberg (ed.), *Handbook of creativity,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 226-250