Platform Visibility and Creative Autonomy among Malaysian Independent Illustrators

Nur Aisyah Rahman; Daniel Wei Jian Lim

Department of Creative Industries, Peninsula Institute of Technology and Social Innovation, Shah Alam, Malaysia

Abstract

This paper examines transparent portfolio discovery rules in relation to creative autonomy score in a setting motivated by Malaysia. The objective is to develop an classroom research example and test an analysis strategy before field implementation. The proposed mechanism is that predictable discovery rules may protect experimentation by reducing the pressure to imitate immediately popular styles. A reproducible numerical exercise generates 144 case observations with balanced intervention allocation, a standardized baseline variable, a binary contextual support variable and a continuous illustrative outcome index. An adjusted linear model estimates the intervention contrast at equal contextual support, while a bootstrap provides a second uncertainty assessment. The illustrative adjusted contrast is 2.86 index units, with an approximate 95% confidence interval from 0.60 to 5.12; the corresponding unadjusted contrast is 3.08. Five effect scenarios, each repeated 200 times, assess estimation bias, root mean squared error and interval coverage. The analysis demonstrates how baseline variation and income stability can be represented in a transparent preliminary design. It does not estimate an actual effect in Malaysia, validate the proposed measurement instrument or establish operational effectiveness. The paper contributes a topic specific intervention rationale, an auditable numerical demonstration and a field validation plan. Practical recommendations focus on measurement quality, implementation responsibility and careful interpretation of estimates and outcomes. Further research should calibrate assumptions with real data and examine whether implementation costs and distributional burdens alter the proposed decision.

Keywords: transparent portfolio discovery rules; creative autonomy score; numerical exercise; implementation

Introduction

Platform Visibility and Creative Autonomy among Malaysian Independent Illustrators raises an applied problem that cannot be resolved by assuming that a new practice will benefit every user or organization equally. The intervention considered here is transparent portfolio discovery rules. Its intended outcome is creative autonomy score, while the principal implementation condition is income stability. A useful preliminary manuscript needs to connect these concepts to observable decisions and a clearly stated comparison. The setting is motivated by Malaysia, but the numerical model is not calibrated to a representative national sample. The paper therefore treats location as a context for future investigation rather than a source of estimated population characteristics.

Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

The literature is used as a purposive theoretical foundation for the proposed intervention. This is not a systematic review or a claim of comprehensive coverage. The selected works contribute complementary concepts for participation, decision making, measurement or

implementation. Their role is to justify what should be examined in a later empirical study; they do not supply the numerical coefficients used in the numerical exercise. No country specific effect size is inferred from these sources.

Co-design shifts attention toward collective creativity. (Sanders & Stappers, 2008) Participation must influence both the framing of a problem and the interpretation of the resulting alternatives. For this study, that concept informs the support condition rather than a claimed empirical effect.

Participation includes differences in decision power. (Arnstein, 1969) A consultation activity is insufficient if participants cannot influence permissions, priorities or resource allocation. For this study, that concept informs the support condition rather than a claimed empirical effect.

Value-sensitive design incorporates human values into design. (Friedman, 1996) Technical success should therefore be considered alongside access, understandable choices and the distribution of burdens. For this study, that concept informs the support condition rather than a claimed empirical effect.

Innovation implementation concerns the effective use of innovations. (Klein & Sorra, 1996) Adoption should be analyzed through the routines and responsibilities that make a proposed practice usable. For this study, that concept informs the support condition rather than a claimed empirical effect.

Planned behavior distinguishes attitudes, norms and perceived control. (Ajzen, 1991) A favorable evaluation cannot substitute for an opportunity to act or for confidence that an action is feasible. For this study, that concept informs the support condition rather than a claimed empirical effect.

The resulting framework contains four elements: initial creator experience with online commissions; exposure to transparent portfolio discovery rules; the availability of income stability; and the illustrative creative autonomy score. The central proposition is that predictable discovery rules may protect experimentation by reducing the pressure to imitate immediately popular styles. The contextual proposition is that support changes the intervention response because the practice depends on resources or routines beyond individual intention. These propositions define relationships for testing; they do not establish that the relationships hold in a real setting.

A competing explanation is that visibility metrics can reward conformity even when commissions increase. This possibility creates a need for an independent outcome measure and a comparison condition. In particular, autonomy requires separate questions about discretion and commercial dependence. A future evaluation should report the intended benefit and the competing burden separately so that a favorable headline score cannot conceal a consequential disadvantage.

Research Methodology

This manuscript is a classroom research example. The dataset was constructed for teaching statistical analysis; it was not collected from participants or field sites. Author names and affiliations are illustrative examples. The analysis follows an explicit numerical specification (Morris et al., 2019) to examine an intervention contrast under stated assumptions.

The primary run uses random seed 260902 and 144 case records. Half of the records receive intervention exposure G = 1 and half comparison exposure G = 0. The order is randomly permuted. Baseline B represents standardized creator experience with online commissions and is drawn from a standard normal distribution. Context C represents low or high income stability and is drawn independently from a Bernoulli distribution with probability 0.5. These are deliberate experimental assumptions rather than descriptions of the national population.

The outcome is an arbitrary continuous index for creative autonomy score. It is not a validated questionnaire, a physical quantity or a clinical score. The generating equation is $Y = 52 + 4.20G + 3B + 4C + 1.80G(C - 0.5) + e$, where e is independent normal noise with standard deviation 7.20. The equation provides a known average contrast of 4.20 at balanced context. Coefficients are chosen for illustration and are not borrowed from the cited literature. There is no rescaling, clipping or deletion of unusually high or low generated values.

Table 1 Operational definitions for the numerical exercise

Element	Representation
Intervention	transparent portfolio discovery rules
Baseline	creator experience with online commissions; standardized normal input
Context	income stability; binary support input
Outcome	creative autonomy score; arbitrary continuous index
Primary estimand	Adjusted intervention contrast at C = 0.5

The fitted model includes an intercept, G, B, C and G(C - 0.5). Ordinary least squares estimates coefficients. Approximate 95% intervals use 1.96 times the model standard error. A 400-resample row bootstrap checks the primary contrast using percentile limits (Efron, 1979). Five true contrast settings are evaluated with 200 independent runs each. Bias, root mean squared error and coverage are calculated against the known contrast; Monte Carlo standard errors accompany coverage.

Results and Findings

Table 2 reports the primary case dataset. The adjusted contrast for transparent portfolio discovery rules is 2.86 arbitrary index units, compared with the specified true contrast of 4.20. The unadjusted mean difference is 3.08. The approximate interval is [0.60, 5.12], and the bootstrap percentile interval is [0.57, 4.80]. These quantities describe one reproducible computer experiment. Their numerical precision does not imply that the proposed outcome measure is precise in an actual field study.

Table 2 Estimated coefficients in the primary case run

Term	Estimate	Approximate 95% interval
Intercept	53.38	[51.09, 55.67]
Intervention at balanced context	2.86	[0.60, 5.12]
Standardized baseline	3.94	[2.90, 4.97]
Context support	3.18	[-0.02, 6.38]
Intervention by centered context	2.27	[-2.26, 6.80]

The fitted intervention contrast under low support is 1.72; under high support it is 4.00. This difference follows from the interaction term. It illustrates why an average intervention estimate should not erase contextual variation. The two subgroup contrasts are conditional model outputs, not independent empirical findings about users or institutions in Malaysia.

Table 3 Monte Carlo performance across five true average contrasts

True contrast	Bias	RMSE	Coverage	MC SE
0.00	0.04	1.35	0.930	0.018
2.10	0.12	1.24	0.940	0.017
4.20	-0.10	1.29	0.925	0.019
6.30	0.01	1.24	0.940	0.017
8.40	0.06	1.19	0.965	0.013

Each Table 3 row summarizes 200 runs with the same sample size and noise specification. At the primary contrast, adjusted RMSE is 1.29, compared with unadjusted RMSE of 1.46. Coverage is 0.925, with Monte Carlo standard error 0.019. The zero-average scenario retains contextual moderation; it does not assert that all subgroup effects are zero. Coverage comparisons should account for finite numerical repetition and the use of an approximate normal interval.

Discussion

The numerical demonstration clarifies what a proposed evaluation of transparent portfolio discovery rules would need to estimate. The main substantive mechanism remains a proposition: predictable discovery rules may protect experimentation by reducing the pressure to imitate immediately popular styles. The generated contrast demonstrates that the specified mechanism can be represented in a statistical design; it does not confirm that the mechanism occurs in practice. The distinction matters because the effect coefficient is supplied by the investigator before any case observation is created. A model that reproduces that coefficient is behaving as intended, rather than discovering an intervention benefit.

The contextual term makes income stability a condition to investigate explicitly. A future study could compare implementation under different support arrangements while documenting changes in the underlying practice. Such a comparison should not replace support with a vague institutional category, because organizations assigned to the same category may differ in staffing, resources and decision authority. Measurement of creator experience with online commissions is also important: an apparent intervention benefit may partly reflect initial differences that are unrelated to the intervention.

An important competing interpretation is that visibility metrics can reward conformity even when commissions increase. This is not included as a second measured outcome in the numerical demonstration, so the numerical exercise cannot resolve it. The immediate design response is to define a burden measure alongside creative autonomy score. A practical protocol should specify who experiences that burden, how it is observed and whether it could undermine the intended improvement. A favorable aggregate score would be insufficient if the intervention systematically makes access or work more difficult for a relevant subgroup.

The small difference between adjusted and unadjusted estimates in some runs should not be interpreted as proof that baseline measurement is unnecessary. Random allocation makes baseline differences accidental in this numerical exercise. In actual organizations or classrooms, uptake may depend on motivation, staffing or previous performance. These selection processes require an appropriate design and cannot be repaired by automatically adding available variables to a regression. The field protocol should define allocation and the timing of baseline measurement before outcome data are inspected.

Transfer to Malaysia requires calibration rather than a verbal assertion of realism. A pilot should test whether autonomy requires separate questions about discretion and commercial dependence, and should evaluate the practical meaning of the support condition. Local language, operating procedures and access requirements may alter the measurement process. The numerical exercise becomes useful when it informs these decisions and is revised in response to pilot evidence. It remains insufficient as a substitute for that evidence.

Recommendations Limitations and Conclusion

The first implementation recommendation is to define the intervention as a reproducible procedure. For transparent portfolio discovery rules, the protocol should describe the steps delivered, the resources required and the decisions left to users or staff. Responsibility for income stability should be assigned to an identifiable role. A record of departures from the intended procedure is necessary because an intervention name alone does not establish consistent delivery across sites.

The second recommendation concerns measurement. In particular, autonomy requires separate questions about discretion and commercial dependence. The arbitrary index used here should be replaced by an instrument or observation protocol with defensible content validity and documented scoring. Assessors should work independently of delivery where feasible. Outcomes should be recorded at prespecified times, and the protocol should distinguish task performance, implementation acceptance and downstream benefits. These distinctions are especially important when an improvement in creative autonomy score is only one part of the operational objective.

The third recommendation is to evaluate feasibility and burdens before expansion. The key concern is that visibility metrics can reward conformity even when commissions increase. A small field pilot should record participation or operating continuity, resource use, unexpected failures and differences across users or sites. Interviews may explain why a procedure is difficult to use, but quotations should come from actual consented participants rather than generated text. Any later field study needs real investigators, appropriate institutional review where applicable and a data management plan suited to the collected information.

The principal limitation is the use of a classroom dataset. The coefficients, support prevalence and noise distribution are illustrative; they have not been estimated for Malaysia. Independence between allocation, baseline and support simplifies the design. The model assumes linear relationships, additive normal residuals and a single form of moderation. It omits measurement error, clustering, attrition and time variation. With 200 repetitions per scenario, Monte Carlo precision is limited. Alternative assumptions may change estimation performance and should be investigated before selecting a field analysis.

A second limitation concerns the literature foundation. The paper uses selected works to frame an applied problem, rather than a reproducible systematic search of all relevant research. Evidence may vary across languages, disciplines and implementation settings. The bibliography establishes conceptual starting points and statistical methods; it does not establish a country specific intervention benefit. A full empirical revision should add relevant local evidence and explain how it modifies the proposed framework.

This numerical exercise provides a reproducible preliminary design for platform visibility and creative autonomy among malaysian independent illustrators. The adjusted contrast of 2.86 index units describes the case dataset. The contribution is a testable intervention proposition, a

contextual analysis and a validation plan. Real observations, measurement validation and assessment of implementation burdens are required to evaluate effectiveness.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35*(4), 216–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225

Efron, B. (1979). Bootstrap Methods: Another Look at the Jackknife. *The Annals of Statistics, 7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176344552

Friedman, B. (1996). Value-sensitive design. *Interactions, 3*(6), 16–23. https://doi.org/10.1145/242485.242493

Klein, K. J., & Sorra, J. S. (1996). The Challenge of Innovation Implementation. *The Academy of Management Review, 21*(4), 1055–1080. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1996.9704071863

Morris, T. P., White, I. R., & Crowther, M. J. (2019). Using simulation studies to evaluate statistical methods. *Statistics in Medicine, 38*(11), 2074–2102. https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.8086

Sanders, E. B. N., & Stappers, P. J. (2008). Co-creation and the new landscapes of design. *CoDesign, 4*(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/15710880701875068

Appendix Reproducibility Specification

Primary random seed: 260902. case records: 144. Balanced intervention allocation: 72 per condition. Baseline distribution: standard normal. Context distribution: Bernoulli with probability 0.5. Outcome intercept: 52. Baseline coefficient: 3. Context coefficient: 4. Primary intervention coefficient: 4.20. Centered-context moderation: 1.80. Residual standard deviation: 7.20. Bootstrap resamples: 400. Monte Carlo repetitions: 200 per scenario. True average contrasts: 0.00, 2.10, 4.20, 6.30, 8.40. Case records and numeric summaries are retained in the internal research audit. All reported table values can be recreated from this specification and the accompanying builder script.