

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

Alf Rehn¹

¹ University of Southern Denmark

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

There is a lot I like here, and I think the author is on the right track with a lot of what is done in this note. That said, I have some comments regarding both contribution and conclusions, that I think would strengthen the paper. Also note that this is the first time I have reviewed for this... well, whatever this is. Journal? Platform? Whatever it is, I am not sure what quality criteria I should deploy here. Thus, these are my comments regarding how this could be developed to be the best publication it can be, rather than a straight accept/reject.

To start, this reads more like a research note than a full paper. It is a very interesting research note, but as there is little in the way of new empirical data or a fuller conceptual development, I am going to call it a research note. It is a well-written such, and quite an interesting one, but it does make quite a leap from astute observations regarding limitations in previous attempts to define and codify creativity, to making similar limited statements itself.

At the heart of this note lies the complexity of defining creativity, and the paper does a very nice job of outlining the challenges in the many attempts that have been made in introducing such a definition. Even more specifically, the article does a good job of outlining how external frames of reference have become implicitly valorized in creativity research, to the point where it seems more central to much of the literature whether others hail an idea as creative than whether the creator thinks so. This emphasis on the external framework is critiqued quite nicely in the paper, and the issues that arises from this are detailed. This part I really enjoyed, even though a few more examples would not have gone amiss.

The paper then attempts to rehabilitate the internal frame of reference, i.e. "that the perspective of the creator must **necessarily** be considered when examining their creative process" (emphasis mine). Now, whilst this is argued for with vim and verve, I am not quite convinced that we aren't ending up in another version of the same old mess.

What I enjoyed was the manner in which the paper critiques simplistic assumptions in creativity research, so the manner in which the note ends in rather absolute claims, just opposite ones from what has so far been quite nicely criticized. I would have wished that the paper would have dared to state what for me is the obvious conclusion: We will never have a perfect theory for creativity, as one cannot perfectly balance the internal and the external frames of reference, and there will always be a bias towards one or the other. To me, this is not a problem, as creativity is a manifold thing that deserves a manifold theory, as well as a complex concept that cannot necessarily be reduced to simple definitions. Let us remember that when Barthes declared the death of the author, he was very clear that this was a *perspective*, not the final word on the creative process – and I feel Barthes would have found any claim of stating such quite problematic.

Thus, this paper reads like the beginning of a really powerful critique, but one that does not dare draw the full conclusions of its elegant analysis. It is at its best when it critiques, but then falls a bit flat when it feels a compunction to take things back to models simple enough that creativity researchers will understand them...

I hate giving stars, as a paper is not a burger joint, but I ended up with three (out of five) just so I can post this. I do this to denote that I think this is a really nice start, with some really good elements, but not really fully developed yet.