

Review of: "Why the Standard Definition of Creativity Fails to Capture the Creative Act"

Gaurav Manohar Marathe¹

¹ Indian Institute of Management Ranchi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Contribution

1. In this paper, Anna presents a compelling critique of the current standard definition of creativity, focusing on two dimensions. She offers alternative perspectives to the prevailing conception. The author's exploration of creativity's two dimensions, namely "originality/novelty" and "value/usefulness" (Dimension 1 and Dimension 2), is well-developed and has persuaded me to question the representativeness and validity of these dimensions in defining and measuring creativity.
2. Anna acknowledges the criteria of "originality/novelty" as less problematic for defining creativity and retains this dimension in her new conceptualization. However, she deems the measurement of "value/usefulness" too contextual and controversial for evaluating creativity.
3. Anna replaces the "value/originality" dimension with the "satisfaction" dimension, proposing a new definition of creativity anchored in "satisfaction" and "originality/novelty."
4. She argues for assessing creativity not solely based on audience reception but also considering the creator's experience, introducing an internal frame of reference alongside the dominant external frame.

Her paper promises to trigger interesting scholarly conversations among creativity scholars. Please find below some feedback/opinions based on my understanding to make these future scholarly conversations more impactful

1. While the inclusion of the "satisfaction" criterion seems promising, concerns arise similar to those with the "value" dimension. How we define satisfaction itself? how we separate out impact of traits, dispositional characters, positive/negative affect, situational demands from satisfaction from the creative work itself? The more clarity on satisfaction dimension would help to build more coherent scholarly conversations.
2. Additionally, Anna may need to articulate how her conception surpasses the notion that creative ideas are novel and meaningful, as in everyday creativity (Richards, 2010). Is satisfaction necessarily a superior criterion to meaningfulness?
3. The relationship between Anna's dimensions—satisfaction and novelty/originality—is a crucial inquiry. Are these dimensions independent or interdependent? What is their distance from the evaluative context? The recent publication by Harvey and Berry (2023) in academy of management review discusses the relationship between original two dimensions in great depth to propose the meta- theory of creativity and their approach may be very helpful lens to deliberate on new definition of creative idea.

4. Anna's definition of a creative idea, as one that is novel and satisfying to the creator and/or the recipient, opens up opportunities for a multidimensional construct in judging creativity. Developing a typology could add depth to the discussion. For instance, are creative ideas evaluated low on novelty and satisfaction for the recipient but high on these factors for the creator different in nature compared to ideas with the opposite pattern? How does this typology align with Kaufman's mini-C to big-C model? Considering their broader circles, are internal vs external dimensions more bipolar?

Anna has proposed a novel and valuable idea, or we could say, Anna has found a novel and satisfactory idea :). It is hoped that scholars find more value or higher satisfaction in further developing this idea through an interesting inquiry, contributing to a more evolved foundation for defining creativity in research.

My best wishes to develop the alternative definition further in more depth.