

Challenges in second-tier cities transformations

The three second-tier cities, namely Gdansk, Dublin and Glasgow are presented according to their urban transformation in specific time frames and contexts. The comparative studies first undertaken to analyse the main stressors of urban changes from 1990 to 2010 were in need to be revisited in 2024. The Gdansk Dublin study (2010) concluded with the smart city approaches in city planning. (+ *more on the explanation why Dublin is here as the second-tier city*). The Gdansk Glasgow study (2013) explored the spotted difference between place-oriented and people-oriented planning. Therefore, the selected second-tier cities formerly compared, are perceived as the characteristics to depict familiar real-world phenomena. The second-tier cities' logic of transformative change observed through the model scenarios will explain the spectrum differences in transform/transition capacity in Gdansk, Dublin and Glasgow.

Placemaking context

Neoliberal placemaking complements contextual and processual human creativity and affects the urban transformation capacity. The simulation-based studies required building a mathematical model representing the theory that could depict empirical observations.
(+ *more on the creative city concept, manufacturing etc.*)

Creativity Action Probability model

The theoretical Creativity Action Probability model presents the approach to understanding the creation by analyzing the decision-making process in the urban environment. The objective was to define the theoretical chances of creativity to >exist< through a logical model. Scientific research to date has encountered two problems. The focus on the outcome in the process-based approach to creativity not only merged productivity with creativity but also excluded the efforts undertaken in order to personally experience creativity.

The most comprehensive framework for creativity research was described by the 4Ps model of novel and suitable products created by individuals having traits of a creative person in an environment that allows them to create (place/press) and in a process during which the individual develops creativity. The 4Ps creativity model fails to account for the dualism in the creative process. The hybrid model was an attempt to reconcile the two extreme sides of the generality and specificity of domains through an assumption that the dichotomy of creativity is false as it conceals the mixed nature of creativity. The APT model of creativity, uses the metaphor of an amusement park to describe the creative process. It identifies four stages: initial requirements, general thematic areas, domains, and microdomains. Only the first level (initial requirements) is highly general; every subsequent level is more domain-relevant. The APT model is the first one, in which, despite its generality, accounted for the issues related to the impact of the environment (education/motivation) in the creative process. From the level of general thematic areas (and domains – in the broad sense of the term), the model moves up to specific microdomains. With this approach, the processes differentiated the moment they became product-oriented.

Built upon the 4 C concept by Kaufman, the Creativity Action Probability model rethinks the identified interactions between the creative process and the external stimuli sourcing from, among others, a socioeconomic space with a specific value system that shapes and motivates individuals and communities to act.

The model had to embrace the identified interactions between the creative process and the external environment, understood as external stimuli coming from the urban environment, i.e. a socioeconomic space with a specific value system that shapes and motivates individuals and communities to act. By adopting the representative sampling method for distribution of potentials (2C-3C-4C) at the beginning, it was able to differentiate the flows of potentials through the creative process, their mutual interactions, certain deviations, non-evident issues and changes in the Creative Action Probability results for specific potentials. The other challenge addressed was that product-oriented conceptualisations excessively emphasised the “ossification” of creativity modelling because they obscured the dynamic process of building creativity. It has been assumed that a process can be creative and dynamic even if there is no result in the form of action. Any type of behaviour during the flow is possible, including the abandonment of the creative process in the middle and process looping. Theoretically, the model assumed equal probability for the nodes; appropriate weights were defined only for selected flows (in places identifiable as significant). It was a challenge to calculate the Creative Action Probability for specific values of the potential, because the attempts showed that one potential was distributed unevenly to several potentials, dominating in one of them.

The education, motivation and values flows

The creativity potential assumed to vary at the beginning of the process: from Little-C through Pro-C to Big-C . There are situations where the external environment may adversely affect the creativity potential. Consequently, it is assumed that negative stimulation may result in the emergence of the Mini-C potential. Analogically, in the case of a negative impact, when the potential decreases, so there is Pro-C instead of Big-C and Little-C instead of Pro-C. Every skill enhancement stage is considered as education. It is assumed that the first conscious creative action can take place during learning. Since intentional inaction was also considered as a creative act, such inaction is considered possible from the level of motivation. It is generally accepted that the environment continuously influences the creativity potential through external stimuli at all stages of the creative process. The external environment stimulation diagram adds the interactions between the environment and the creative process to the 4Ps model. Just like in the APT model, initial requirements are understood as a process that a specific potential undergoes – first during education and later under appropriate motivation. The basic difference from the APT model is the next level, which leads to the creativity domain in the APT model and to a specific value system in the present model. Education, motivation and values are all understood as external stimulations in the urban environment. Such stimulations (and personality traits) lead to dualism at the level of both society and the individual. This multiplies the impact of dualism on the creative process. First of all, dualism differentiates the action paths and may loop the process. Furthermore, the two levels – the social level and the individual level – interact with each other. It must be stressed that a creative process can be abandoned (no action may be taken in the end). Stimulation takes place regardless of the will of the individual or the society.

The understanding of process dualism impact

The assumption is that the CAP model displays hybrid features concerning process dualism, which is the unity of domain specificity and generality and convergent and divergent thinking – from the individual perspective; and of sole creation (individualism) and co-creation (collectivism) – from the social perspective. *(Need to put more in here)*

Scenarios and logic in urban changes

The simulation scenarios developed for the CAP model were designed to explore the interactions between the surroundings – the urban environment and the creative process. The impacts of the environment were described through particular attributes/levels/factors influencing the creativity potential during the process and the probability that creative action will arise. The variables influenced the creative process evolving across particular levels to shape creativity potentials and the probability of creative action.

Impact valorisation involved calculating the probability in each of the assumed simulation cases and comparing the resulting situation to the phenomenon observed in the real-life urban environment. The simulation scenarios of the CAP model were prepared in accordance with the presented procedure through the identification of: the key attributes/variables (with potentially high impact and high probability), the phenomena shaping the creative process, variants with a description of the anticipated probability results (in order to analyse and assess the intensity of the changes) and the key interrelations in the CAP model (both hierarchic and subordinate ones).

(Need to put more in here)

Conclusions

The representative sampling method adopted for the distribution of potentials at the beginning makes it possible to differentiate the flows of potentials through the creative process, their mutual interactions, certain deviations, non-evident issues, and changes, which results in the Creative Action Probability with specific potentials. Moreover, a mathematical model (or a whole family of such models) illustrates the creative process and calculates the probability based on the interactions between the creative process and the urban environment. Such insight into the process permits a better understanding of the phenomena, followed by interpreting the urban transformation capacity scenarios in selected cities.

(Need to put more in here)

References:

(Need to put in here)