

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

Iman Feghhi¹

¹ Wagner College

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this paper, the authors begin by presenting the standard definition of creativity. Subsequently, they highlight certain problems associated with this conventional definition and explore attempts by other scientists to address these issues. At this juncture, the authors effectively convey the need to improve the existing definition of creativity.

To further underscore the necessity for a new definition, the paper introduces some lesser-discussed problems. A primary concern addressed by the somewhat novel definition is the frame of reference issue. The argument posits that an idea should be considered creative if it is novel to the individual generating it. However, a challenge arises when one can generate a new and valuable idea but fails to recognize its significance. An anecdotal example might help clarify my point here. When I was a teaching assistant, one of my students came up with a methodological question. Because I did not know the standard method and I was on the spot to answer the question, I came up with an idea on the fly. It was not satisfying for me, and I did not recognize it as a valuable idea. Later, when the student consulted a professor who had worked on the subject matter for decades, the professor realized that I had provided them with an interesting, valuable, and new idea. In general, while the definition suggested here has some merits, solves some of the problems, and is practically valuable in some conditions, I think it is not as comprehensive as asserted.

Another notable concern raised is the frequency of quotations throughout the paper. The reviewer suggests that the excessive use of quotations, especially in a paper on creativity, might not be a strength.

In conclusion, while the paper offers valuable insights and practical applications, the reviewer maintains reservations about the comprehensiveness of the suggested definition and recommends a reconsideration of the frequency of quotations in the context of a creativity-focused paper.