

Csikszentmihalyi claims creativity is not the product of a single individual, is the reason because creativity is something new and the concept of new or novelty is a social concept ? or is it linked to the concept of value and only other may define the value of what we create like a painting ? help me understand

Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi's systems model of creativity fundamentally shifts the focus from individual genius to a dynamic interplay between three components: **the individual**, **the domain** (cultural/symbolic knowledge), and **the field** (social gatekeepers). Here's how this framework addresses the relationship between novelty, value, and social context:

1. Novelty as a Socially Constructed Concept

Csikszentmihalyi argues that creativity requires **novelty recognized within a cultural context**:

- A creation is only "new" if it diverges from existing patterns in a **domain** (e.g., art, science, mathematics) while still being intelligible within that domain's rules^{[1] [2]}.
- Example: Van Gogh's paintings were initially dismissed as chaotic but later recognized as groundbreaking because the *field* (art critics, historians) reevaluated their relationship to emerging modernist trends^[3].

This means **newness is not inherent** but depends on:

- The domain's current state (what already exists)
- The field's willingness to accept deviation^[4]

2. Value as a Social Judgment

Creativity's societal impact hinges on the **field's validation**:

- The field (experts, institutions, critics) acts as a filter, deciding which novelties are valuable enough to enter the domain^{[2] [5]}.
- Example: A painting's artistic "value" isn't determined by the artist alone but by galleries, curators, and collectors who contextualize it within art history^[3].

Key points:

- **No individual can unilaterally declare their work creative**—it requires acceptance by the field^[1].
- Value is tied to **cultural relevance**: Innovations must address problems or gaps the field deems important^{[4] [5]}.

3. Why Individual Genius Isn't Enough

Csikszentmihalyi's model rejects the "lone genius" myth:

- **Individuals** generate ideas, but creativity only manifests when:
 - They deeply understand the domain's rules (e.g., a physicist mastering quantum mechanics)^{[2] [5]}.
 - The field validates their contribution (e.g., peer-reviewed publication)^{[1] [4]}.
- Example: Einstein's relativity theories required the physics community to recognize their alignment with (and expansion of) existing frameworks^[2].

Conclusion: Creativity as a Collaborative Process

Csikszentmihalyi's framework shows creativity is **not purely individual** because:

1. **Novelty** is defined relative to a domain's existing knowledge.
2. **Value** is assigned by the field's social processes.
3. **Cultural context** determines whether an innovation is meaningful.

This explains why many revolutionary ideas (e.g., Gregor Mendel's genetics work) only gain recognition when the domain and field evolve to accommodate them^{[2] [3]}. Creativity thus emerges from the **intersection of personal insight, cultural tools, and social validation**.

✱

1. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0142694X99000137>
2. https://us.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/11443_01_Henry_Ch01.pdf
3. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/creativity-concept-katja-tschimmel-1f>
4. <https://jarednielsen.com/creativity/>
5. <https://tylerdevries.com/book-summaries/creativity/>